18358

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

4 EDWARD VII., 1904

VOL. LXVII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1904

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 6, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With the indulgence of the House, as I have to be away in a minute or two, I would like to call the attention of the House to a matter in regard to which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked for information yesterday, that is in regard to the report of the Treadgold commission. The House was advised some time ago that the concessionaries had withdrawn and asked to be relieved of their contract and that the application had been granted by the government. Thereupon my colleague, the Secretary of State, advised Mr. Justice Britton of the fact and intimated there was no necessity of a report. Mr. Scott acting without consulting Council, and when the matter was brought to the attention of Council his action was not approved of. Mr. Justice Britton was advised immediately to consider the letter of Mr. Scott as unwritten and withdrawn, and therefore we expect a report from Mr. Justice Britton on the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the right hon. Prime Minister any information to give the House as to the date when we may expect the report ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Judge Britton is being communicated with at the present time, and I will perhaps be able to tell my hon. friend to-morrow.

RESIGNATION OF LT.-COL. GREGORY—INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I would like to know when we may expect to have brought down the papers relating to the resignation of Lt.-Col. Gregory ? These were spoken of in the debate which took place last week in the House and it was then announced by the hon. minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that there was no objection to bringing the papers down, and that they would be brought down at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia to this matter and have the hon. gentleman's question answered to-morrow.

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know whether or not it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation founded upon the resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) which passed this House unanimously about ten days ago ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will call the attention of the government to the hon. gentleman's question, and will be able to give an answer to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the hon. gentleman is the government. I expected an answer from him.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am a very humble member of the government.

SUPPLY—LETTER OF MR. W. T. R. PRESTON *RE* LORD DUNDONALD'S DISMISSAL.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I would like to bring to the attention of the government a communication which appears in the London 'Times' of June 18, over the signature of Mr. W. T. R. Preston. I presume the gentleman is the Canadian Emigration agent at London. I would like to get some information from the government respecting this communication, whether the government approve of it, if their attention has been called to it, or whether they disapprove of it, and whether they think Mr. Preston is in the line of his duty as emigration agent of this country in the old country in addressing an ex parte, inaccurate, and therefore misleading statement to the English people through the columns of the London 'Times' respecting a matter upon which there is a wide divergence of opinion in this country. Mr. Preston is the servant of the people

of Canada, and I would like to ascertain if the government think it is consistent with the discharge of his duty to the people of this country that he should be permitted to rush into print when he feels disposed to do so, and to make statements that are not in accordance with the facts as we understand them on this side of the House, and that will, in the light that this is the case, mislead the public as to the situation. Mr. Preston has made a statement respecting the differences between the government and Lord Dundonald, late General Officer Commanding, and in order that the House may be apprised of the nature of the communication I will read it with permission. It is found at page 8 of the London 'Times,' of Saturday, June 18, and is as follows :

IMPERIAL OFFICERS AND THE CANADIAN MILITIA.

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,—So long as the discussion upon the recent difficulty between Lord Dundonald and the Canadian government was confined simply to newspaper editorials however unfair they may have been—

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). Will my hon. friend say what paper he is reading from.

Mr. CLARKE. The London 'Times,' of Saturday, June 18. I will send it over to the hon. gentleman.

IMPERIAL OFFICERS AND THE CANADIAN MILITIA.

Is the heading.

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,—So long as the discussion upon the recent difficulty between Lord Dundonald and the Canadian government was confined simply to newspaper editorials, however unfair they may have been, I do not know that the circumstances altogether called for a reply.

But when I find correspondents in the columns of your journal, of a recent date, accepting as absolutely true various inferences which have been drawn by the public press respecting the administration of the Canadian militia, it occurred to me that a few lines from a Canadian might not be out of place.

I do not propose discussing at length the Dundonald affair, but desire to point out that the charges which are being made as to politics entering into the militia administration in Canada are based upon the refusal of the acting minister to accept Lord Dundonald's recommendation in one particular. And it now transpires that the gentleman whom Lord Dundonald recommended as major of the force was not even connected with the Canadian Militia. I am not going to suggest reasons which might have actuated Lord Dundonald in making this recommendation. Anything of that kind would be uncalled for. But in dealing with the facts of the case that circumstance stands out clear and distinct. I wonder how long the War Office in this country would hesitate about striking the name of a civilian off the list of recommendations by one of its officials under similar circumstances. I think I am safe in saying that it would be done in less time than it was done at Ottawa, and that writers to the press here would have waited for all the circumstances to be made known before charging the minister of the day with being actuated by political reasons.

However, that is outside of the case to which I desire to reply, i.e., Mr. Herbert's allegations in a letter to the 'Times' of the 17th inst., where he bewails with much grief the presence of political prejudice in connection with Canadian militia appointments. As a Canadian I have much pleasure in assuring him that his grief is expended upon a myth. He first builds up a case to suit himself and then proceeds to demolish it without first finding a case established and then arguing from that standpoint. The absolute truth is that the militia is one of the phases of life in Canada which both political parties have kept free from either political partiality or political prejudice. The administration of the militia forces in Canada by both political parties proves from time immemorial the truth of my statement. The discussions in parliament the criticisms which naturally take place under responsible government from time to time all go to prove that both political parties have refrained from introducing politics into the militia. The order of promotions is provided for by legislation and by regulations accepted by parliament, so that politics cannot fairly enter. And if further evidence was wanted of the general non-political character of the Canadian militia it is found in the fact that both political parties are represented in every phase of the citizen military life of Canada.

But the seriousness of the charge which is now made is that the present government are the principal sinners in this particular. To prove how unfair this allegation is one has only to refer to distribution of responsibilities in connection with the late war in South Africa and the Coronation ceremonies two years ago. The principal positions upon both of these occasions were in point of fact given by the government to political opponents. Apart from these particular cases instances without number can be given of a purely provincial or local aspect proving that the opponents of the government of the day have been the recipients of official preferment to as marked degree as government supporters.

But because government opponents in Canada choose to make charges at the present juncture of a broad general character, as is done also in this country, therefore the British public are asked to believe, without hearing the other side of the case, that these charges are absolutely true.

Your correspondent fears that this trouble between an imperial officer and the Canadian government is going to prove detrimental to the entire military system of Canada and that, because Lord Dundonald has taken a course which could only result in his dismissal, therefore the citizen militia of Canada is going to become utterly demoralized. Mr. Bron. Herbert may as well dispel his fears first as last. Canadians have a strong sense of the need of an efficient militia, and they will undoubtedly be able to bring the citizen soldiery of Canada to a high state of efficiency even if there is no imperial officer to give the government of the day the benefit of his experience.

The people of Canada upon this, as upon other subjects of federal jurisdiction, can safely be left to solve their own difficulties and it will be

found that the genius of government has not altogether departed from the country. And it will also be revealed to ultra-loyal pessimists of the character of your correspondent that the British interests have not been imperilled, and that this incident has not dissolved a valuable link between the two countries. All Canadians ask is that Mr. Bron. Herbert, and those like him, will be fair to the statesmen of the Dominion, and not allow the ex parte statements of political opponents or allegations founded upon imperfect knowledge of the circumstances to prejudice their interest.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) W. T. R. PRESTON.

11 and 12 Charing Cross, S.W., June 17.

I take it that there can be no doubt at all that the writer of this communication is the Canadian emigration agent at London. I would like to ascertain if the government think that this gentleman is in the line of his duty in sending communications of this kind to the public press ? Has any remonstrance been sent to Mr. Preston regarding this communication ? I would also like to know, Mr. Speaker, if Canada has a high commissioner in London, whether it would not be more in accord with the fitness of things —if any injustice has been done to any interest in Canada by the publication of imperfect reports in the English newspapers— that it should devolve on the High Commissioner, rather than on the Canadian emigration agent, to set the English public right. I recognize Mr. Preston's right to entertain opinions on all these subjects; but in view of all circumstances I challenge his right as a servant of the people of Canada to rush into print with a statement of this kind. Mr. Preston was probably not more fully informed when he wrote this communication than was the gentleman whose communication he took exception to. We should have some declaration from the government as to the policy it intends to pursue respecting matters of this kind. Is it within the line of Mr. Preston's duty to write such communications and have them published? Do the government approve of his action? If they do not approve of it, have they disapproved of it; and what means have they taken to express their disapproval ? Has any communication passed between the government and Lord Strathcona about this matter ? These are questions which the government may fairly be required to answer. We ought to know what their policy is. If an official in the employment of the government writes anything to the public press derogatory to the policy of the government, his official head is immediately taken off. Are we to understand that officials, paid servants of the people, have immunity from official frowns if they fawn upon the government, their masters or paymasters for the time being ? Are they at liberty to address communications to the press here or in the old land eulogizing the action of the government, and are other officials debarred from expressing opinions contrary to those entertained by the government ? I do not desire to take up the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to have an expression of opinion from the government as to what they think of Mr. Preston's communication and what they intend to do about it ?

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). I was not aware until yesterday that the official in question had written a letter to the London 'Times,' and I only became aware of it then through a reference which I noticed in one of the Ottawa papers. I gave instructions to one of my officials to look up the authentic report of the letter and to bring it to me yesterday, but I did not have time to examine it, and have not had time to examine it yet. Therefore, neither myself nor any member of the government has any definite knowledge of the contents of the letter, except such as we received this morning through hearing the hon. gentleman read it. All I can say is : that subject is one that we will have to give our consideration to, and at the present time I am not prepared to express any opinion about it or to say anything further. So soon as the government has been able to give the subject consideration we will be able to announce the conclusion at which we have arrived.

Mr. CLARKE. Under the circumstances, I presume I will be at liberty to bring this matter again before the attention of the government within the next two or three days ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume that this matter is in the Department of the Minister of the Interior, and in order that it may be still further considered by him and by the government, I may state that it is a well known fact that not only Mr. Preston but others of the officers of this government in the old country are in the habit of writing articles to the English press condemning the policy of the opposition here, and tooting and palavering the policy and the members of the administration. This country voted the sum of $15,000 last year to help what was termed the Canadian Associated Press Bureau, or some such institution. Then these same gentlemen had these manufactured toots of their own chiefs for the time being telegraphed all over the world as the expressions of the British public, quoting from some remote north of England, or Scotch or Welsh journal the opinion of the editor upon the magnificence and grandeur of some of these gentlemen. I shall give you a sample of it.

Mr. SIFTON. Will my hon. friend permit me ? Is he referring to anything written by an official of the government, or is he referring to the reports prepared by the agents of the Associated Press ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am referring first to the editorials or comments published in

the English papers as coming from the English editors themselves, but in reality written for them by these tooters. I am going to give the House a sample of these editorials. These comments, so-called original editorial comments, in the papers are telegraphed back to Canada and all over this country as the opinions of the great English public. Perhaps the hon. minister (Mr. Sifton) does not know how the thing is run and is a stranger to the way the thing is managed. We will give him details of it, and perhaps, if he will consult the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), he will get a pointer or two.

Now, Sir, I have here one of this class of articles undoubtedly written by an official of this government. I am not saying that he does it during his office hours, or he has not a perfect right to express his views if he can get paid for it, and there may be no great harm in that. This editorial is undoubtedly written by one of the agents of the Minister of Agriculture and published all over as the opinion of the great British public, of that hon. gentleman. Here it is. I may say that it is headed 'The World's Greatest Farmer.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He might have added 'The New Minister of Militia.' The editorial reads :

Canada confidently looks forward to being at no distant date the granary of the empire, and even now the man who is her Minister of Agriculture may be described with scarcely any exaggeration as the greatest farmer of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Did I understand the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was going to ask hon. gentleman if he said the greatest farmer or the greatest failure ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not expressing my own views, I am simply reading from the extract.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Do not work off these minstrel jokes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—(reading) :

This is especially the case with regard to the present Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, whose name is prominently before the public in connection with Lord Dundonald and the Dominion militia.

Mr. BENNETT. The best advertisement he ever had.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—(reading) :

He is a practical farmer himself.

I do not see my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) here, or he would query that assertion.

On a considerable scale, his fine property, Alva Farm, which is situated in the eastern townships of the province of Quebec, being one of the best in the Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a little early in the morning for the hon. gentlemen to be so filled with enthusiasm.

Mr. GALLIHER. We cannot help it, you are so nice and genial.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If it occurred at the usual hour in the evening, we would not be surprised. But at this early hour of the morning——

Mr. MACPHERSON. You would be able to make your speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Note how well posted these English editors are on this great genius who occupies the position of Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada. They even know of his most beautiful farm 'Alva,' in the eastern townships.

But as Minister of Agriculture he has a unique opportunity. The government maintains in several parts of Canada large experimental farms for the purpose of exploiting the latest ideas with respect to agriculture. New methods and theories, ranging over the whole area of farming operations are carefully considered, tried and adopted, if successful, while the results arrived at are given the widest publicity. How important all this is to a nation of farmers like the Canadians is easily understood.

It is a fortunate thing for Canada, now developing enormously on her agricultural side in Manitoba and the Northwest, that Mr. Fisher is not only a thoroughly competent farmer himself, but also that he brings to his work a highly-trained intelligence and an inspiring enthusiasm.

And this is the gentleman who opposed the establishment of experimental farms in this country with all his might and main for many a long year until he happened, through the influence of his paper and his position, to again become a member of this House, when this aggregation came into power, and, forsooth, they had to put him in some place, and the place where he could do the least damage was in the portfolio of Minister of Agriculture.

Though he is an excellent farmer, it will not do to think of him as a 'horny-handed son of the soil.' He is a man who has been educated at McGill University, Montreal, and Trinity College, Cambridge. His father, a Scotchman, was a well known Montreal physician.

Note, Sir, how accurately this poor, deluded British editor is posted on this great genius from Canada.

His superb——

Listen ; hold your breath, please.

His superb mental equipment and decided ability led him to take large, statesmanlike views.

I presume especially in the establishment of new regiments of militia along the boundary.

His vigorous policy has brought about something like a revolution in Canadian agriculture, chiefly by the extension of the principle of co-operative farming, the great success of which is notably shown in dairy farming.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And, Sir, it is told of him that on one occasion he went out to interview his foreman, and, going over to the bull pen, he asked him which was the Jersey that gave the best cream.

He has also travelled far and wide with a view to the opening up of new markets, or the development of those already existing.

Especially in regard to the Geisha girls in Japan.

He has founded several flourishing organizations for the furtherance of agriculture.

He is in the prime of life. His political career began in 1880, and in the famous electoral campaign of 1896, which resulted in the overthrow of the Conservative party——

Remark that it does not say in the triumph of the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I notice that all the gentlemen who are slated for offices are leading vigorously in the applause.

Mr. WADE. Russell is not here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Otherwise he would have been at the top of the list, if the hon. gentlemen would be good enough to take the lead right along from our good friend.

Mr. Fisher took a very prominent part, and in the Laurier cabinet was included as Minister of Agriculture, with the unanimous approval of all Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The unanimous approval of all Canada—a plebiscite.

The Canadian Department of Agriculture includes in its range some matters not exactly of an agricultural nature, such as public health, patents, copyright, and census statistics, and Mr. Fisher has introduced several beneficial changes with regard to these subjects.

Now Sir, there is an important addition here. Under the new Orders in Council we find that this gentleman is charged with the administration of militia affairs also. The Minister of Militia, being thoroughly incompetent to attend to his business, the cabinet appointed the Minister of Agriculture to deal with militia matters in this special district. Would the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Agriculture or the minister of whatever department this was sent from, be good enough to have that corrected ?

One of the things he has done is to amend the copyright law of Canada with a view to the protection of English authors.

Yet the general view taken in this country is that he endeavoured to amend the Copyright Law in order to shut out English authors.

He is a strong temperance worker.

Mr. BENNETT. What about the dozen bottles of whisky ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let us draw a mantle over that.

He carried in 1896 a government measure providing for a popular vote on the question of total prohibition.

The writer might have added that he carried around with him on his trip to England several bottles of good Canadian rye whisky.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was not referring to these hon. gentlemen. There was no danger of their carrying whisky around in their cases. It would have been carried elsewhere by them.

Mr. SIFTON. What paper is this published in ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is published in the London 'Daily Mail.' I do not know how much it cost a line.

Mr. SIFTON. Who is the writer ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is no name, but undoubtedly it was inspired by the Minister of Agriculture. Of course he would not have his own name signed to it.

Mr. SIFTON. Would the hon. gentleman give the reference so that we may look it up ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will give you the extract.

Mr. SIFTON. What date ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Thursday, June 16th, 1904.

An hon. MEMBER. Did he surrender ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These hon. gentlemen seem to forget the fix they were in the other evening, or they would not say anything about surrendering. But I want to tell them that when I get hold of anybody who surrenders, he never escapes.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This sort of thing is rampant throughout the English press. We find extracts from obscure country papers in England cabled out here at the expense of Canada, tooting gentlemen of no

greater capacity than the hon. Minister of Agriculture and others of his colleagues. Emboldened by impurity, we find these paid servants of the Dominion, not content with anonymous contributions, not content with misinforming the editors of English newspapers, as they have been doing a long time, under cover of anonymity, are coming out brazenly, writing over their own signatures, and deliberately falsifying the record. It is about time that these people were brought to a sense of their duty and this sort of thing stopped.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. I just wish to refer for a moment to the fact that this practice, to which my hon. friend who has just spoken has alluded, was indulged in to a considerable extent some years ago by the immigration officer we then had in Ireland. We had him not only dealing with matters which were not by any means relevant to the duties he had to perform, but actually improperly and insolently discussing the acts of members of parliament. One instance after another of this was brought to the attention of the government and we had the assurance of the Minister of the Interior that it would be stopped. The following year however we had a repetition of the offence.

Mr. SIFTON. Does the hon. gentleman say I did not stop it ?

Mr. SPROULE. What I said was that when it was brought to the hon. minister's attention he said it would be stopped, but the next year we had a repetition of it.

Mr. SIFTON. It was stopped.

Mr. SPROULE. It was afterwards, but only after it had gone on two or three years. Forbearance ceases to be a virtue when the servants of the people are allowed to abuse it as they have been doing. Our immigration agent in Ireland left of his own accord the service of the government, but just as soon as he dropped out, another started in on the same lines. There is no doubt that this article on the Minister of Agriculture was inspired from Ottawa and written no doubt by some one who was expecting promotion or perhaps by some member of the government. I venture to say that there is not one of a thousand readers in Canada who will not reach the same conclusion. It is highly improper that an employee of this government should be allowed to indulge in that kind of work. Whether that employee be W. T. R. Preston or any other notorious character, makes no difference.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understand that my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, inquired about certain papers having reference to the extension of time of Lieutenant Colonel Gregory's command and the refusal to further extend it. I have given an order to have these papers prepared. They are somewhat voluminous, but will be ready in a day or two.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. minister also bring down his orders and regulations regarding the new examinations ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce have the papers which I asked him about yesterday brought down ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All the papers in the hands of my department were sent to the Secretary of State, but there was some information from the Department of Justice which is being put in shape and will be furnished this afternoon or to-morrow.

Mr. BELL. The Postmaster General promised me some information regarding the mail contract on the River John. I was to have got it in the course of a day or two.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. During that debate on the estimates, I promised to bring down the following day information asked for by a number of gentlemen, and I told my deputy to bring me everything promised. If my hon. friend had put his question during that discussion, I would have been in a position then to give him the information, and therefore I am not in default. I shall have great pleasure however in bringing it down.

Mr. BELL. I understood the hon. minister was going to send me a memo.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am sure that my deputy had the information and it would have been given had my hon. friend asked for it. I am not finding fault, and will see that my hon. friend's wishes are complied with.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Intercolonial Railway—working expenses, $6,500,000.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is the usual vote.

Mr. CLARKE. When the minister was making his statement the other day, he alluded to increased expenditures in the operation of the Intercolonial caused by increased wages paid to employees, and he promised to bring down a statement of the number of employees on the Intercolonial in 1896 and in 1903, the years for which his comparison was made. Has he that information now under his hand ? I would ask also for a return showing the train mileage served by the employees of the different grades—engineer, fireman, brakeman, conductor and so on. If the hon. gentleman proposes to make comparisons, he must sup-

ply the House with information to enable members to judge of the correctness of those comparisons. He has promised to bring down this information, but he has not yet done so. I would like him to implement that promise now.

Mr. EMMERSON. I telegraphed the general superintendent at Moncton and asked him to prepare such a return and send it at once. But the return has not yet reached me. I shall have the information, however, before the consideration of the railway estimates by the committee is finished.

Mr. CLARKE. But how could the hon. minister have made a comparison unless he had this information ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As to the number of men ? I based that upon the actual figures.

Mr. CLARKE. But where are those figures ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I want not only the actual number of men but the number of days. I made the statement generally, and now I propose to verify it. I propose to show, not merely the increase in the sum total, but the increase per diem paid to the several employees. That information will be forthcoming—my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) need not be at all alarmed. The information is accessible, and I will have it here so as to demonstrate to a mathematical certainty the correctness of my general statement.

Mr. CLARKE. But where is the material upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) based his statement in the committee the other day. Has he not that now under his hand ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My statement was a statement of totals, and I showed, from the actual expenditures on these items in the different years, what increase had taken place. My hon. friend asked me at that time for a statement for the number of men and the actual wage per diem ?

Mr. CLARKE. And as to the duties performed by these men.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the same duty performed year by year. The enginemen, for instance, perform the same duties as before.

Mr. CLARKE. But how about the train mileage they run ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Even as to that a schedule will be furnished.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) will bring down a statement of the mileage in 1903 and 1904 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is contained in the report.

Mr. INGRAM. That can hardly be, because we have not the report for 1904.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) to mean for the year 1903. I understand that he means for that year and for the ten months of 1904 for which we have returns.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will get that.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is the master car builder now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Samuel King.

Mr. DANIEL. What position does Mr. King's predecessor, Mr. David White, occupy now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He is chief car inspector.

Mr. DANIEL. What is his present salary?

Mr. EMMERSON. The general manager informs me that it is $100 a month.

Mr. DANIEL. Is Mr. King a Canadian or an alien ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A Canadian.

Mr. DANIEL. What salary is Mr. King receiving ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed it is $150 a month.

Mr. BELL. I would call the attention of the minister (Mr. Emmerson) to the fact that it is reported that some of his staff have been taking an active part in politics. I am informed that Alphonse T. Leblanc, canvassing agent for the Intercolonial, with salary and allowances of $1,531.28, took active charge of the government campaign in a portion of the county of Guysborough in a recent election. Has the minister any information as to that, and was it with his consent that this official engaged in that work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not had the matter called to my attention. But, within a few days, I have heard some joking about it.

Mr. BELL. Has the minister made any inquiry ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the matter was not brought to my attention. I was not aware that Mr. Leblanc at any time, had any connection with an election.

Mr. BELL. In what way has the information reached the minister ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I heard some joking about it among the members. But I have not had any complaint with respect to the matter.

I wish to correct the statement that I made a moment ago with respect to the pay of Mr. King, master car builder. He gets

$200 a month. Mr. White gets $100 a month.

Mr. INGRAM. Where was Mr. King previously employed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Grand Trunk?

Mr. INGRAM. Whereabouts ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The general manager tells me he thinks it was at London.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He used to be in Montreal.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was for a long time in the employ of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it true that the present master car builder receives the assistance in his duties of the gentleman who previously held that position, Mr. White ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. White's employment is very largely outside of the works at Moncton. He is engaged in inspecting the cars that are built at the different points in the Dominion for the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what are the duties of Mr. White, who was formerly the master car builder ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. White's duties are largely outside the works at Moncton. He is engaged in inspecting the cars that are built at different points in the Dominion for the Intercolonial.

Mr. DANIEL. What salary did Mr. White get as master car builder ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The general manager tells me he received $125 or $150 a month.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not this gentleman come into the class of those whose salaries have been increased ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know whether my hon. friend wants to enter into a discussion as to the merits or demerits of that matter. I can give him the facts. In the position which Mr. White now holds he gets a salary of $100. When he held the position of master car builder he commanded a salary of either $125 or $150. The master car builder's position now commands a salary of $200. It is some years since Mr. White occupied the position.

Mr. DANIEL. How long ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Speaking from personal recollection, four or five years.

Mr. INGRAM. We understand that Mr. White occupied the position of master car builder up to some four or five years ago, and for some reason he has been displaced and a Mr. King has been put in that position. Now, it appears that the department has employed another man and gives him an advance in wages of $50 per month over that received by Mr. White. The hon. gentleman does not state whether Mr. White was competent for the position of master car builder. What is the reason for the change ? Why should this country pay $50 additional to Mr. King if Mr. White has given satisfaction and is a thoroughly competent man ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) apparently desires to go into that question. When a mechanical superintendent was secured for the Intercolonial some five years ago, Mr. White was master car builder, and the mechanical superintendent reported that in his judgment Mr. White was not satisfactory for the position.

Mr. INGRAM. Why ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, there was a question of competency and fitness. The superintendent made a report and requested a man of more experience, and Mr. White was placed in a position of car inspector and the services of Mr. King were secured. This was some four or five years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. How long has Mr. White filled the position of master car builder ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About ten years, I am told.

Mr. INGRAM. And this government employed for ten years a man who was incompetent to be a master car builder, and it took the government ten years to find it out. I doubt whether he was incompetent.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say that in my opinion he was incompetent, I only gave that as the reason assigned by the mechanical superintendent. I have no personal knowledge as to his fitness or competency. I am only giving the reason assigned by the mechanical superintendent for desiring to change the official.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the reason why I doubt the statement that has been given that he was incompetent.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman does not doubt my statement ?

Mr. INGRAM. I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman was told so, but I question the statement itself being accurate. The idea of the Intercolonial having a master car builder for ten years, and only then they discovered that he was incompetent. On the very face of it that statement does not appear to be true. Then you make an incompetent man a car inspector. That is very inconsistent, I am sure. Is that the system the general manager is following ? I think probably there is some other reason that has not been stated for this change. I think the reason was probably a political reason.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am only giving the reason assigned. We might speculate on a whole lot of other reasons, but this is not a matter for speculation. I do not know who is more competent to determine as to the fitness of a man for the position of master car builder than the mechanical superintendent of the railway.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was he ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At that time it was Mr. Joughins, and he is still the mechanical superintendent.

Mr. INGRAM. And after seven years he discovered that this man is incompetent, though he is considered competent for the important position of inspector.

Mr. EMMERSON. When the mechanical superintendent came upon the road, he made a number of changes in the men employed on the Intercolonial and one of them was with respect to Mr. White. A man may be very competent in one department and not in another. Mr. White may be a very competent inspector of cars, but he might not have that executive ability which would qualify him to control a large number of men.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the reason ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is one of the reasons assigned.

Mr. INGRAM. And Mr. White was in charge over these men for ten years and only then it was discovered that he was incompetent.

Mr. EMMERSON. And during that period we got a new man, Mr. Joughins, as mechanical superintendent. He was the best judge of the requirements of the situation, and he made a number of other changes in the personnel of the mechanical department. Certainly he was the most competent to judge of the fitness of the men employed in his department, neither the general manager nor the Minister of Railways were in a position to exercise a proper judgment in the matter.

Mr. INGRAM. We will leave the hon. gentleman's explanation at that.

Mr. SPROULE. If they had not got that man they would never have found out that he was incompetent.

Mr. BELL. I will ask the hon. gentleman's attention to some facts in reference to the manner in which this staff have been conducting themselves in political campaigns.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is very interesting.

Mr. BELL. I observe my hon. friend is very much disposed to treat this matter as a joke.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not at all. My hon. friend must not think that because I am smiling I regard this as a mere matter of joke. It is only my good nature.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It does not mean anything.

Mr. BELL. I do not think I misunderstood the hon. member a few moments ago when he said he heard of this thing as a joke and that he did not think it necessary to make any further inquiries.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I said that I had heard it from a number of members who were joking amongst themselves. I said that I had had no complaint made to me, that the matter had never been brought to my notice in any form and that therefore I know nothing of it.

Mr. BELL. Officially ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Officially or personally.

Mr. BELL. I am going to have the pleasure of bringing the matter to the hon. gentleman's notice very definitely. In the first place a gentleman who occupies the place of canvassing agent on the Intercolonial Railway with a salary of $1,531, with allowances had actually charge, according to my information, of the campaign in the interest of the government in a very important district of Guysborough county called Larry's river and in other French districts, spoke at public meetings and took an active part in the elections. That is supported by declarations. My information is that at public meetings he addressed the electors in the interest of the government candidate. Not only that officer, whose name is Mr. Alphonse T. LeBlanc, but others as well, were active in the interest of the government candidate. Mr. Pushie, a conductor on the Intercolonial Railway, is another. I had his name given me as having taken an active part in this contest. I know Mr. Pushie to be a gentleman of very strong political leanings. He actively canvassed in Mulgrave and on the trains between Mulgrave and Truro. Mr. George W. Peeples, engine cleaner at Mulgrave, was an active canvasser and on election day drove his own team to carry voters to the poll. Mr. Harry A. Peeples, locomotive fireman, canvassed in Milford district in that county for the government candidate and I am told that he was so far recreant to the Presbyterian ideas of the province of Nova Scotia generally that he occupied part of Sunday in that work. For the government, that may not be so bad because possibly it may be said that on Sunday he was not in the employ of the government. John McDonald, mate on the government ferry 'Scotia,' at Mulgrave canvassed in Melford district for the government candidate

and he also used up part of his Sabbath Day's rest for that purpose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was this in the Guysborough election ?

Mr. BELL. In the election which occurred quite recently.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That was the election that was a redeeming feature in the maritime provinces.

Mr. BELL. The election which occurred quite recently in Guysborough and which has given a new member to the House of Commons.

Mr. EMMERSON. And a good deal of trouble to hon. gentlemen of the opposition.

Mr. BELL. I would like to send a little of that trouble in the way of the government and possibly a little of that trouble in the way of these officials who have undertaken to do this work. Then, Lewis Maguire, baggage master at Mulgrave, and William Maguire, fuelman at Mulgrave, brothers, spent several days canvassing in the Milford district for the government candidate. They were apparently allowed to go away from their positions and to occupy themselves in working for the government. Alexander Reeves, fuelman at Mulgrave, also devoted some time to canvassing Melford district for the government candidate. John P. Meagher, deck hand on government steamer 'Scotia' at Mulgrave, was an active worker in the interest of the government. On election day he was busily engaged with his team carrying voters to the polls. Chas. Crittenden, deck hand on the 'Scotia' was an active worker in the government ranks. John M. Grant, Intercolonial Railway policeman at Mulgrave, is a very active party man and always has been a hard worker. He is warden of Guysborough municipality. In the recent by-election he declaimed with noisy demonstration against weak-kneed Grits who have to be prevailed upon by money and other like means to vote for the party candidate and who himself scorned such sordid, corrupt things. This patriot has taken unto himself since the by-election the office of Intercolonial Railway policeman at Mulgrave with its emoluments, said to be $60 per month. Some ten or twelve officials of the Intercolonial Railway were actively engaged in the by-election carrying on the work of canvassers during that by-election and that such a thing could be done without the knowledge of the management is so improbable that it is quite beyond any reasonable person's belief. The probability is that instructions were issued by some person in authority that justified this action on the part of these officials because they would not have employed themselves in this way unless they had had information to the effect that their action would not be looked upon with disapproval by the government What was the attitude assumed by the present government in reference to Conservatives ? It was laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and other members of the government that while an official of the government might exercise his right to vote he might do so, but that if he went further and took any active part in a political fight he would be allowed to devote his whole attention to politics, which practically meant that he would be dismissed from the service. That has been the law which has been applied to Conservatives everywhere. In my own county a postmaster was dismissed for the reason that at a public meeting he had asked a question of a gentleman who was speaking in the interest of the government. That was an offence and he was dismissed promptly. The law laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister and acted upon by members of his government has been carried out, and that is that if a man who is not content simply with exercising his right to vote takes an active part as a canvasser or takes any active part in any other way in carrying on political warfare he takes his political life in his hand and will be dismissed. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to inquire into these facts and to appoint a commission and that if proof is brought to his knowledge that the statements made in reference to the acts of his officials in the matter are correct he dismiss them and that he apply to them the rule which has been applied to Conservatives throughout Canada and which has been laid down as the policy of his party. Now, the hon. minister can no longer say that this matter has not been brought to his notice. I have brought it to his notice very definitely and I am satisfied that if he appoints a commission to make an inquiry into these statements they will be proved absolutely and to the hilt. In the recent campaign in Guysborough the government turned into that county not only one but many of their officials. The gentleman who occupies the very honourable position of warden of Dorchester penitentiary went all the way from New Brunswick to Nova Scotia and spent the whole day at the Forks polling place. His name is Mr. John A. Kirk, the noisiest and most demonstrative gentleman who ever occupied a position on this side of the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Kirk canvassed in the election ?

Mr. BELL. I make the statement that he spent the whole day at the polling place.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I want to know if the hon. gentleman charges Mr. Kirk with canvassing ?

Mr. BELL. I make the statement that he went to the Forks with a gentleman named Mr. Robert Kirk of Antigonish who was supposed to take certain supplies to the polling place and that he remained the whole day at the Forks polling place. What was he doing there ? I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) to account for his presence. Mr. Kirk has not taken the trouble to tell me what he was doing, but if we get the commission which we suggest we will make it interesting for him. I make the statement that this gentleman spent the whole day at the poll. It being a winter day he did not stay there for pleasure.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that the Forks polling district is Mr. Kirk's native place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. I am quite aware of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And that it is not an extraordinary thing for Mr. Kirk to spend one day in his native place, which as a matter of fact he frequently visists.

Mr. BELL. I am perfectly aware that Mr. Kirk had his residence in the Forks and was a very influential man in that section, and that is the reason he was there.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to know if the hon. gentleman is going to make a definite charge. If he has a definite charge to make against Mr. Kirk let it be made.

Mr. BELL. I make the statement that he was there in company with Mr. Robert Kirk, of Antigonish, who I believe had no vote there and had not ostensible reason for being there. He was there and spent the whole day in the vicinity of the polling place. I see the premier is in his seat now, and I may recall to his recollection the language which he used in this House with reference to officials who are not satisfied with voting, but who take an active part in political work either in canvassing or in any other way. In 1897 the Prime Minister laid down the principle, that when an official went outside his duties to take any part in political work, he would be allowed to devote his whole attention to politics ; meaning that such an official would be dismissed from the service. That is the principle which has been acted upon pretty thoroughly by this administration.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As against Conservatives.

Mr. BELL. Yes, of course. If that be the policy of the government, it should be applied to officials of both political parties. I assert that the Minister of Railways should make inquiry into this matter, and if it can be shown that these men have done more than simply deposited their ballot, then I ask in the interests of fair-play and good government, that these officials should be dismissed in accordance with the rule which the minister has laid down. The Minister of Railways can no longer say that he takes this matter merely as a rumour or a joke. The conduct of Mr. LeBlanc was notorious ; he was delighted with the position he occupied ; he boasted about it on the train ; he grew exhilarated about it and on his way out of the county on the Intercolonial Railway train after the election, he was inclined to take a great deal of credit to himself for the result. A man who flaunts his insubordination in the face of the government should not go unpunished ; a man who deliberately boasts that he has defied the rule laid down by the Prime Minister in such matters, ought not be able to rely for security on the fact that he belongs to the same political party as the government in power. The same measure of justice should be meted out to all.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can now say that the matter has been definitely brought to my notice with respect to certain officials of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not understand my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) to read any sworn declaration, but would rather gather that he is indulging in rumour.

Mr. BELL. I have declarations with respect to LeBlanc's conduct.

Mr. EMMERSON. And with respect to all the others ?

Mr. BELL. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend will admit that around election times there are always a good many rumours about men indulging in political partisanship, and especially are these rumours rife among those who have been unfortunate enough to lose the election.

Mr. BENNETT. In St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I was about to refer to the election in St. John. Just after that election and since that time I have had not merely rumours but stated charges against gentlemen in the railway service, that they took a very active part in the election against the government candidate. Only this morning I received a letter making a distinct charge against one of the officials, and indeed against a number of officials in the railway service in Moncton, who are charged with writing political editorials against the government and against the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I will say to my hon. friend that I shall go into all these matters, I trust in a judicial way, and consider not merely what he has said, but also what my correspondents have stated with respect to others in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway. After the session is over I hope to have an opportunity of inquiring into what is alleged with respect to the St. John election as well as the Guysborough election, and I trust that I

may be able to reach a conclusion that will be satisfactory all around. Let me say a word with respect to a fellow townsman of mine, Mr. Kirk, the warden of the Dorchester penitentiary. When it was intimated that he had gone to Guysborough to take part in the election, he wrote a letter to the press in which he stated distinctly that he went to Guysborough, but that he took part in no way in that election, nor did he canvass a single man. He unqualifiedly denies that he took any part in that election, and he challenges any one in the maritime provinces to prove the contrary. I have known Mr. Kirk since he came to Dorchester and from my knowledge of the gentleman I cannot believe that he is in any sense a political partisan. Mr. Kirk is a very high minded man, and a man who is true to his convictions. I am prepared to accept his statement, and until something more than mere rumour is brought to contradict him I shall rely on what Mr. Kirk says.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does he say what he went to Guysborough for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He says he voted ; do hon. gentleman opposite say that he had not the right to exercise the franchise ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. The friends of the Minister of Railways held that Ontario Conservatives who voted in 1896 should be sacked.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I can give you the names.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am obliged to accept the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) but from my knowledge of the Liberal party, I believe they have in no sense dealt with officials for such a thing as exercising their franchise. However, the matter will be investigated.

Mr. DANIEL. Now that the Minister of Railways has referred to the St. John election, I may recall to his mind that shortly after the opening of parliament I put a question on the order paper with regard to the dismissal of two employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and the only answer given by the government was that they were considered to be undesirable employees. It was stated at the time in the public press that one of these persons was dismissed because he was unable to be present on election day, being away attending the funeral of a near relative. What truth there may be in that, of course I do not know. I would like the minister to give a little more definite information if he has it as to the reason why these two parties were dismissed at that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. I remember the question which my hon. friend asked shortly after the opening of parliament. I might say that these two men are not included in the list of employees whom I have in my mind as having been charged. I informed him at that time that they were not considered desirable employees. I have not seen the references in the press to these cases, but if there was any statement in the press that one of the men was dismissed because he was absent from the city and did not take part in the election, that statement was certainly absolutely untrue, because such a circumstance was not brought to my notice nor was my attention called to the subsequent report of it in the newspapers. The men whose action I have promised the House will be investigated, are not the employees mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel). There were very substantial reasons why these men should not be continued in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway. The position taken by the management of the Intercolonial Railway with respect to the engagement and dismissal of men is that when it is necessary in the interest of the service that we should relieve ourselves of a man's services we do not feel that it should be either a matter of investigation in individual cases or that the management should be called upon to give in individual cases the reasons for their action.

Mr. DANIEL. I might remind the minister that one of these men has been in the service of the Intercolonial Railway for a great many years. What his political affiliations were I do not know, but I have always understood that he belonged to the same political party as the hon. gentleman. Although this man had been in the service of the Intercolonial for between twenty and thirty years he was dismissed without notice. It was a sudden and summary dismissal for which no reason was given. Treatment of that kind towards any official, no matter how humble, is nothing less than cruel. People in that position of life have not the chance to accumulate money, they do not get such salaries as, for instance, the minister himself enjoys. They receive simply a wage of a dollar or a dollar and a half a day, and it is hard that these two men should be summarily dismissed and thrown on the charity of the public in the middle of winter or early spring, at a time when they are very unlikely to get employment elsewhere. A large private employer of labour or a corporation, in case the necessity arose of dispensing with the services of an employee, would certainly find some more charitable and kindly way of doing so than has been adopted in this case. Every member will consider that treatment of that kind except in the most extreme cases is unwarranted and cruel, and I cannot conceive why this course should be adopted unless it was intended by the hon. gentleman to give a black eye to government ownership. It will certainly render a

great service to those who are opposed to government ownership.

Mr. EMMERSON. These men must have received the usual notice because I received a telegram asking me to stay their dismissal which was to take place at a date some time after I received the telegram.

Mr. DANIEL. What length of notice ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A fortnight, I think.

Mr. DANIEL. These men received no notice.

Mr. EMMERSON. They must have received notice or I could not have received that telegram. My hon. friend intimated that these dismissals arose out of the St. John election and were political in their character, but in his next utterance he says that one of these men had been long in the service and was a political friend of the party to which I owe allegiance. That surely would prove that the dismissal was not for political reasons.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The man might have seen fit to support the late Minister of Railways, but could not screw himself up to supporting the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I understand he was absent from the city and could not have taken part in the election, and the mere absence of a man would certainly not show that he was taking part in an election. The other man, it was represented to me, was appointed two or three years ago by the party in power. These were not matters for consideration in determining the advisability of retaining a man in a certain position. The Intercolonial Railway officials are beseiged by a great many applicants for employment in different sections and many of these men finally succeed in getting employment as opportunity presents itself. If the management were to undertake in the case of each individual man all over the 1,500 miles of railway to investigate or if we were to say that the management cannot remove men from their positions without investigation it would lead to endless trouble. That rule is not applied in private corporations, it is not applied in the industrial corporations of this country. They reserve the right to employ and to dismiss as they please, and it seems to me that it is in the interests of the railway that there should be given to the management the right to continue to follow that practice.

Mr. DANIEL. Neither of these men has had any communication with me either directly or indirectly, by themselves or their friends. All I know about the case is what I have seen in the press and certainly the general impression among the people is that the government through the Minister of Railways has excercised its power in an arbitrary and cruel manner in this case. No reasons have yet been given why these men were dismissed. Even yet the minister has not told us why these parties were considered undesirable employees, so that evidently he takes the position that having the power he shall exercise it and refuse to give any reason why. Having arbitrary power, he intends to use it in an arbitrary manner, but I do not think that such conduct will conduce to his reputation as a fair man, to say the least of it. This thing is a matter of common discussion among people of the same walk of life and they certainly are not sparing in their criticisms of the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are dispensing with the services of employees every week, and the management do not see that they should be called upon to give reasons. The usual course has been not to give reasons. My hon. friend has sought to leave the impression that these men were unjustly dismissed on political grounds. Well, the case on behalf of these two men was put to the government by the strongest government supporters in the city of St. John, one of whom had taken an active part against my hon. friend ; but I felt that, while I would have been very glad to accede to their request, I could not allow my personal opinions to interfere.

Mr. PUTTEE. When a man is discharged from the Intercolonial and applies for a discharge sheet, is he not given one, stating the cause of dismissal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has never been done.

Mr. PUTTEE. In what position then would that man be on applying for employment on another railway ? He would be asked for his discharge sheet. The hon. minister has given us the impression that when a man is discharged from the Intercolonial no reason is given, and that on other roads and in other industrial establishments the same course is pursued. The hon. gentleman is wrong. On all railways, except the Intercolonial, when a man is discharged, he is given a discharge sheet setting forth the reasons. That is the invariable practice in the case of an employee of any length of service. Any industrial establishment, which treats its employees as people having some interest in their employment, will give a discharged employee the reasons for his dismissal, and I am surprised to hear the Minister of Railways say that that practice is not followed on the government road. I was not aware until this spring that the Intercolonial was run differently from other roads as regards its employees. Suppose a man in the telegraph service or an engineer is discharged, is he not given the reasons if he applies for them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a special agreement with the Telegrapher's Union covering their case. We deal with the body

and not with the individual. In the case of an employee whose services are not required, the management do not consider it necessary to give the reasons for his dismissal. Of course it would be very easy to do it.

Mr. PUTTEE. The only ground on which the government would discharge an employee would be for good and sufficient reasons. If so, why should not those reasons be stated? If they are damaging to the man discharged, he will keep the information to himself. If it be a question of unjust discrimination, the organization will see that justice is done him. If he belongs to no organization, he can only appeal to men's sense of fairness and justice. The minister has said that in the case of telegraphers who are discharged, the reasons are given, but in the case of men who do not belong to any organization, they are discharged without any reason being given. Well, a man who gets $1.50 a day is just as much interested in keeping his place as a man who gets $3.50 a day. And after a man has been a number of years on the Intercolonial, his usefulness is gone for other labour. No man who has been in continual service should be discharged except for good and sufficient reasons, and there can be no honest objection to telling him what those good and sufficient reasons are. The hon. member has brought up the case of two men. I am referring to two other men whose cases have been brought up before the House. They were employed at Moncton and were discharged at the beginning of this year—Fabien Leger and F. B. Wood. Now it is said by these men and by others on their behalf that they were discharged really for activity in connection with unions.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) knows that that was denied. The hon. gentleman himself had an interview with me with respect to that matter, and it is fair for him to state that fact, I think.

Mr. PUTTEE. I was going on to say, Mr. Chairman, in the very next sentence, that this was denied by the minister. But with this denial should be given information as to what was the reason for their dismissal. One of these men had been for twenty-three years on the Intercolonial. As a matter of fact, he has been active recently in trades union matters. It must be remembered that, as we have seen this morning, the fact that the trades union is strong and some of its members are employed under the department leads to this—that if one of those men is discharged it becomes necessary, under the agreement under which he was employed, that the reason for his discharge shall be given. One of these two men I have referred to, I believe, was the correspondent of the government's 'Labour Gazette' and was soliciting subscriptions among the employees of the Intercolonial Railway for that publication. Not only on his representation, but on the representation of his fellow-workers and fellow-townsmen, the impression has been given and certainly exists that activity in trades union matters was disagreeable to some prominent men in the city of Moncton and dismissal followed. At page 3437 of 'Hansard' there is a long series of questions put by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Ralph Smith) and answered by the Minister of Railways. It seems from what the minister says that the men are absolutely denied the advantage of having put before them reasons for their dismissal other than simply that it is 'for the benefit of the service.' On behalf of every labour organization I want to say that that is no satisfactory answer to any man who has been discharged after being employed in any service for a number of years. The reason given should be a specific reason. It is stated—and on this I would refer to the hon. member for Vancouver—that the dismissal was ordered from Ottawa, that it did not come from these men's superior officers nor from any one actively engaged in the operation of the railway. I believe that men thus employed should be given, not only in this case but in every case reason, for their dismissal. That is a point that is always put forward by trades unions and it is always conceded in each case. And surely the weak man, the man who has not the support of his coworkers is entitled to the same treatment.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is almost a pity that this incident was brought up, for it has, in a sense, the effect of drawing a red herring across the trail, and preventing us from getting information which we desire with respect to political partisanship on the part of officials. I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that it is a great injustice that men should be dismissed without reason given. It might be that if a man knew the reason, he might set the matter right and so avoid dismissal. It may be a case of double injustice. A man may be dismissed upon allegations which, if examined into would be found to be incorrect; and, as the hon. member for Winnipeg says, when he applies for employment elsewhere and is asked the reason for leaving his former employment, he is unable to give any reason, and so must rest under suspicion that he is not worthy. But it appears from what the minister says that if he belongs to the telegraphers' union reason must be given if he is dismissed. And why? Because there is a force behind him——

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a subject of agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. The man who is unable to bring any force to fight his battles can-

not claim such treatment, but may be dismissed without any reason given.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the one case the man is employed without any such understanding, but in the case of the telegrapher there is a written agreement that this shall be one of the conditions of employment.

Mr. SPROULE. But why is that done in one case and not in another ? We have a Minister of Labour to see to it that every employee gets fair-play. Was he invited to interfere in these cases or make any inquiries ? Not at all, so far as any information has been given to the House. We are told that reason is given in the case of dismissal of a member of the telegraphers' union, but not in the case of one who has not such a powerful union at his back. Does not that of itself indicate that where a man has power behind him he can get his rights, but where he has none but himself to fight his battles his rights will not be recognized ? It seems to me that that is the meaning that is to be taken from what the minister has told us. But the question which started this discussion was the question of employees taking part in elections—was that principle right or was it wrong ? We have it on the authority of a number of hon. gentlemen opposite, including ministers, that it was an improper thing for employees in the public service to take an undue part in an election, and that any who did so would be dismissed. As a matter of fact a number of men have been dismissed on this plea. We are told that we must not accept these cases on mere rumour, and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) was asked if he had affidavits to establish the facts he alleged. I would ask in return where were the affidavits to establish the charges against any members of the Conservative party who were dismissed in 1896 ? Did it require affidavits for the dismissal of these men ? Not at all. The government were quite ready to act on mere rumour ; on the mere charge being brought to the department the men were ruthlessly and barbarously dismissed, with no opportunity given them to disprove the allegation made against them. On the other hand, the hon. member for Pictou mentioned nine or ten different cases of officials of the Intercolonial taking an active part in one by-election in support of the government candidate. But nothing is done to these men. If this kind of thing were confined to the Intercolonial it might not be so bad. But I have information here that men in the Department of Marine and Fisheries took an active part in that Guysborough election, men who were servants of the country, and servants not of one political party but the people of all political parties. But they are in the service of the party in power for the time being. They did not take their political lives in their hands because they knew they would be shielded, therefore they come from the Fisheries Department to take part in that election. I have here two cases : Mr. John Davis, fishery overseer, goes down and takes part in that election ; Mr. Havelock Torrey, another fishery officer, takes part in that election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to say what he is reading from ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am reading information given to me with regard to certain parties who took part in that election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. By whom is that statement signed ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It being one o'clock I now leave the chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that when a member is on his feet it is hardly courteous, either to the committee or to the member, for the chairman abruptly to close the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is always the rule for the speaker or the chairman to leave the chair when the hour arrives for adjournment. But if the hon. gentlemen wishes to finish his statement he can do so. If that is the sense of the committee, then the chairman will take his seat and give an opportunity to the hon. member to finish his statement. But it is not the business of the hon. gentleman to censure the chairman.

Mr. SPROULE. It is my business to draw attention to any irregularity in his conduct, and I refuse to abandon my right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please sit down. The irregularity is not on the part of the chairman, the irregularity is on the part of the gentleman holding the floor after the hour has arrived for adjournment. It being one o'clock I now leave the chair.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. At one o'clock I was treating the question of the interference of civil servants in elections. I wish now to continue, by saying that in this particular instance, the election at Guysborough the offence, if offence it is, and we have the authority of hon. members of the government to say it is an offence—was widespread and not confined to one branch of the service, because we have instances brought to our notice from several branches. We have first the warden of the penitentiary who belongs to the Justice Department. Now it is rather a strange coincidence that penitentiary officials are so frequently put in constituencies where there is an election going on. Some of them, I think, ought to be inside the walls instead of outside, but they happen for the time being to have their liberty, and they make use of it in

doing very improper work. I have noticed up in Ontario over and over again that the inspector of prisons, whenever there is a local election going on, is always sure to be there, and if you ask him : Why do you happen to be here ? It is a strange coincidence that he just accidently happens to be in that riding.

Mr. COWAN. He went there to see how many Conservatives ought to be in jail.

Mr. SPROULE. If he would attend to his own crowd first and put a few of them behind the bars, they would not be so troublesome at these particular times—I mean those who ought to be there, and whom the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me (Mr. Cowan) has so frequently defended. It is a strange coincidence that the official always happens to be there at the time of an election, and according to his own statement, it is the merest accident in the world. So we are told it was in this particular case, Mr. Kirk, the warden of the penitentiary happened to be there because it was his old home. Now that may be an excuse and it may not be. I think if the honest and real reason was given we would find out that he went there for the purpose of assisting and voting in that election. Now I would not object to his voting, if he had a vote in that particular place, because I regard that as a right which every man should exercise. But if the Ontario law prevailed there he could not vote there because he does not reside there ; as an elector can only vote in the polling subdivision in which he resides, and therefore this man could not possibly have voted there legally. I do not know what the law of that province is, or whether he was voting illegally or not ; but if the same franchise law exists there as we have in Ontario, if he voted at all he voted illegally, and we are told that he did vote.

But the circumstances which strikes me is the fact that these officials always happen to be there when there is an election going on, and the excuse given is that it was a mere coincidence. I say it is very improper, and condign punishment should be meted out to any civil servant who is found taking a part in an election. Now the government have dealt with such cases, they have dealt with officials who have taken part in elections, dealt with them summarily, not upon affidavits, as the minister requires to-day, but upon the mere statement of a member of this House. I think it was the hon. the Postmaster General (Sir Wiliam Mulock) who stated that when any member of this House gets up and says that a person took part in an election, that he acted as an offensive partisan, he, the minister, would regard that as sufficient evidence and would ask nothing more. Why does not the Minister of Railways and Canals make the same rule apply to his side of the House that he applies to members on this side ? It is because they apply one rule to this side and another to their own side that we complain. It is because he metes out punishment to his opponents that he does not mete out to his own friends that we have a right to complain. Now, as I said before, this offence is not confined to one particular branch of the service, nor was it an isolated offence. We find that there were some nine or ten names read over of employees of the Intercolonial, employees of the government, who went down to Guysborough and took part in that eleciton. I have no doubt that many of them were offensive partisans and took an improper part in that election, and yet the Minister of Railways says : Oh, I have heard my friends laughing and joking about it. It was rather an amusing matter in his view, because he got the benefit of the joke and his candidate got the benefit of the votes.

Did the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), did the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) treat it as a joke ?—not by any means. They treated it as a serious reality and meted out punishment to the parties who were the guilty offenders. Then I say the same rule should be applied to both sides of politics. We had two employees from the Fisheries Department, one, Havelock Torrey, fishery officer, who is getting a salary from the country and another, John Davis, a fishery overseer, who is getting a salary from the country as well. These men and others, some getting large salaries, some moderate ones, but it does not matter whether their salaries be large or small, were employees of the country and had not any right to take part in the election. Then, we had another party named Geo. N. Grant, who was said to be chief constructor of cold storage plants. I suppose he is under the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). He appears to be capable of running more branches than one and I suppose he had this election on his hands as well. I have cited these cases to show that there was evidently an understanding in the various departments that it was not only the right but the duty of civil servants to go down and help in the Guysborough election. There is the agricultural branch, the Marine and Fisheries branch and the railway branch and if we were aware of all the facts I have no doubt that there would be found to be several others as well so that it would be quite clear that there were a number of sinners in the election. Yet, we are told that this is only a joke, the hon. minister says : I heard some joking about it ; I did not pay any attention to it. Is that the way they treated the Conservatives when they found them doing the same thing ? Why do they not treat the Reformers the same as Conservatives ? If the rule is good for one side it is good for the other and if they think it worth while to mete out punishment to one side

let them mete out punishment to both sides impartially. If they mete out the same punishment to the members of their own party as they do to members of the Conservative party we will have no ground for complaint whatever. As long as it is the case that these offences are winked at, if they occur on the part of their own friends, and severe punishment is meted out to the friends of the Conservative party we will hold it to be an improper course and we will have the right to adversely criticise any minister of the Crown who evidently allows it and does not bring the parties to book for it and mete out to them the punishment which they justly deserve. The day is past when we should have such discrimination as this. We have had it all over the province of Ontario in a most disgraceful and scandalous way. It has been going on for over thirty years and yet there is no effort being made to stop it. We have penitentiary birds, we have every class and character of the worst type that the country affords and because they are useful at elections we find supporters of the government shielding these men and manipulating the course until it has become a public and notorious fact to-day that you cannot get one of those criminals before a magistrate appointed by the government of Ontario and secure a conviction. It is utterly impossible to do it because in one way or another the case is put over or hushed up or the indictment is quashed on a technicality, or something is done to shield the criminal. We hope that this is not coming down into this parliament. We have always had reason to hope that we would have a better code of morals in this House than in Ontario in regard to political offences, but I am afraid they are apt scholars down here and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals seems to be as apt as any of them because he seems disposed to treat this as a joke so long as the benefits accrue to his own friends.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am perfectly fair.

Mr. SPROULE. Perfectly fair, the hon. gentleman says. I will not criticise his sense of fairness or the spirit he displays in saying so, but I may be permitted to say that so long as this is done the government are bound to take notice of it according to the rule they laid down in the House and if they do not do so there can only be one construction put upon their conduct and it it that they are not willing to mete out the same punishment to their friends as they mete out to their opponents.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has already promised to investigate the charges preferred against these men by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). Taking that view of it I assume the hon. gentleman is not in favour of employees taking part in elections. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. EMMERSON. If anybody went into an election in a county and showed himself to be a violent partisan I do not think it would be correct or proper.

Mr. INGRAM. So there are certain degrees of partisanship?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the mere fact of a man going into a county, being there and exercising his franchise is not a reprehensible act.

Mr. INGRAM. But if he takes any part in the election by speaking or canvassing then he is a partisan? That is what I take the position of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to mean. We would like to get a proper definition of what partisanship is.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is an act of partisanship—is that what the hon. gentleman wants to know?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think if a man went into a county and acted as the agent of a candidate and put himself in that position it would be a very partisan act.

Mr. INGRAM. I quite agree with the hon. minister in that and I think it is a very fair definition of what partisanship is. What steps is the hon. minister taking to prevent employees of the Intercolonial Railway taking such a part in elections?

Mr. EMMERSON. The employees of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, throughout the county of Westmoreland, throughout New Brunswick, and as far as I know throughout the several provinces are at liberty to exercise the franchise as they please. There are no restrictions upon them in that regard. They have been told that in every election that I am aware of since this government came into power. They have been told that distinctly by the late Minister of Railways and Canals and I shall follow in the footsteps of my predecessor (Mr. Blair) and the acting minister in that respect.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. minister be good enough to tell us in what way that was communicated to the employees?

Mr. EMMERSON. Publicly.

Mr. INGRAM. In what way?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the public platform. I have heard the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals convey that on more than one occasion and in more than one election.

Mr. INGRAM. So that is really the only way in which it has been communicated to them?

Mr. EMMERSON. What more do you want?

Mr. INGRAM. Did it ever occur to the management of the Intercolonial Railway to issue a notice and have it posted up in the shops ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have changed all that.

Mr. INGRAM. You have changed all that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In former days men who were suspected of any leanings against the government of that day were sent out on trains so that they could not exercise their franchise. That has all been changed. If men who wish to exercise their franchise will, by going out on their regular runs, be deprived of that privilege they have always been notified that if they wish it arrangements will be made whereby they will have the privilege of voting regardless of whether they are Liberal or Conservative.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman makes a pretty bold statement as to what the state of affairs was before he and his friends were in power.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. By whose authority does he make any such statement ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know because when I was in power——

Mr. EMMERSON. This was when you were in power.

Mr. HAGGART. When I managed the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway as minister, if the officials did anything of that kind, they did it without my authority.

An hon. MEMBER. They did it all the same.

Mr. HAGGART. If it were done they had no hint or direction from me to do it. The hon. Minister of Railways tells us that there is a change ; that there is purity of administration on the Intercolonial Railway now, and that there is no coercion on the employees. It is refreshing to hear these gentlemen opposite talk about purity of administration after the experience we have had of their tactics in every province of this Dominion. It reminds me of the statement of a friend of mine, once a member of this House, that the chances were that those persons who are always talking of purity are themselves the most corrupt, and that one should beware of them. The present officials managing the Intercolonial Railway were managing the Intercolonial Railway when I was in power, and I defy the minister to obtain from them any instructions that I ever gave which would tend to interfere with the exercise of the franchise by any of these employees.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Railways has told us that when he goes to Moncton in a political campaign, he tells the employees of the Intercolonial Railway that they have a perfect right to do as they please in the election. If the hon. gentleman desired to conduct the government railways from a purely non-partisan standpoint, he would take a leaf out of the book of some of the railway companies who post up a notice stating that no foreman, or other petty officer of the company, shall be allowed to interfere, and that every employee is at perfect liberty to cast his ballot as he sees proper. That is the non-partisan method of conducting a railway. The Minister of Railways says that he proposes to investigate these matters, but he has not told us how he will investigate them. If he wants to conduct his investigation in a non-partisan manner he will issue instructions to his general manager to delegate the proper officer, who very likely is the superintendent, to find out whether any of these employees have taken a partisan part in the elections. Let him instruct his general manager that it will be a reason for dismissal whether the employee took an active part on the Liberal or Conservative side, and if the minister does that he will have a non-partisan administration in the Railway Department. The minister has spoken of the applications for positions on the government railways which come in from all quarters. If the general manager of the government railways were sitting in the House now, I would tell him that on account of the interference of members and supporters of the government, he is not allowed to conduct the government railways on business lines, but, by reason of the influence brought to bear on him by government supporters he is forced to employ men who are unnecessary and who are unsuited for the positions they occupy. That is the great fault with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway to-day ; that has been the fault with the Intercolonial Railway since I have been a member of this House, and I care not what party be in power. The trouble is that you have a partisan head ; that you are administering your railway from a partisan standpoint and that you have done ever since I have been in the House. I make that statement boldly. When political partisans try to use their influence in the administration of the affairs of that railway, no general manager can conduct it on purely business lines. If a politician wants to have a friend employed on the government railways, let him submit his name to the general manager if he chooses, just as any other private citizen would, and if the candidate be competent to fill a vacant and necessary position, let him be appointed upon his merit. Until the day comes that this is done on the government railways, the government railways will never be a success. I shall not discuss the question of government railway ownership now ; but I do say that it is idle

folly for the Minister of Railways to state in this House that he is administering the Intercolonial Railway in a non-partisan way. He has not taken the primary step to do so, and judging from his conduct to-day he has no idea of doing so.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the case of Geo. N. Grant, chief inspector of cold storage, who draws salary and expenses amounting to $2,167 a year, is a most glaring flagrant case of political partisanship. This man who took an active part in the Guysborough election is not only an active partisan, but he is actually the president of the Reform Association in Guysborough and he evidently regards that position as not inconsistent with his position as a civil servant. Is that fair or proper ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. What evidence has the hon. gentleman that Mr. Grant took an active part in the election ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have been telling the House what evidence I have. The hon. gentleman is better at asking than at answering questions. I am not here to be cross-questioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Not even by an eminent lawyer on that side of the House who seems always to interrupt for the sake of interrupting more than for the sake of information.

Is that statement correct ? Is George N. Grant not the president of the Reform Association in Guysborough ? Does not the president of an association take an active part in elections ? Generally the most active and influential politicians in constituencies are made presidents of these associations and the very fact that Mr. Grant is a president and at the same time an employee of the country should be sufficient evidence to the minister that he was not doing his duty. He could not properly serve the country and hold that position because he was acting the part of a partisan.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the members will be surprised at the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the flippant manner in which he passes over the serious charge brought to his attention by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). The hon. member for Pictou pointed out that no less than 10 or 12 of the officials of the railway, receiving large salaries from the government of this country, had taken an active part in a certain election. The minister pays no attention to it but says the matter was brought to his attention by some supporters on his own side who were laughing about it at some former time. My hon. friend was not sufficiently interested to inquire whether it was correct or not. But he dismisses Conservatives in the employ of this government without the shadow of investigation. This was also done by his predecessor. This matter was discussed in the House in 1897. This is not the first time that the opposition has charged the present government with having acted in a partisan way in the dismissal of officials since they came into power. In 1897 this question was asked by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper :

(a). Have the following, or any of them, and which of them, if any, been dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial :

1. Alexander Stewart, section foreman at Linwood, Antigonish ?

2. John Chisholm, section man at Heatherton, Antigonish ?

3. Finlay Chisholm, section foreman, James River, Antigonish ?

(b). If dismissed, was any investigation made prior to dismissal, and what was its nature ?

(c). How long were these men in the service of the government, and what was the record of each for efficiency and conduct ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The services of Alexander Stewart, section foreman at Linwood, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 7th of January last. (b.) No investigation was considered necessary as it was explicitly and positively affirmed by Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that Alex. Stewart had infringed the rule laid down in respect to government employees. (c.) He had been in the service since September, 1880. Nothing recorded against him.

2. The services of John Chisholm, section man at Heatherton, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 12th of November last on the personal statement and representation of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that Chisholm had been guilty of active and offensive partisanship in the last general elections. There was no investigation. He had been in the service since August, 1884. Nothing recorded against him. 3. The services of Finlay Chisholm, section foreman at James River, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 18th November last, on the statement and representation of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that he had been guilty of active and offensive partisanship in the last general elections. There was no investigation. He had been in the service since June, 1879.

The hon. gentleman who was then Minister of Railways regarded it as sufficient evidence when a supporter in the House stood up in his place and charged a government official with having taken an active part in politics. The minister then thought that was sufficient evidence and dismissed Conservatives without any investigation whatever. Now, when an hon. gentleman on this side of the House brings to the attention of the government the case of a government employee having taken an active part in politics the minister laughs at the idea. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) not only made the statement in the House but made the further statement that he had an affidavit that a certain government employee named LeBlanc, holding a very important position on the Intercolonial Railway, that of travelling agent, and receiving a large salary, had not only taken an active part in politics but had arranged for and spoken at political meetings, and was an active partisan while holding this important position.

My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) said he was prepared to support that by evidence, and yet the hon. the minister laughs at the idea and does not seem to think it is worthy of any investigation whatever.

In 1897 Mr. Ganong asked this question :

1. Is it true that Michael Behan, storeman on Lachine Canal at Montreal, was dismissed on 30th April without any previous notice ?
2. Was he so dismissed by order of the Minister of Railways and Canals ?
3. On whose recommendation was he so dismissed ?
4. Why was he so dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1. The services of Michael Behan, storeman on the Lachine Canal, were dispensed with on the 30th of April last. 2. Yes. 3. At the request and upon the representation of the members of parliament for Montreal districts. 4. No written complaint was lodged in the department.

On the statement of members of parliament that this gentleman had taken an active part in politics, a statement unsupported by an affidavit, the Minister of Railways dismissed this Conservative employee, and I am sure the present minister will not think it strange that members of the opposition should bring to his attention cases of this kind. I have here pages of matters of this kind but I shall not weary the committee with them. It seems that the government have one set of rules which they apply to Liberal-Conservative civil servants and another set of rules which they apply to Reform civil servants. I am surprised that the hon. minister who has newly come into office, a gentleman from whom we expected better things, a gentleman who had made great pretensions in his own province of purity and morality, a gentleman who held himself up as a moralist and who we expected would discharge his duties without fear or favour, on these things being brought to his attention should laugh at them, making no answer to the question and not even going so far as to show what the policy of his department is with respect to the officials of that department who take part in politics. Sir, it is no wonder that the civil service in this country is going down.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). No ; it is going up.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure my hon. friend is good authority because he is superannuated from the civil service himself and receives almost as much from his superannuation as he does from this House.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). There have been increases of salary all around, you know.

Mr. BLAIN. I am surprised and the people of this country will be surprised when they hear the hon. gentleman deal with this matter in this way. It is the right of every man in this country holding a civil service position to go to the polls and vote, but when the government makes a bold statement that their policy is that an official who enters into partisanship and takes part in political meetings shall be dismissed then I think the government officials of this country, whether Liberal-Conservatives or not, have a right to expect that the rules laid down for officials belonging to one party shall be applied to those who belong to the other party.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule laid down by the hon. minister's leader in 1897, as I recollect—and it is a rule upon which action was taken in a great many cases—was this : There was no objection to any public servant exercising the right of the franchise, but when any public servant went beyond that and took an active open part in any election, the policy of the government would be that that public servant would be relieved from his public duties so that he might devote the whole of his time to the political affairs in which he took so much interest.

A great many men were dismissed by this government on that account, many without investigation. One man in my own constituency was dismissed simply because he asked a civil question of a Liberal candidate at a public meeting, and he was dismissed without investigation or inquiry whatever. I have under my hand a list of about twenty officers of this government, with salaries ranging from $2,000 down, who took an open and active part in this election. Not only did they take an open and active part, but one of them at least boasted, after the election was over, of the corrupt acts to which he had been a party. Evidence of that can be given. Under these circumstances, I do not think it will do for the Minister of Railways and Canals to dismiss this matter with a mere shrug of the shoulders, unless he is prepared to announce a new policy for his party and absolutely depart from that proclaimed by the Prime Minister only four or five years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not necessary, I presume, to get into a discussion of all these matters. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has been answered very fully by the statement of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) as to the management of the railway during his regime.

Mr. INGRAM. And you, too.

Mr. EMMERSON. I, of course, understand that my hon. friend included me. The hon. member for South Lanark referred to what transpired during his administration. Of course, I do not know whether the particular matter I am about to refer to came within his knowledge at the moment, but I am sure he has heard that just previous to the elections of 1896 there was a list made out of the train hands of the Intercolonial who go out of Moncton. That list was put in the hands of the train despatchers, with

the letter 'O' marked opposite the names of those in favour of the opposition and the letter 'X' opposite the names of those who favoured the government. And the men who favoured the Liberal party then in opposition were sent out of the city on new runs so as to prevent their voting, while those favourable to the late government were kept at home. That list was a matter of public record, produced as evidence in an investigation at Moncton. The evidence is there, the list is there in the records of the court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the minister has spoken of this list, he had better lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I say it was produced in court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was a public document produced on investigation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that it is in the records of the department. I have not seen it there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is in Moncton, the minister can easily get hold of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of a document which was produced before an investigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said it is a matter of public record. If it is, we should have it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not in the department to my knowledge.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it an investigation by a commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was an investigation held at Moncton in connection with some railway employee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was an investigation taken under the authority of the government ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the government has control of the document ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that it has. I have seen the record, but not in the department, and I am not aware that it is filed in the department. The investigation was held before Judge Wilson of the county court of New Brunswick. It is a matter of public notoriety. Every one in the maritime provinces is familiar with the facts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Every one is not, because the gentleman more particularly interested absolutely contradicted the statement to me personally, and told me further that the evidence was given behind his back and he had no opportunity to cross-examine the witness who made the statement. I have heard a good deal of that document. It is acknowledged to be a public document, and the minister should place it on the table.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the statement I make can be borne out by the facts. I know that the document was in existence and was marked as I have described it. We know that it has been referred to time and time again in this parliament, and this is the first time the statement of facts has been challenged at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not challenging the statement of facts, but asking for the document which the minister quotes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have the right to refer to a document which was used in court. If it were a document in my hands or in the department, I could not quote from it without producing it. There is no use bringing its existence into question, because it did exist and its contents have been stated over and over again. Every one in Moncton is familiar with the fact that these men were deprived of their right to vote, if there was any suspicion as to the way in which they would vote. That was publicly stated in the city of St. John. It has been stated elsewhere in the province. Now the men have enjoyed that right, and they will continue to enjoy that right if I have anything to say with respect to the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. They have enjoyed a good deal more than that right.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, they have enjoyed the advantage of drawing more pay.

Mr. SPROULE. And of taking an active part in the elections on the government side.

Mr. EMMERSON. The statement has been made by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that the management of the Intercolonial was much embarrassed by the appointment of men who were not wanted. I wish to take issue with my hon. friend on that point. I am sure he is not familiar with the facts.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister will find that out in a few minutes.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the hon. gentleman has the evidence, let him produce it. As to men who are not wanted being employed on the Intercolonial, I desire to say that there is not a man appointed to-day on the Intercolonial except on the request from the management for such a man.

Mr. INGRAM. Has that been so from the time this government came into power up to this moment ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I speak of it under the present administration. And the ex-minister is making a statement with respect to his administration. I cannot speak personally with respect to the past—I would not be expected to do so. But this complaint is made against the Intercolonial to-day, and

if it were a matter of importance, I could show evidence directly to the contrary of what my hon. friend states. The rule laid down by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with respect to the conduct of officials is one that I do not feel called upon to take exception to. I have told the committee that the cases to which reference has been made by my hon. friend from Pictou, (Mr. Bell) and the other cases concerning which complaint has arisen, will be inquired into. I will satisfy myself as to their correctness and I will deal with them. Now the question is raised whether the declaration of a member should be accepted. We must take such declarations as correct when made in this House. But I think I am not uncharitable when I say that these matters brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Pictou are brought forward not with a view so much to correcting the conduct of employees of the Intercolonial as with a view to making political capital against the administration. And I think there is a great point of distinction there. I believe that in the management of the Intercolonial the minister should be surrounded by men in whom he has confidence. The employees all along the line should be men who, at least, are not disposed to put obstructions in the way of proper management of the railway. But I have known cases on the Intercolonial Railway—I speak, now, be it remembered from personal knowledge—I have known cases, for instance, of despatchers who have delayed trains and have boasted afterwards that they did it with a view to showing that the administration of the Intercolonial under this government was a failure in that the trains did not run on time. Now, that is not the kind of men we want. I am perfectly willing that the employees of the Intercolonial shall vote as they please. But I do not wish them to be animated by the desire to make the administration of the railway under the present regime a failure. If they attend to their duties without regard to politics, if they do not allow their feelings to interfere with their work in connection with the railway, then, so far as I am concerned, they shall be retained as employees of the Intercolonial. But if they are animated with a desire to make unsatisfactory the management of the road, to cause the people to be dissatisfied with that management, then, if I find evidence of that, I care not what the consequences to myself politically or otherwise, I will strike the official head off every such man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. If hon. gentlemen opposite are cheering the sentiment that, if a despatcher takes advantage of his position to delay trains in order to bring discredit on the management he should be discharged, I fully agree with them. There is no man on this side of the House who will take exception to that. It would be a remarkable state of affairs indeed if such an employee were to find any man who would endorse his acts.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a condition of things that existed on the Intercolonial within three years.

Mr. INGRAM. I have only to say that if the minister discovered such an employee and could prove it, he should not lose a moment's time in discharging him. Now, I want to refer to statements I have made in this House from time to time as to men being employed on the Intercolonial on the recommendation of supporters of the government. I say that has been the rule for years and it is the rule now. And I wish to point out, as I have often pointed out before, that, instead of that being an advantage to a government supporter, it is often an embarrassment to him, and that the sooner it is stopped the better it will be for the government railway, for the members of this House and for the people of this country. My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) said that I had proved a great deal against the administration of government railways previous to 1896. Am I to understand that the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) instructed his officers at Moncton to allow only Conservatives to go out and vote while Liberals were prevented from voting ? We have heard the denial of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart). If the management is guilty of such an interference with electors, or if any superintendent under the management is guilty of it, the matter should be attended to. The same officers are managing the road to-day that managed it in those days, and I suppose they are easy to get at with a view to finding out the facts. Whoever is guilty of such a thing should be punished for it. Now, with respect to men being employed on the Intercolonial that were not necessary, I will bring proof that will be satisfactory I am sure to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson). Here is what the hon. gentleman himself said on April 25, 1902 :

> And while the Minister of Railways and Canals has stated before this House that he has given the utmost freedom to the employees of that road in respect to their voting, I want to tell him that his officers, and that his bosses, and that his foremen have not been so generous. I want to tell the minister that in many instances there have been good Liberal votes sacrificed, not in the interest of that fairness of which he has been an apostle, but of which his officials and his foreman have not always been apostles by any means. I have not seen eye to eye with the minister. I have felt on occasions that there had been men placed in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway who should not be there, and I have so told the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. I bring forward the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) as a witness. Does he dispute his own statement ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say that no one should be there. The point I was making was that these men should not be there, conveying the idea that other men should be in their places.

Mr. INGRAM. And that the wrong men were there, and too many of them were there, and that is what the hon. gentleman was objecting to. And the right class of men, I fancy, were not there.

Mr. EMMERSON. There should be men there who were not traitors to the minister. My point was that the minister was surrounded at that time by men who were traitors to him and traitors to the railway. They are not there now.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend is getting on to dangerous ground. I think he took a trip once to Moncton himself, and that was not the act of a loyal man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What does the minister mean by traitor ?

Mr. INGRAM. What the hon. gentleman means by a traitor is a man who leaves the city of Ottawa and goes down to Moncton and induces another man to steal a memorandum which he gives to the hon. gentleman. So the hon. gentleman can come back to Ottawa and pretend to be in sympathy with the Minister of Railways and yet be able to hold a club over his head in the shape of this memorandun. Is that the class of men he wants to surround the Minister of Railways and Canals ? Then there was the question of the ties. It is a well known fact that the hon. gentleman cannot take credit to himself for being overloyal to the late Minister of Railways. I am simply giving that instance. Knowing what it is to be disloyal himself, he is now taking particular care that he will not be surrounded himself by disloyal railway employees. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman, and so long as he confines himself to taking off the heads of the disloyal employees I am willing to support him. If he find any employee of the Intercolonial who will use his position in order to make it difficult for the management of that road to conduct it in the public interest, I for one will support the hon. gentleman in cutting off his head. But if he means that because a man entertains different political views from himself he will cut his head off, I will oppose him in that contention. It is for that reason we complain. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell), who was in the county of Guysborough at the time of that by-election, has made a statement in this House with regard to certain government employees taking part in that election. When he mentions certain names such as Mr. Kirk, we find the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) very much exercised, and he rises up and disputes it. But the member for Guysborough has not said a single word about these other nine men. What has he got to say about Mr. Leblanc ? What about these two men by the name of Peoples ? What about Crittenden, what about the two McGuires, Reeves, Marr and Grant ? Does the member for Guysborough deny that these men did not take part in that election ? The hon. gentleman dare not deny it, he dare not put himself on record in this House as denying it. But when he thinks there is a good chance of making a denial in some particular case he is ready to do so. The hon. gentleman has put himself in an awkward position. He has not given the Minister of Railways an opportunity of knowing whether there is anything in his statement or not ; therefore we have a right to assume that these nine men, government employees did take part in the Guysborough election.

Mr. BELL. That is only one department.

Mr. INGRAM. This government is getting into a peculiar strait. We first find the Department of Agriculture trying to administer the Department of Militia. Then we find the Minister of Railways in nearly the same difficulty. Instead of trusting his manager, issuing circulars from the head office to his management in Moncton and allowing his manager to act unfettered and freely, to administer the goverment railways without any partisan interference, and holding him responsible for their management, he himself is putting every obstacle in the way of their management by allowing political interference, placing his manager in a false light. That is the position of the manager to-day, and that will be the position of the manager, I care not how capable a man he may be. You may take the ablest railway manager in America, place Mr. Hays of the Grand Trunk at the head of the government railways of this country, and what will be the result ? The result will be exactly what it is to-day, a large deficit on the government railways. The only way you can avoid that is by giving the manager of the railroad a free hand and holding him responsible for its proper administration. When you do that, instead of having a deficit you will have a surplus, and that is what the people will appreciate. I make this statement boldly to-day, that it is owing to the political administration of that road that we have these deficits from year to year. It is not owing so much to incompetent management, but it is owing to the fact that the manager's hands are tied so that he cannot administer the road as it ought to be administered. I am sorry that any official should be placed in that awkward position. The officials of that road are interfered with from one end of it to the other, they are subjected to political interference, they have not a free hand.

Mr. KENDALL. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ingram) says that the Intercolonial is interfered with from end to end on political grounds. Now I represent rather an important end of that railway. For forty miles that road runs through my constituency. I think we have at least 150 men employed on the Intercolonial living within the bounds of my constituency—my colleague says 250. Now I want the House to accept this statement: Since 1896 my colleague and myself together have had the right of recommendation to employment, the right of patronage on that road, and up to this moment I am unaware that a single man has been foisted upon that road, that a single recommendation made by my colleague or myself to the management for employment, has been accepted unless the man was required, and I challenge contradiction of that statement. Now I wish to make another statement. In 1896 the manager of that road called up a number of men and said: You, you, you, are in the black books of the Conservative party; go to Mr. So-and-so, or to Mr. So-and-so, and place yourselves right with the Conservative party.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the name of the manager of the road who did that?

Mr. KENDALL. His head was taken off. It was Mr. McLennan, station agent, who had charge of the employment of labour at that point. The former Conservative member for Richmond was returned by a small majority made up mostly by Intercolonial Railway employees who had a right to vote only in Sydney but who, after voting there, went on and voted in Inverness, and after voting there, went on and voted in Richmond county. We might have dealt severely with these men, but my colleague and I——

Mr. INGRAM. 'We'? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that they did not interfere with the management of this road.

Mr. KENDALL. I will answer that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why had they not a right to vote in Richmond county?

Mr. KENDALL. Their names were on the list, but they were not paid in Richmond county. Their names were wrongfully on the list, they were also wrongfully on the list in Inverness county and they voted not only in two counties but in three counties on the same day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was perfectly legal.

Mr. KENDALL. It may have been legal, but it was evidence of partisanship. I may say that these very persons admitted that it was not their desire to so act but they said they were compelled to do so by the management of the road. We might have dealt with these men severely but we did not do so. We recognized that they were almost compelled to act as they did and those who remained still enjoy their positions on the road and many of them have been promoted under the present administration. When the 1900 election came on no such undue political pressure was brought to bear. I took it upon myself, and I think my colleague did the same, to have it published to the men on the Intercolonial Railway that they were at liberty to vote as they wished and some voted for us and some against us. Some of those who have voted against us have been preferred in their lines. I wish further to accentuate what I said to the hon. member for East Elgin when he challenged contradiction of the statement that the Cape Breton end of the Intercolonial Railway was overmanned by political interference.

Mr. INGRAM. If I were making such a statement as that which the hon. gentleman has made, I could not prove my case more conclusively. I live alongside of several railways. Imagine my going to the management and saying: You must put this man on, or this man must be dismissed. It should be no part of the patronage of a government member living alongside of a government railway to recommend and force the employment of any men on the line.

Mr. EMMERSON. How long have you held that view?

Mr. INGRAM. Always.

Mr. EMMERSON. And your friends alongside of you?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, Sir; and I also held that view when I was on that side of the House. I am one of those who entertained that view on that side of the House as well as on this side of the House, and I had the courage of my convictions.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think you were very much in the minority then.

Mr. INGRAM. I am in a happy minority now, but I am glad to know I am right, and I have proved out of the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite, by means of the statements they have been making this afternoon, that it should be no part of the patronage of government members to say who shall be on the railway and who shall not be on the railway. That should not constitute a part of the patronage of the government, but the management of the government railway should have a free hand. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not like that, let them create a commission and hand in their recommendations to that commission, and if the commission think they require the services of any of these applicants let them employ them. Then you will have a better system than you have to-day. But so long as you have the system that you have to-day, you will have the same interference

that my hon. friend has spoken of, namely, political interference. The very moment that men come forward with applications to hon. gentlemen opposite what do they do? They say: We are Liberals; we will support you, and we want employment on the government road. Of course, if you get these men's votes you are willing to support their applications, and you do your best to get them employment on the road. You do not consider whether the road requires them or not, you are interested in getting the men employment on the road, because by getting them employment you get their support. I know what government supporters do; I have been there. I have been on the government side of the House, and I know that government members did the same thing as you are doing now in that regard. I found fault with it there, and I find fault with it here. I am willing to go so far as to say that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals does not know all these little things. Some of them he no doubt does know, but he knows what the system is, and the system is that which I am condemning, because it is wrong.

Mr. EMMERSON. Did the hon. gentleman ever bring to the notice of the House that his friends were exercising undue influence, or did he express the ideas which he now holds and favours? I call his attention also to the fact that the hon. member for South Lanark said that the system which he has been depicting now did not prevail under his regime, although my hon. friend says that it did prevail then in the same way as it does to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. I said that government patronage was exercised then on the same lines as it is to-day.

Mr. EMMERSON. Did you move a resolution to have it changed?

Mr. INGRAM. No, Sir; I got up in the House and condemned it, and I propose to do so as long as I am a member of this House, because in doing that I am doing my duty. It is not necessary to move a resolution. If the hon. gentleman will read 'Hansard' for several years back, he will find my views recorded against that system, and if the people understood to what extent the government railways are administered in that way, they would rise up in their might and condemn it.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I thought the object of our meeting here to-day was to pass these supplementary estimates for the Department of Railways and Canals, and it is time that all this trash and nonsense were dispensed with.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Victoria, Nova Scotia (Mr. Ross) is always correcting the House upon these small questions. I would like to read to the hon. gentleman a letter, and to ask him whether he holds the same views now that he did in 1874, when he was Minister of Militia in Mr. Mackenzie's government?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) that that letter was a forgery, and that I never wrote it.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is the letter:

Balls Creek,
February 5, 1874.

Mr. Dennis Egan,
North Sydney.

Dear Sir,—I must inform you that the government expects every man in its employ to vote for its supporters. This being the case I wish you to proceed to Sydney mines and poll your vote for Mr. M. Mackay.

Yours, &c.,
(Sgd.) WM. ROSS,
Minister of Militia.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Mr. Chairman, I was returned by acclamation at the general election in 1874, I was returned by acclamation in the general election in 1872, I was returned in the general election in 1867, a record that no man who was ever in this House has had before.

Mr. COCHRANE. That has nothing to do with this letter.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Just excuse me. After I won my election I went to the county of Cape Breton to assist Newton M. McKay, now deceased, in his election, and I stayed at Ball's Creek. A sleigh drove up, and I was asked to write a letter to Dennis Egan. I said that in my election in my own county officials of the government were allowed to vote against me, and that I would not do there what I was asked to do. The sleigh drove back, and a man from North Sydney, W. Exmore, now dead, wrote that letter and signed my name to it—forged that letter.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Certainly, it is a matter of history.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). It is a matter of history. When that letter was brought up at the time I was Minister of Militia and Defence, I asked to have it produced and placed on the table of the House, but it was never done. They dared not produce it, and I say, before my Maker in heaven, that I never wrote that letter. I have said that publicly many times before this, and it is most disgraceful to bring that trash up now in this House. If there is any trash to be brought up in this House, that hon. gentleman is capable of doing it. It is scandalous.

Mr. BLAIN. It is quite evident that the hon. gentleman was pretty close when the letter was written.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I was not within five miles of where the letter was written.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No; he will not take it back.

Mr. BLAIN. I am reading from the report of session 1874.

Mr. McDonald (Cape Breton) said that when they made the charge a few evenings ago, the gentleman did not give the statement a denial, and therefore he considered he stood convicted of the charge. He might say in reference to the letter, that he attained possession of it the second day after the election. He knew the handwriting of the hon. Minister of Militia, and was satisfied that it was written by him. He had since shown the letter to several gentlemen who also said it was written by the Minister of Militia. He handed the letter to the right hon. member for Kingson and had not seen it since.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I asked at that time that the letter should be produced and laid on the table of the House, and if it had been written by me I should have acknowledged it before the whole House. What was the reply? The reply was that it was in the possession of Doctor Tupper, then in Montreal; and they dared not bring it before the House, because they knew I never wrote it.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did'nt the hon. member deny it then?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member (Mr. Ross) did not deny it then and he has never prosecuted any one for being charged with writing it.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I never had an opportunity to prosecute.

Mr. INGRAM. He waited until the gentleman was dead and now he gets brave. I am surprised at my canny friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) getting angry.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Does my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) mean to say that I wrote that letter? I deny it before this House and before my Father in Heaven.

Mr. INGRAM. I have not missed my hon. friend on his long journey.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Cowardly.

Mr. INGRAM. Cowardly! The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) did not deny it then, and he never prosecuted the man——

Some hon. MEMBERS. He denies it now.

Mr. EMMERSON. He never had the letter on which to prosecute.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend said——

Mr. GALLIHER. Why don't you apologize frankly when you are wrong?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I will make another explanation. The editor of the North Sydney 'Herald' who at that time was as prominent a partisan and supporter of the Conservative party as there existed in Cape Breton, denied it in an editorial at that time and I have that editorial in my possession among my private papers. The editor of that paper said that he could see the man who wrote that letter every day. I found out afterwards who wrote it, and I challenged the government and the man who made the charge against me to prove it. It was not a man from the province of Nova Scotia, but they got a man from the province of New Brunswick to do it. I challenged them to produce the letter and put it on the table of the House and it was never done. They knew better.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the man who made the charge is alive to-day, and if the hon. gentleman wants to prosecute him; I suppose he can.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). That man knew better than to make the charge, but he gave it to a man in New Brunswick who is not living, and who was afterwards elevated to be a judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) has denied writing the letter himself; he has not said that he had not any knowledge of it.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I had no knowledge of it at all until I heard it was produced in this House.

Mr. GALLIHER. Oh, take it back.

Mr. INGRAM. Take what back? Better save your time because I don't have to take it back.

Mr. GALLIHER. Don't you think it would be a manly thing to take it back?

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) is addressing his remarks to me, I can tell him that I have nothing to take back. It is for the man who made the statement to take it back.

Mr. BUREAU. And you are endorsing that statement.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a matter of record.

Mr. BUREAU. False record.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It does appear to me that after the statement of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross) it is not fair; it is not worthy the position of any member of this House to suggest that such a fraud has taken place. Out of respect to the dignity of parliament it is not proper to suggest that what my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Ross) has said, is not true. The hon. gentleman has given this a most unqualified denial. Surely there is something due from one gentleman to another in this House, especially when you consider

that my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) is a veteran of this House ; one of the oldest parliamentarians in Canada ; a gentleman approaching four score years. I do think that something is due to the occasion, and to a respected and venerable member of this House.

Mr. INGRAM. I have nothing to take back.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross) states to the House that he did not write the letter or authorize it, we are bound to accept his statement. Pehaps it was a little unfortunate that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) undertook to lecture the House about the manner of conducting business. We are entitled to our own opinions as to the criticism which we are disposed to offer. While there is not one of us who has not the utmost respect and esteem for the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross) still, possibly his remarks just now were a little uncalled for and they very likely led to the incident which has just taken place. In view of his denial that he wrote or authorized the letter, I think we should at once accept his statement, and I would ask my hon. friends on this side of the House to let the incident drop.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. I was discussing the question under debate in this House——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You were perfectly right.

Mr. INGRAM. And I shall further discuss that question notwithstanding the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Ross). Personally I have nothing to retract, and I don't propose to retract. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) thinks that we are discussing rot in connection with this item, let me draw his attention to what the item is, and probably he may change his mind. We are discussing a vote of $6,500,000 for working expenses on the Intercolonial Railway. If that is rot to the member for Victoria, it is not rot to me. In this vote is included the employment of unnecessary men on the Intercolonial Railway and in this vote is included a lot of money which will be wasted on political friends and political management. I am perfectly within my rights when I am discussing that, and I do not propose to take any lectures from the member for Victoria (Mr. Ross).

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). You have been discussing the Guysborough election for the better part of the day.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, and that is perfectly in order. No body has heard my friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) find fault with the government, and if we waited until he rose in his place and discussed this and other items, there would be very little discussion and a very short session indeed.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. So much the better.

Mr. INGRAM. Here is another fresh one who has just come in.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Better be too fresh than too rusty.

Mr. INGRAM. When my young friend is a few years in the House he will learn to hang his hat on a peg. He will know less in the next five or six years than he thinks he knows to-day. Let me give him a piece of advice : don't be quite so fresh my young friend and you will get along better. I have no desire to prolong the discussion on this item ; I have said all I want to say on it, and what I have said, I believe to be correct.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to get the information which the minister promised with reference to the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will get the information. The general manager has retired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not permanently retired.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; voluntarily retired for the moment.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not intend to prolong the discussion, but I suppose it will be expected that something should be heard from me as the question of the Guysborough election has been so long under discussion this afternoon. I think, Sir, it is unfortunate that we should have to waste the time of the House at this late hour of the session in fighting over our petty election contests, but there does not seem to be anything too petty to engage the attention of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. For a number of weeks I have noticed a great deal of anonymous correspondence in the Conservative press throughout the country, with reference to the Guysborough election.

In this correspondence all sorts of crimes and misdemeanours are charged against the good people of the county which I have the honour to represent. Not only has there been anonymous correspondence of this character, but there have been similar editorials in some of these journals. These charges have been reiterated so often that it appeared to me that an attempt was being made to repeat these false statements so often that some credulous persons would accept them. I have made it a rule in the short time I have been in public life to take very little notice of the statements made by anonymous correspondents in newspapers, and I think I might apply the same rule to the editorial attacks of some of those journals. At the same time I do not wish it to be understood by hon. gentlemen opposite or by any one that I would like to

avoid discussion in regard to the Guysborough election. I am quite willing that every transaction, so far as I know them, in regard to the Guysborough election should have the fullest and the widest publicity throughout the Dominion of Canada. The Liberals of Guysborough on that occasion fought a clean and an honest fight and won a very signal victory in the face of the most determined and persistent campaign of slander and misrepresentation and open and flagrant bribery on the part of the Conservative party. In this election we had some new experiences, such as we have never before had in the province of Nova Scotia. For the first time in the history of political warfare in Nova Scotia we had men introduced into the county from outside whom I shall describe as professional bribers, men whose faces we had never seen before, and whose names, post office addresses or places of residence, we could not discover. Two of these suspicious characters operated in the polling booth where I happened to be on election day. They did not belong to the polling district of Whitehead. They did not belong to the county of Guysborough and I feel confident that they did not belong to the province of Nova Scotia. They dropped down there at that polling booth at eight o'clock on the morning of election day and at five o'clock they disappeared ; they folded their tents like the Arabs and as silently stole away.

The question arises : Where did they come from, and who supplied the funds they were paying out so lavishly on election day.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Montreal 'Star.'

Mr. SINCLAIR. In that particular booth where I was, I saw these men. I did not see them carrying on their operations, I did not see them pay out money, but I know they occupied a room close to the polling booth, and also carried on their operations in an adjoining shed, from which the fumes of whisky—bad whisky, I was told—emanated. The question arises who sent them there and who supplied the funds they were spending on that occasion. They could not have been sent by my opponent, Mr. Giffin, because he is a very pious and respectable gentleman, who would have nothing to do with anything of the kind. The organizer of the Conservative party, Charles E. Tanner, of Pictou, was in the county for a few days ; he seemed to be taking a very active interest in the campaign although I believe he only addressed one meeting. But Mr. Tanner could not have had anything to do with these outside people because he has always condemned anything of that kind. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) was also in the county for ten or twelve days during the election. I understood that he was in charge of the campaign in the western end of the county, not in the district where I was myself. I presume he does not know anything about where these men came from or what they were doing in the constituency. The agent of the Montreal 'Star' was in the province at the time and appeared to be directing the campaign.

Mr. KENDALL. Surely that must be a mistake, because I can assure the hon. gentleman that I saw the representative of the Montreal 'Star' during the famous Tupper-Murray campaign in 1896, and he seemed to be rather favouring the Liberals in Cape Breton county.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not want to hint that the Montreal 'Star' had anything to do with this, because every one knows that the Montreal 'Star' is an independent journal. I do not know that any one can say where they came from or who sent them or who supplied the money so lavishly. They may have come of their own accord and may have been using their own money for anything I know.

After all the abuse that has been heaped on our devoted heads by the Conservative papers during the last three months about this Guysborough election and about the part taken in it by Dominion officials, it seems to have come down to one case. I take very little account of the names read here, by hon. gentlemen opposite. They have secured the names of certain men in the public service in Guysborough and have said that they were told by some one that these men took an active part in the election. I do not know that they took an active part. Some gentlemen in discussing this question wanted me to deny that they did. I am not aware that those gentlemen did take an active part and there is not the slightest proof that they did. It appears that it comes down to the name of one man, a Mr. LeBlanc, and that they have secured some evidence that that man took some part in that election. They scoured Guysborough from end to end, for evidence in respect to this matter and we are told by the Truro 'Sun' an organ of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia that a representative of the Montreal 'Star' came to the province for that special purpose and spent about a week in the province looking up information, and yet they have only been able to discover one man against whom they can make a definite charge. Counting all the Dominon officials there, postmasters, and fishery officers and custom house officers and railway employees, I suppose there are between two hundred and three hundred men in that constituency alone, and if they are only able to find one who has actually overstepped the bounds and done something that he should not have done in this election, I think that is not a very bad showing for the Liberal party. In the case of this solitary official I am told that he

was not then in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway; that he obtained three months leave of absence owing to some accident that had happened to him and was not fitted for work. It was during his vacation that he took his little trip down to Guysborough. I am informed that is a fact and I believe it to be true. Do you imagine, if the position was reversed and hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, that we would only have to complain of the interference of one official in Guysborough? Under the system that prevailed prior to 1896 nearly every single official was an election agent of the Conservative party and they were expected to be election agents. The bounty cheques, for example, were used as a sort of campaign fund in Guysborough in those days and I am informed that the time for the distribution of these cheques was arranged so that they were handed out to the fishermen at the time that the Conservative candidate was making his canvass along the shore. Another scheme was to levy fines against the fishermen for political purposes, fines that were never attempted to be collected. A fisherman was selected and was charged with having small lobsters in his possession or some such offence and a fine of $15 or $20 was entered against him but no attempt was made to collect the fine. Then, when an election came on, we would have a list of the names of these fishermen along the shore of that county—and I believe of every county in Nova Scotia—that were popularly known as lobster votes. We used to mark opposite them that they were lobster votes and we could not expect to get any of them to support the Liberal party. The heelers of the Conservative party came to these men and said: If you vote for the Conservative candidate, this fine will not be collected; but if you vote for the Liberal candidate, a distress warrant will be issued to-morrow morning. In this way they used to hold the fines over these people and secure their votes from election to election. These were some of the methods adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. That was only eight short years ago, but since they have got into opposition they have grown very pure and go into hysterics over the case of one official who took an active part in an election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman give us the name of one fisherman who was dealt with in that way?

Mr. SINCLAIR. They will be found in a return which was brought down to the House in the year 1891, and they will also probably be found in 'Hansard,' because this matter was then discussed in the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground that no man who is an official of the government should have anything to do with an election, but they surely do not forget that when they were in office we had some 200 revising barristers, many of whom were active and offensive partisans. They were the men who made the lists and decided who should and who should not vote. The discussion we are having to-day seems to have been deliberately planned by our hon. friends opposite. It is nearly two months since the Truro 'Sun' made the following announcement:—

> During the recent by-election in Guysborough, Mr. B. A. Macnab, a Montreal newspaper man, well known in the commercial metropolis, journeyed to New Glasgow. There he remained a week. His presence in that place drew from the local Grit paper a perfect tirade of abuse. The visitor was accused of being a corruptionist; he was styled a second edition of 'Cap.' Sullivan. A more flagrant series of prima facie libels could not well be conceived.
>
> Mr. Mcnab made no sign. He left New Glasgow when his work was over. What that work was is now becoming apparent. The revelations of corrupt methods employed in the Guysborough campaign are alleged to be due to his initiative. It would appear that during the campaign he had arranged a plan to bring to light the devious methods of the Liberals. And now, day by day, some new phase of crooked work is being brought out. The climax will, it is said, be reached when the matter is brought up in the House of Commons in connection with the passage of salaries, in the estimates, of some of the government employees who took an active part in the fight. The affidavits in these particular cases are said to be very interesting.

We did have one affidavit mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou, but I do not think he told us the name of the man who made it, nor did he give us the whole affidavit. He read some remarks from a paper which he said was an affidavit, and said that Mr. LeBlanc had taken an active part in this election. The Truro 'Sun' is one of the leading organs of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia. The editor of that paper is said to be high up in the ranks of that party and ought to know what he is talking about. He tells us that Mr. McNab came to Glasgow and remained there a week without making any sign. He is evidently a mysterious character is Mr. McNab. He was to old a campaigner to make any sign by which his real mission to Nova Scotia might be understood. The 'Sun' goes on to say that he was the author of all these revelations which we have been having in the Conservative papers with regard to that county. In other words, that he was the instigator of all these slanders and falsehoods scattered throughout Canada in the Conservative press regarding the people of Guysborough. The statements of the 'Sun' may or may not be true, but I have it on good evidence that the room which this hon. gentleman occupied at the Norfolk House at New Glasgow seemed to be the headquarters of the Conservative party and was the place where the Conservative agents and heelers got their instructions before starting out on their various routes for the county of Guysborough. I am not

charging Mr. McNab with having done anything out of the way because personally I have no knowledge and have no charge to make against him. He may have been distributing religious tracts or prayer books, for aught I know.

Mr. COWAN. It is not likely.

Mr. SINCLAIR. But I find the explanation of the 'Sun' rather peculiar that he remained there a whole week getting up imaginary revelations, and revelations which were not given to the public for something like six weeks after the election was over and therefore could have no part in the result. That, however, was the explanation given by the 'Sun.' We were told that the climax would be reached when this matter would be brought up in the House of Commons. I suppose it is the climax we are having to-day. There is certainly a great deal of noise over a very small matter, but that is becoming characteristic of hon. gentlemen opposite. To quote the language indulged in by the great D. V. Johnson's ghost in the 'Rejected Addresses,' it is not the first time this session, Mr. Speaker, that the parturient mountain to your left has been in labour and has brought forth a muscipular abortion. These hon. gentlemen opposite attacked the Prime Minister over the non-production of the memorandum of the Grand Trunk Pacific and later on attacked the Minister of Railways because he would not make a speech, but when he did, there was not a single man on that side who undertook to answer it. Their recent attack on the Minister of Agriculture also was another evidence of a great deal of ado about nothing, and to-day it seems we are reaching the climax. I do not wish to be understood as advocating a policy of employing Dominion officials to do campaign work, but when one is discovered doing work of this kind, he ought to have the sympathy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They themselves furnished us with an illustrious example in the case of Sir Charles Tupper. It will be remembered that in 1891 or 1892, when Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., was High Commissioner of Canada, drawing a large salary from the people, he came across the Atlantic, and while his salary was still running, stumped Nova Scotia in the interests of the Conservative party. The Liberals in this House then protested. They said it was not fair that a man at the very head of the civil service, drawing a very large salary, should be allowed to conduct himself in that way, but I have yet to hear that any hon. gentleman opposite ever protested against his conduct.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member say that Sir Charles Tupper was drawing his salary while he was here in Canada ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. He was still in office and High Commissioner and I presume he was.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection is that he made the statement that he was not.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If the hon. gentleman would say that Sir Charles Tupper did not draw his salary during the month or two he was stumping Nova Scotia, I will take his word.

Mr. SPROULE. Sir Charles Tupper himself denied that. Surely his denial ought to be accepted.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Would it be considered proper for a civil servant, by simply refusing to accept his salary for the time he was transgressing, to act in the manner referred to ?

Mr. SPROULE. That has nothing to do with it. It is a question of fact.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If that happens to be the case, it is like the case of the men we have been discussing. Mr. LeBlanc who was off duty for a few month on furlough. If that is an excuse for Sir Charles, a similar excuse should not be denied to Mr. LeBlanc. It is only a few weeks ago that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) brought to the attention of the House a very glaring case that happened prior to 1896, that of a Mr. McKay who drew $20 a day from the treasury during a certain period while he was engaged in stumping and organizing the west in the interest of the Conservative party. Now, under the system that was carried on during that period nearly every official was an election agent of the Conservative party. I do not say that was right, but I say as I said before, that when an official now is discovered in an indiscretion of this kind he should have the sincere sympathy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Reference has been made during this debate to my friend Mr. John A. Kirk, of Dorchester. For many years Mr. Kirk occupied a prominent and honourable position in this House. I have no doubt that his word will be taken by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and that when he makes a statement that he did not take an active part in the election, he will be believed. I am certain he will be believed by the people who know him best in the county he formerly represented. It will be remembered that a few weeks ago reference was made to a visit made by Mr. Kirk to St. Mary's, by the Halifax 'Herald'; and Mr. Kirk wrote a letter to the 'Herald' which I will take the liberty to read :

To the editor of the Halifax 'Herald.'

Sir,—I am sure you will be fair enough to permit me to correct a statement you were induced to make by some one who 'told you,' as you say in your comment, on the extract taken from the Sydney 'Post' in the 'Herald' of the 26th inst., under the heading of 'Officials,' to the effect that I was 'ordered by the government to take part in the campaign' on the occasion of the election recently held in Guysborough. I beg to say that I was not

ordered or even asked by the government, or by any member of it, or by any one in anyway connected with it, or for that matter, by any one else to take part in the Guysborough election campaign held on the 16th March last, nor did I take any part in that campaign further than to deposit my ballot at Glenelg, an act which I am sure you will not characterize as offensive, or say that I have no right to do. I made no attempt to influence any elector in the exercise of his franchise, the threats of affidavits to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am pleased to say that I met many old friends of both parties with whom I had very pleasant chats during the three or four hours I remained at the Forks, my old home, on the 16th March.

(Sgd.) J. A. KIRK.

Dorchester, N.B., May 27, 1904.

I think that ought to clear up the record with regard to Mr. Kirk. He went to St. Mary's, his old home ; he went there for the purpose of voting for the Liberal candidate —I have no doubt that that is what he went for—he deposited his ballot and no more. He did not canvass any of the electors, or attempt to influence the vote of any elector, or take any part in the election. Why should his name be bandied about in the newspapers or hints be thrown out on the floor of this House that he had done something that he should not have done ? I feel that hon. members should exonerate Mr. Kirk, and I believe that such statements will not be repeated, because, I have not the slightest doubt that every word that Mr. Kirk has written in regard to this incident is true.

I was a little surprised that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) should make reference to corrupt practices on the part of the Liberal party in the Guysborough election. I do not know that it is a good thing to wash our dirty linen here, but, if the hon. gentleman wants to discuss the question of corruption in connection with the Guysborough election, I am quite ready. If he wishes to compare the conduct of the Liberal party with that of the Conservative party in that election, I am prepared to discuss that question. I am ready to show the hon. gentleman certain facts that he would not care to bear the responsibility of or to have proven against his party. I have some proof under my hand that will be very interesting to the House, but may not be so interesting to hon. gentlemen on the other side. It involves the names of a number of gentlemen and I am quite willing, if it is thought necessary by the hon. gentlemen on the other side to go on——

Mr. BELL. Go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) can take his own course so far as I am concerned. I stated, as I am prepared to state again, that one of these men had made very important declarations as to the part he had taken in the election, statements that indicated that he had not very much regard for the election law. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether it is or is not the fact that Mr. George N. Grant, inspector of cold storage plants, with a salary and allowances of $2,167, is president of the Liberal Association of Guysborough ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think that is true.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did he take no part in the election ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not know whether he took any active part.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) know that Mr. Grant did not take an active part ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not aware that he took an active part. The president of the Liberal association is very often a figure head. I have been asked by hon. gentlemen on the other side to discuss this question of corrupt practices in the Guysborough election. That is my excuse for trespassing any longer on the time of the House. A great many charges have been made in the public press regarding corrupt practices by the Liberals, but I notice that there is an utter absence of detail. Our opponents have had an opportunity to protest that election, but they let that opportunity go by. It was an election that certainly aroused a great deal of interest in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, as well as in other parts of Canada, and, if there was anything done by the Liberal party on that occasion that they ought not to have done there is not the slightest doubt they would have taken the occasion to protest that election. On that occasion I had the assistance for a few days of Mr. E. M. MacDonald, M.P.P., of Pictou. I do not need to tell hon. members of this House who Mr. MacDonald is. He is one of the rising young men of Nova Scotia, and I am looking forward to the time after the next general election when he will take his seat in this House as a supporter of the government and representative of the once Conservative but now Liberal county of Pictou. I asked Mr. MacDonald, who was present at one of the polling booths at that election to give me a statement of the facts that came under his personal knowledge. I was aware that certain things were done in the polling booth at which I was, as I have already told the committee, and was aware that similar things were being done in other polling booths in the county. Mr. MacDonald wrote :

With reference to matters in Guysborough, I beg to state to you some things that occurred during my stay in the county. I may say I arrived there the evening before nomination day and spoke in Guysborough nomination night, in Port Mulgrave on Thursday night, and returned to Guysborough with Pre-

mier Murray on Friday afternoon. I left Guysborough on Saturday with the premier and drove to Canso, spoke there that night, and Monday morning I drove to Port Felix where I addressed a meeting that night, and on Tuesday afternoon I spoke at Charlos Cove, and Tuesday evening at Larry's River, remaining there until election evening when I drove to Guysborough. On nomination day there appeared at Guysborough a man whom I afterwards discovered to be Mr. Prieur, of Montreal, who was closeted that evening in Grant's Hotel with Messrs. Chas. E. Tanner and E. C. Gregory.

Charles E. Tanner is the leader of the Conservative party in the local legislature of Nova Scotia ; he is the Conservative organizer in that province and the leader of such opposition as we have there :

On arriving at Charlos Cove I found that he had been there at the house of Charles Richard since the previous Thursday and that he was accompanied by a man whom the people in that locality called 'Twiger,' which was evidently an assumed name. I found that he had not had any meetings but had been sending for people in that vicinity and interviewing them privately during the week he had been there, and that his conduct had been exceedingly mysterious and wholly different from that of a man who was looking for votes on the ground of principle. On Tuesday afternoon I called at the house where he was but he declined to see me in response to a message I sent to his room inviting him to come to my meeting, the answer was that he was no speaker and did not take any part in meetings. The next day he appeared at Larry's River poll and had his headquarters in the house of a man named Michael Pelrine. His companion 'Twiger' appeared as the agent of Giffin under the name of 'Switzer.' Giffin, the Conservative candidate, was also in and about the house during the day, and from which drunken men emanated throughout the day. That Prieur was not engaged in discussing politics with the electors was evident, and one man, William Petipas, told me he had received money from him to vote for Giffin and that he had taken an oath to vote that way. Before leaving Port Felix on Tuesday morning I discovered that two men whose names were not known, and who I think did not belong to Nova Scotia, were there working in the interests of the Conservative party. In addition to these two men and Prieur and Switzer, the following men were in the county who did not address meetings :—John Baillie, Pictou ; H. V. Jennison, New Glasgow ; Mr. Simson, Halifax, who worked in Queensport district ; Mr. Parsons, Halifax ; Joseph A. Gillies, Sydney. Tanner spoke at only one meeting while he was there for a week, and other persons whose names I do not know.

Now, Sir, on that occasion in addition to the parties named by Mr. MacDonald the county was overrun by Conservative heelers of all sorts. We found their tracks in the snowbanks, everywhere over the county. There was another gentleman by the name of Francois LeMarchand who figured in that election. I am told he was one of the secret agents of the Conservative party. He made no speeches, took no part in public meetings, but when the elections was over he became garrulous. He visited the town of Guysborough and made certain statements to a gentleman by the name of Floyd, who has sent me an account of the statements made by Le Marchand. Mr. Floyd is a young barrister of that town, and he makes this declaration :

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Guysborough.
To wit :

I, D. P. Floyd, of Guysborough, in the county of Guysborough, barrister, do solemnly declare that :

1. I board at Grant's Hotel at Guysborough, Nova Scotia.

2. Between the 24th and 31st day of April, 1904, while in the smoking room or office of said hotel at Guysborough aforesaid, a young man, who had been pointed out to me previously as François Le Marchand, entered and engaged me in conversation.

3. He represented himself as the agent for the Halifax 'Herald' and 'Mail,' and announced his intention of getting the said 'Mail' into as many homes as possible in Guysborough county. He asked me to subscribe and I, not stating to what party I belonged, refused on the ground that the editorials were of a very low order of merit and intimated that I regretted this very much. In this view he concurred.

4. Growing confidential he stated that he not only had the 'Mail' to use for election purposes, but that he had nineteen thousand dollars to spend in the county of Gyusborough, or as he expressed it, 'to place' in the county before the next election, and that it must be placed to proper advantage. I then remarked 'You must have spent considerable at the recent election. In view of the fact that it did not do the work intended, it is strange that you are going to expend more.' He replied, 'The trouble was that the money did not get into the proper hands. Certain men got it and used it injudiciously. Look at the result at White Head ? Had I control of the funds in other districts I could accomplish the same results.' I said, 'There must have been a great deal of money used in purchasing votes at the recent election.' 'How much do you suppose,' he asked. I replied 'about fifteen thousand.' 'More than that,' he said, 'there was twenty-seven thousand dollars spent by the Conservatives in the late election in this county. I do not know where it came from, but there was lots of the stuff. I got a bonus of $750 from the 'Mail' for my work.' This was what he said in substance.

5. The said François Le Marchand remained about a week in Guysborough and, as I am advised and believe, got very few subscribers for the 'Herald' or 'Mail.'

6. I am advised and believe, that the said François Le Marchand spent some time in White Head working for the Conservative candidate, S. R. Giffin, prior to the recent election, and visited other districts in the county previous to said election.

7. The said François Le Marchand, at the above-mentioned interview, stated that he was

preparing an article from Guysborough county for the 'Herald' and 'Mail,' but did not say that he was writing over the pen name 'Oculus.'

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

Declared before me at Guysborough, in the county of Guysborough, this 6th day of June, A.D. 1904.

D. P. FLOYD.

JOHN W. DAVIS,
A Justice of the Peace in and for the county of Guysborough.

Mr. BELL. Who signed that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. D. P. Floyd, barrister of Guysborough. Now, I think perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite have had enough of these details.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have mountains of information here. Our friends opposite are losing interest in this discussion, but I will give them one more sample brick. The Conservative newspapers have been charging the Liberals of Guysborough with having used intoxicating liquors to corrupt the electorate on that occasion. I may explain that the reason why these declarations have been sent to me is no doubt the fact that the Conservative newspapers in Nova Scotia have been stating that solemn declarations were going to be produced in the House relating to the acts of corruption on behalf of the government in the Guysborough election. These statements got abroad, and a great many people have sent me declarations of the facts that occurred, out of which I have selected a few. Mr. Aikens, of Mulgrave, makes the following solemn declaration:—

Canada.
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Guysborough, N.S.

I, E. E. Aikins, of Mulgrave, in the county of Guysborough, merchant, do solemnly declare:

1. That I am an elector of the county of Guysborough, and reside at said Mulgrave.

2. That I know Robert Peeples, also an elector of the said county, and a resident of the polling section of Mulgrave, and had a conversation with him a few days prior to the by-election held in the county of Guysborough on the 16th day of March last.

3. The said Robert Peeples is an active Conservative in the said district of Mulgrave; and I am informed and believe was a member of the committee of that party at that election.

4. I say that the said Robert Peeples on the occasion of the conversation referred to above, informed me that the said Conservtive party had a barrel of whisky which they intended to use for the purpose of influencing electors to vote for the Conservative party and asked me if I would deal it out in their interest; which I refused to do.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

Declared and signed this 9th day of June, 1904, before me.

E. E. AIKINS.

WM. S. WYLDE, J.P.

Now, Sir, I am informed, although I do not know anything personally about this, that it takes about 100 flasks of whisky to fill a barrel. Mr. Giffin on that occasion got 65 votes at Mulgrave. The Conservative party must have given to each voter about one and a half flasks of whisky if that calculation is correct. The Conservative candidate got over 1,600 votes in that election and if they treated them all with the same liberality with which they treated the people of Mulgrave they must have supplied about 2,500 flasks of whisky on that occasion. Still the editor of the Truro 'Sun' turns up the whites of his eyes and talks about the Grits getting votes by the whisky method.

There was another charge made against certain people in Guysborough in reference to decimating the electoral lists to which I think I may be permitted to refer for a few moments as it has become current throughout Canada in the Conservative papers. I will not refer to it if hon. gentlemen opposite object to me doing so. I did intend on a former occasion to take the opportunity of saying something about that question which has been very persistently discussed throughout the Conservative press and by the Liberal press too. As far as I can discover, the charges are without foundation. The charges were made by an anonymous correspondent in the Halifax 'Herald' signing himself 'Oculus.' He gave what appeared to be a great number of facts regarding a number of names which he said had been struck from the electoral list of the district of St. Mary's. This was published also with black headlines in the Montreal 'Star,' and a great many editorials have been written in regard to it. The charge was also published in the Toronto 'Mail.' While I do not wish to weary the House by reading the letter of 'Oculus,' I may be permitted to read to the committee an abstract of it taken from the Toronto 'Mail.' The 'Mail' says:

Some startling disclosures have been made by an examination of the methods employed to keep Guysborough, N.S., in the list of Liberal constituencies. The riding consists of two municipalities, one of which is known as St. Mary's. In the recent by-election St. Mary's increased its Liberal majority by 77, although a smaller vote was polled. This led to inquiry. It appears that just previous to the election the names of 83 Conservatives had been deliberately and surreptitiously struck off the voters' list.

I want hon. gentlemen to note that. The statement is that just previous to the election the names of Conservative voters were struck off the lists surreptitiously. I am

going to explain that it is impossible that this thing could be done and that it was not done.

It seems remarkable that this is possible in spite of the legal safeguards. Yet the scheme to defraud these electors was carefully planned. For federal elections we now accept the provincial lists which are compiled from the municipal records. The Liberals in St. Mary's, therefore, got control of the municipal machinery. Then they excluded all Conservatives from the assessors and the board of revisers, who have to do with the preparation of the municipal lists. Without notice to the parties concerned, and without even posting the preliminary lists, as required by law, the revisers struck off the names of 83 Conservatives whose qualifications for voting are undoubted. The thing was done so quietly that the by-election was on before the imposition was discovered. Then it was too late to enforce a remedy by legal means. That the plot was deliberately laid can hardly be denied since only Conservatives were made to suffer, and the whole business was done in the dark. The proceedings are so scandalous and so contrary to fairness that the exposure ought to be sufficient to effect punishment and redress.

This is a specimen of the editorials which are appearing in the leading Conservative newspapers in regard to this matter. The first statement is that the Liberals obtained a majority of 77 in the district of St. Mary's in excess of the majority they obtained in 1900, and the reason given by this newspaper is that the names of 83 Conservatives were struck from the lists thus enabling the Liberals to get a majority in that section. The municipality of St. Mary's consists of seven polling divisions and four of these divisions along the Atlantic seaboard comprise electoral district No. 1, and it is in the following districts that it is said the lists were tampered with : Mary Joseph, Liscomb, Sherbrooke and Port Hillford. Now as a matter of fact there was practically no increase in the vote polled for the Liberal candidate in Revisal District No 1. The increase was made in the remaining sections of St. Mary's where no question whatever arose about the lists. The editor says that :

Without notice to the parties concerned, and without even posting the preliminary lists, as required by law, the revisers struck off the names of 83 Conservatives.

I have a statement under oath from the reviser, Mr. Ross, who appears to have acted as chairman of the Board, that the facts were altogether exaggerated, that instead of 83 Conservatives being struck off, there were only 21 names altogether consisting of both Liberals and Conservatives struck off, in this revision that took place one year prior to the election held on the 16th March and that out of these 21 names there was not a single one of them that should not have been struck off, except half a dozen, and those were struck off in an error made in copying the list. Three of the six were Conservatives and three Liberals so that there could not have been anything political in connection with that, and it could have had no result whatever on the election. These are the facts as set forth in the declaration of Mr. Ross. It is said in the editorial that we have here that this was not discovered until it was too late. We begin the revision of the lists in Nova Scotia on the 20th January in each year. That revision is closed on the 18th March and the lists on which this election was run were completed and closed on the 18th March, 1903. The election did not take place until the 16th March, 1904, and there could be no change whatever in the lists between these dates. When they are completed the lists are deposited with the county clerk and any person has the right to get a copy. The county clerk sends them to the King's Printer and these lists on which this election was run were printed early in the summer of 1903, at the time that this House was in session. They were circulated amongst Conservatives as well as Liberals. I have no doubt that Mr. Gregory in the autumn of 1903, got his 21 copies of the lists for the election held on the 16th March, 1904, and that he was in possession of these for seven or eight months prior to the election. We heard no complaint. The municipal councils appoint these revisers. The municipal council at St. Mary's held two meetings during the period between the time these lists were made and the time that the election was run and there was no complaint made before the municipal council in regard to the conduct of the revisers or that of their officers. The local legislature of Nova Scotia held one session between these dates and the Conservative organizer, Mr. Tanner, who is the leader of the opposition in the local house, made no complaint in regard to the lists in Guysborough. We had six weeks of public discussion in that county. There was scarcely a schoolhouse or a hall in that county during the election in which there were not orators on both sides addressing the people and I never heard of any complaint being made in regard to the lists in Guysborough until six weeks after the election was over and the letter of 'Oculus' was first printed. If the names of a large number of Conservatives were surreptitiously struck from the lists a few days before the election would not the changes have been rung at every meeting in every schoolhouse during the election upon that fact ?

Mr. BELL. Did any one ever make the statement that these names were struck from the lists a few days before the election ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, I have read it.

Mr. BELL. This is not in the letter of 'Oculus.' That is only a summary the hon. gentleman has read. It is not the original.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It was said persistently by every Conservative newspaper. It may

not be in the letter of 'Oculus.' I am not certain as I have not the letter here.

Mr. BELL. I do not think it was.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Then it is admitted that it was not a few days before the election ?

Mr. BELL. No one ever said it was.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh, yes; it is persistently stated by the Conservative papers that it was a few days before the election when it must have been at least a year before. I simply want to correct that statement, because it would be simply impossible for that to be done. The list was revised a whole year prior to the election and the Conservatives had the same opportunity of placing their names on the list as the Liberals had.

Mr. BELL. Not quite as good.

Mr. SINCLAIR. They had the same chance exactly. I wish also to draw attention to the fact that there was not a single appeal. We provide an appeal court in the province of Nova Scotia so that gentlemen who are not satisfied with the decision of the local reviser can appeal to the sheriff of the constituency. The sheriff holds his court in the main part of the constituency the eastern district, and the chief deputy sheriff Mr. Davis, holds the court in the west. I asked the deputy sheriff to give me a report as to whether there was any complaint as regards the revision of the lists upon which this election was held and this is what Mr. Davis says :

Guysborough, N.S., May 14, 1904.

J. H. Sinclair, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiry of the 10th inst., about the number of appeals from the decision of the local revisers of electoral lists for the district of St. Mary's that came before me. I have attended at the office of the municipal clerk for the district of St. Mary's in accordance with Franchise Act, revised statutes, sixth series, for the years 1902-3-4, and I beg to inform you that no appeals were made to me.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) JOSEPH M. DAVIS,
Chief deputy sheriff for the county of Guysborough.

It appears, therefore, that there was not a single one dissatisfied with the decisions of the local revisers at the time the revision was made ; or else, they took so little interest in it that they did not go to see whether their names were on the list or not.

There was no difficulty in the way of their ascertaining if their names were on the lists. The municipal clerk lives in the town where these things were said to have been done ; his office is there ; the list of electors is deposited in his office, and any man in the constituency has the right to walk in to his office and demand an inspection of the lists. If any injustice were done to them, they had the privilege of appealing to the sheriff, which privilege they did not take advantage of. To put the whole question beyond dispute, Mr. Ross, the chairman of the Board of Revisers made a solemn declaration in which he says :

Canada.
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Guysborough.

I, George W. Ross, of Sherbrooke, in the county of Guysborough, magistrate, do solemnly declare :

That I am one of the revisers of electoral list for revisal, section No. 1, in the municipality of St. Mary's, Guysborough county. That I have been such reviser for a number of years, A.D. 1901-2-3-4. That no appeal, in any of these years, has ever been taken by the Conservatives or any one else, from any decision of the revisers of this section to the sheriff's court. During all these years no application to register the name of a voter, or would be voter, has been improperly or illegally refused or rejected by the revisers in this section. That from A.D. 1900 to the date of this declaration, the Conservatives have never made a single application to the revisers to strike a name or names from the electoral lists of this revisal section. That I posted the electoral lists for Sonora and Sherbrooke polling districts in each and every of the above-mentioned years in every respect as required by law. That I have been assured by the other two revisers of this section that they posted the electoral lists in the remaining polling districts of this revisal section, in a similar manner and from other information as well as I believe they did so. That I have carefully read the charges made in a certain letter signed 'Oculus,' which appeared in the Halifax 'Herald' newspaper bearing date May 4th, 1904. That these said charges are absolutely false and without a shadow of foundation in fact. That the lists 'Oculus' gives in the above-mentioned letter (purporting to represent the names of seventy-seven illegally disfranchised Conservatives) include names of men without property who have not been in the province of Nova Scotia for years, of men who have been dead for years, of insane men without property or income, of Liberals who never voted Conservative, of manufactured men (no men answering to such names having ever been in this revisal section), of aliens, of men whose names were not on the electoral lists in the first place and including also an escaped criminal without property or income qualification. That one of the names in these lists, that of George Kaiser, sr., is that of a man not only insane but also a pauper, an inmate of the poor house for the last three years. That as a matter of fact only twenty-one out of eighty-two names given by 'Oculus' were struck off at the revision in A.D. 1903, which was the revision of electoral lists just prior to the by-election of March 16th, 1904, and that not all of the owners of the names then struck off were alive when the names were removed. That three Conservatives and three Liberals all voting on property were unintentionally omitted by a clerical error in copying the final lists in 1903. That this to the best of my knowledge and belief is the

full extent of the injury caused either of the parties by errors or partisanship of the revisers. That as to income voters more Liberals have been omitted from the lists than Conservatives, but that I believe the decision in each and every such case was right and would be upheld in any court of law. That in the case of property holders above referred to when the revisers discovered the error, these six names were restored by them without solicitation, at the next revision and are now upon the lists. That at the revision of electoral lists March 5th, A.D. 1904, there were present the revisers, C. W. Pye representing the Liberals and Newman H. McDonald and H. F. Harding in support of other applications. That out of the lists of eighty-two names cited by 'Oculus' as disfranchised and referred to above, only fourteen applications to add to the electoral lists for A.D. 1904, were made by the Conservatives, the owners of thirty-nine of those names are alive and in this county, without the Conservatives making any effort to secure them the franchise. That as touching the pronounced Conservative leanings of those on the lists cited by 'Oculus' in the Halifax 'Herald' as before referred to, in the polling districts of Sherbrooke and Sonora, the Liberals added sixteen names from those lists of, 'Oculus,' the Conservatives only four, their total applications being six, and two they were unable to qualify. That as far as my knowledge goes, intentional wrong by the revisers in this revisal section No. 1 was never intended or committed. I have the fullest confidence in the integrity of my associate revisers, Messrs. Pye and Reid, and I firmly believe that did not their absence from the county, preclude them from making a careful review of the necessary document, they would be pleased to join with me in every part of this declaration, or to make independent declarations of the same tenor, covering their term of office.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

Declared before me at the town of Sherbrooke, in the county of Guysborough, this 26th day of May, A.D. 1904.

G. W. ROSS.

W. D. R. CAMERON,
A commissioner,
For taking affidavits in the Supreme Court for county of Guysborough.

The complaint was made that names were left on the list that should have been taken off, but the reviser declares that there was not a single application to strike names off. You will notice that the Conservatives complain that the name of Geo. Keiser was not found on the list of electors, and they charge the reviser with the criminal offence of striking it off improperly, but it turns out that Mr. Geo. Keiser is an insane man who was supported at the expense of the district. It will be noted also that there were twenty-one names struck off in these four polling districts, and that is not a very large average of men to become disqualified during the year. This declaration of Mr. Ross was published in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' the 'Eastern Chronicle,' New Glasgow, the Montreal 'Witness,' the Montreal 'Herald,' and no one has ventured to question what Mr. Ross has stated. I have already said that no complaint was made to the municipal council or to the local legislature or to any source, until several weeks after the election was over.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Pardon me. Did not 'Oculus' write a letter in answer to that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think he did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then it is hardly right to say that no one has questioned it. As the hon. gentleman has read the affidavit or letter or whatever it is; instead of saying that it had never been questioned, he should have read the answer as well, if he desired to present a fair case to the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would be quite willing to read that letter of 'Oculus,' if I had it. However, I do not think the answer has any bearing upon the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rest of us might like to form a conclusion.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would be very pleased to put the answer on record if it is the only answer the Conservatives can make. But let me say that in the first place it is an anonymous answer, and no person has had the courage to make a statement at all over his own signature in regard to this. Now Sir, the only person who did attempt to make any change in the electoral lists in the constituency on that occasion, was Chas. E. Tanner the Conservative organizer in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Tanner approached the returning officer, who is a layman, not a lawyer, and made an application for the addition of certain Conservative names to the electoral list a few days before the election and he attempted to insist on these names being added, saying that there was legal authority for doing so. He got the returning officer into a good deal of confusion but the returning officer refused and very properly refused to add any name to the official list sent him on which the election was to be conducted. This was the only attempt made to tamper with the list in the county of Guysborough during that election. It was a bold and impudent attempt to tamper with the lists and was prevented by the refusal of the returning officer to do what was asked by Mr. Tanner. On the strength of these so called revelations, which are not signed by anybody and for whom no person will become responsible, we have been read a great many lectures by the Conservative papers in Canada in which we are told that it is of the first importance that there should be no interference with the lists. I wish to place myself on record as agreeing with that principle, that it is of the utmost

importance to the people of this country that no man should be allowed to tamper with the ballots and that there should be a fair revision of the lists on every occasion. I can assure hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who do not belong to Nova Scotia and who may have read some of these articles in the Conservative papers throughout Canada in regard to the manner in which the lists are revised in that province, that we have a fair and just revision of the lists and that there is no real reason to complain. I know that we have men on both sides who will try to take advantage of their oppenents and to get their own men on the list and keep the others off. But we have every safeguard around the franchise in Nova Scotia and no man need complain who takes interest enough in his own affairs to see that his name is recorded. I know of only one case in the history of this country when this right, which every Canadian holds dear was in danger and that was the occasion of the introduction by the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite of that precious piece of legislation known as the Dominion Franchise Act. That Act threw the whole question of revising the lists into the hands of partisan revising barristers. These were the only people who had the right to decide whether a man should vote or not vote. That system was created and maintained for the purpose of loading the dice; it was one of the greatest outrages ever perpetrated on a free people and the political party which is responsible for the Dominion Franchise Act and for the Act by which the counties of Ontario were gerrymandered should not find any fault with the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say that all the revising officers in Nova Scotia were Conservative partisans ? I understood him to make that statement.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Most of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think he said all of them. Was not Judge Morse of Amherst county, county judge, was not Judge Savary of Annapolis one, and was not Judge Blanchard of Kentville another of those revising officers ? I think I could name others.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is three out of two hundred. I did not mean to say all. I think I guarded that statement. I did not mean that they were all partisans but I quite understand that in localities where there was a resident county judge, we had the benefit of his decisions in this respect, but in other counties, where there was not a resident judge, we had to take the decisions of partisan revising barristers. That was the position of affairs during that period. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have said over and over again that they are not responsible for what their predecessors did and I do not hold them responsible in the same sense, that I hold them responsible for the things which they do themselves. At the same time they are constantly reminding us of the achievements of their party in the past and it is only right and fair that they should be kept in a humble, lowly and penitent state of mind by being occasionally reminded of the depths of depravity to which their party sank during the period in which they had the power to control the franchise of the people of Canada.

Mr. BELL. I shall not detain the House very long in replying to the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I have no doubt that he has had this upon his stomach, so to speak, for some time, and it is therefore only fair that the House should have patience and allow him to get rid of it. I was careful in introducing the subject to the committee to make as little reference as possible to the Guysborough election, because I do not approve of discussing provincial matters in the House. I therefore introduced the subject at the proper time, during the criticism of the estimates of the Minister of Railways and called attention to the action of some officials with the least possible reference to the Guysborough election. Without any reference at all to reports and rumours, I based what I had to say on what I believed to be authentic information and invited the minister to give us the opportunity, by the appointment of a commissioner, to prove the truth of what I have stated. My hon. friend has gone very far afield. He has developed to a large extent the party view of the recent election in Guysborough and he has filled me with pride in the opposition by informing us that that party had at its control in this election large sums of money. I knew that we had virtue. I knew that we had industry and a good cause, but I did not know that we had the money. If my hon. friend had devoted his time to telling what he knew, instead of what he did not know, he could have given us some very valuable information indeed. He could have told us the course of certain cheques that were cashed at banking agencies in Halifax just about that time and which possibly found their way in the course of time to Guysborough.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I could not, Mr. Chairman. I am not aware that any cheques at all were cashed on that occasion relating to my election.

Mr. BELL. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I presume my hon. friend was prudent enough to take care not to know much about it. Possibly, however, some other people know a little more. The hon. gentleman has entertained the House with

his revelations as to the crimes and the crookedness of the Conservative party during that election ; and if I ever heard anything absolutely farcical it was the unfolding of his evidence on that point. Anything more grotesque and absolutely ridiculous, was never given in the hearing of this House. It was absolutely 'vox, et praeterea nihil.' There is nothing to it, just rumours and suspicions. He has spoken of certain men named Switzer and Twiger. A man must have a name and there has been no evidence to show that the men did not give their own names.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister has justified that on another occasion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Justified what?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Going under an anonymous name. The instance he cited was the Prince of Wales. He said that the Prince of Wales travelled anonymously and why should not an officer of this government travel anonymously ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a good example.

Mr. BELL. I do not know how far these assertions that these gentlemen were travelling under incorrect names are true. I recall, however, one matter which was ventilated in this House in which case no less a gentleman than the father of the Solicitor General of this parliament was proved to have made his appearance, during an election in the Magdalen Islands and there to have represented his distinguished son under an assumed name. He was Mr. Lemieux when he went to the Magdalen Islands, but in the stimulating air of that district his name grew to Lamirande in the course of a night. Why should not other people have the privilege also of travelling incognito?

The funniest thing of all was that the hon. gentleman has succeeded—and I regret to say in connection with my own country—in disinterring the gentleman who must forever pass as the chiefest of all the suckers in this world of ours, who met a gentleman called by my hon. friend François Le Marchand, who informed this gullible gentleman that he had $27,000 to spend on the last election. I regret very much that Mr. Floyd's habitat has been established in Nova Scotia, for I would like the people to believe that we are not altogether simpletons in that county down by the sea. No man has ever taken the trouble to prove by affidavit that he has been made a fool of to such an extent as our friend Mr. Floyd. Then we had a long statement from Mr. E. M. Macdonald, which contains absolutely nothing whatever. If he does not prove himself better at running elections than at drawing affidavits, it will take him some time to get hold of the county of Pictou ; and if he does not know more about running elections in the county of Pictou than he has shown he does in the county of Guysborough, he cannot be very dangerous, and I need not feel much alarmed. But why did the hon. gentleman not give the names of those who found their way into the county of Guysborough in his own interests ? He mentioned three or four who had gone there to represent the Conservative party, and said that the snow banks were covered with their tracks. But a gentleman who was recently his legal partner in New Glasgow was there, and there was no mark of his tracks on any of the snow banks. He had a much more comfortable means of conveyance. He was driven through the county by the gentleman who was deputy returning officer. The deputy returning officer drove my hon. friend's late law partner, and he carried a very suggestive looking little satchel, of which he took great care. I did not hear that Mr. Patterson addressed any public meeting, but he and his friend the sheriff did drive from house to house, and never parted company with that precious little satchel. I am willing to assume that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) did not know anything about money in this election. I am willing to assume that it was a perfectly purely conducted election, although there were some surprising turns over in the vote. But when he undertakes to read the Conservative party a lecture on the use of liquor, I think he must have braced himself up with some kind of a bracer—possibly something of the kind that was used plentifully in that campaign. It is not possible that he was altogether ignorant of the fact that a good deal of spirit was thrown into the operation of the Liberal party on that occasion by the old custom of putting spirits down to keep their spirits up. There was a good deal of that sort of thing done, and I am much pleased to find that he regrets that that ancient and time-honoured custom was ever followed. The hon. gentleman made some comments reflecting on a gentleman named Mr. McNab, of Montreal. I am glad, however, that he showed more caution in his strictures than was displayed by the writers of certain articles in the Nova Scotia press. Mr. McNab is a clever and estimable gentleman, who has been undeservedly treated with a great deal of undeserved ignominy by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite. The articles written concerning him were not signed for most excellent reasons, but I regret very much for the fair fame of our province that a gentleman could not go into the neighbourhood of the county of Guysborough, when an election was about to take place, without being treated with such foul abuse as was heaped on Mr. McNab. As an instance of the extremes to which the partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite went, I might men-

tion that one of them in my own county expressed the great regret he felt that Mr. McNab had not broken his wretched neck on his way home. I might say that Mr. McNab was never in Guysborough. He was in the town of New Glasgow, where I saw him, and certainly there was nothing improper in his conduct in that town. He was there acting as any gentleman might whose business had brought him to that place. Why does the hon. gentleman single out this gentleman and not mention any of the other estimable men who were in the county at that time? Why did he not mention Mr. Kirk, who left the Dorchester penitentiary and went all the way to Guysborough, and spent there a long winter day, from eight in the morning until five o'clock in the evening, in the vicinity of the polls? Why did he not mention also my friend Mr. Dickie, who was there in the interests of the party opposite, and who had not even a vote in that county, as far as I know, or any particular business apart from politics?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not notice that Mr. Kirk said he was only there three or four hours.

Mr. BELL. I have credible information to the effect that he was there all day, and I am not disposed to quarrel with my information, which comes from two or three different sources. He did spend many hours in an open sleigh in the immediate vicinity of the polling place. Was he there acting as guard over some of the whisky which was used there in the interests of my hon. friend? Then, again, the premier of Nova Scotia was there, and also Mr. Macdonald, of the county of Pictou, and Mr. Patterson and a host of others. Why were they not singled out by the hon. gentleman for comment? But I would ask what is there to prevent anybody from going into that county if he should take an active interest in any election there? No one would question on this side the right of any citizen to take part in an election, who is free to do so. Why, then, should my hon. friend spend so much of our valuable time in telling us that certain gentlemen had gone into that county to take part in an election? Surely that is the most natural thing to do. Not long ago I had the pleasure of meeting my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in a county in which he does not live, and I expect to meet him again in several counties in Nova Scotia during the next campaign. It is a part of the duty of public men to take part in an election campaign. If our hon. friend had taken up our valuable time in telling us what he does know, we might derive some benefit from his remarks, but all he did was discuss things of which he has not any personal knowledge. All he did was to indulge in a mass of surmises which were absurd on their face, and he demonstrated their absurdity by this affidavit of Mr. Floyd. If anything would show that the hon. gentleman was not fit to represent a constituency in that province, it is the fact that he seriously discussed such an absurd affidavit, and indulged in such ridiculous surmises. My hon. friend went into the question of the electoral lists, but why deal with that question here? That question has been thoroughly discussed in the public press. I was in the county myself, and I know that in the St. Mary's district, where I was working, some eighty names were not on the list which should have been there, and this was due to the fact that in that municipality the lists are prepared by revisers appointed by the county council, and that county council is composed of some five or six Liberals and not one Conservative. And in that district there has not yet been appointed one reviser or assessor within the memory of man who is not a partisan of hon. gentlemen opposite. Although these men have to perform judicial duties, they are, without exception, selected from the ranks of the party opposite. Every member of the council is a Grit, and every appointment made, if it has attached to it a salary of 25 cents, is made from the ranks of the Grit party.

Every electoral list prepared in that county is prepared by these men, and my hon. friend knows as well as I do that some of them are not over-scrupulous. He read an affidavit from a gentleman named Ross, who says, for the purpose of misleading the public outside the county of Guysborough, that one of the men left off the list was an escaped criminal. What are the facts?

John Biard did not leave Sherbrooke until after the 1903 revision. He had been on, and there was no change in his circumstances, yet he was struck off. In the spring of 1903, after the revision, he was convicted under the Scott Act of having paid for and passed over to another man one bottle of liquor. That is the criminal warrant. A conviction under the Scott Act is known to be no disqualification under the Scott Act.

Here is a man whose affidavit is read in this House, a man who puts what is practically a lie in his affidavit in order to mislead persons in other portions of Canada who do not know the facts. I need not, after that sample, pursue my inquiries on the character of the Ross affidavit. In the neighbourhood in which he has lived there is no occasion to do so for he is too well known. I could deal with other points in this affidavit, but it is not necessary. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) could not close without a fling at the Dominion Franchise Act. And yet the government which he supports and on whose behalf he pounds his desk so vigourously themselves proposed to pass a Franchise Act with regard to one province because they have lost temporarily control of the government of that pro-

vince. But they were compelled to drop the bone they thought to carry away. They may hope, in a short time to recover control, but they could not afford to wait. They were quite willing to fly in the face of the principle which they themselves had so often declared for by taking the control of the lists out of provincial hands. The moment a province gets out of their control they are ready to enact for it the law that they denounced so generally and so loudly. The hon. gentleman was not over ingenuous in what he said about the Franchise Act. He said that it was passed to enable the former government to appoint partisan revising officers. He spoke of this as being for the whole of Canada—he mentioned two hundred counties, and, though he was not quite right as to the number, it is evident that he had the whole of Canada in mind. He said that the late Conservative government had imposed upon Canada electoral lists made up by partisan barristers. His reputation for strict adherence to facts will not rise very rapidly in this House if he continues to make such statements. He was compelled to acknowledge his error. Being a practising barrister in his own province he could hardly have failed to know that in many of the counties in Nova Scotia, the revising officers were the judges, and in Ontario, it was almost the rule to have the county court judges perform this function. To my mind it would have been better if the hon. gentleman had not made his speech. He will not add much to his reputation for judgment and sincerity by such speeches, and he has not added much to the esteem in which the people of his county will be held when he produces and reads such absurd affidavits as those to which he has treated the House to-day. He read the statement of Mr. MacDonald which, I think, the House will agree was a ridiculous statement. He might have done better if that hon. gentleman—I do not know that I should say 'honourable' for it seems a misuse of the term to use it in that connection had prepared his list of voters, Mr. MacDonald was on trial before the grand jury of my county for presenting to the sheriff, who was revising officer, affidavits which had been forged and falsified, and he very narrowly escaped spending a portion of his years in a public institution where his keep would not have been at all costly to him.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House the result of that trial ?

Mr. BELL. The result was that the grand jury did not bring in a Bill. There was a friendly judge on the bench and Mr. MacDonald was allowed to go before the grand jury and succeeded in begging off. But there was no question about the facts and he never denied them. If he had brought his talent to bear the hon. gentleman would have had even a better list than that on which he ran and which was a very good one for him, because, to my knowledge, some eighty names were left off the list, and of these almost all were Conservatives. They were not quite all Conservatives—and this will serve to show how nicely this Grit machine works. There were a few Liberals left off, and why ? Because, in a previous municipal election they had ventured to vote for certain men for municipal office who were not acceptable to the Grit machine. That machine cuts off the heads not only of those whom it is not able to control for Dominion elections, but even those who will not obey its behests in municipal elections. Altogether my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) might better have left this matter where it should have been left to be discussed—in Guysborough and in Nova Scotia. It is not proper to introduce such subjects in this House. In beginning the few remarks I thought fit to offer I took care to make no reference to my hon. friend. I simply called attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that certain of his officials were alleged to have taken an active part in elections. My hon. friend has admitted that one government official is president of the Liberal Association of Guysborough. All I wanted to do was to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the facts and to ask him whether he proposed to apply in these cases the principle laid down by his leader in 1897. When we challenge the conduct of the government in dismissing men for alleged partisanship, the principle was laid down by the right hon. leader of the government that a public official was free to vote as he chose, but was not allowed to take a more active part in political contests. I will watch—and so will others along the line of the Intercolonial—to see whether the Minister of Railways is going to live up to the lofty principle enunciated by his leader. I cannot say I expect very much from him. We can hardly fail to recollect that, when our friends on the other side of the House talk about purity in elections, when they proclaim their love and their devotion, their adoration even, for purity and high principle, it is the same as when certain people talk about honesty—time to button your pockets. We know—it is no matter of hearsay ; it has been proven to a demonstration and is set out broad and clear upon the pages of Canadian history, so that even the most casual reader cannot but note it—that the very things that these gentlemen profess to admire and revere as lofty and pure are the very things that, in practice, they sedulously avoid. They have preached every political virtue and have declared each to be dear to their hearts, but in the practice of these virtues they have been sad failures indeed. If ever a party was branded and stigmatized as being made up of hypocrites, of men wanting in sincerity, that party is the Liberal party of Canada.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

WEST CANADIAN COLLIERIES, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 80) respecting the West Canadian Collieries, Limited.—Mr. Oliver.

On the preamble.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is a Bill of considerable importance, and I do not think it is properly understood. I hope the promoter will be able to make a satisfactory explanation of the Bill, and that before it goes through we shall have the assurance of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) or the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that the matter has been investigated, and that the Bill may be passed.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill was up for consideration the week before last, and on the joint suggestion of the leader of the opposition and the Minister of Justice, it was held over for consideration by the Justice Department. That consideration has been given. The legal gentlemen acting for the company discussed the Bill with the Department of Justice and made such alterations in it as the officials of the Justice Department suggested. The Bill in that form went before the Private Bills Committee the second time and was agreed to unanimously, and now it comes before the House in Committee for final approval. I am not in a position to discuss the very intricate question that was raised by the leader of the opposition when the Bill was before the House before, but I think it will be agreed that having been dealt with in this way we may fairly consider it as having been put in a satasfactory shape and proper to be accepted by the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think that explanation is quite sufficient to warrant us in passing this Bill. To my mind it is an extraordinary Bill, it seems to ask for powers to do anything and everything. Though I do not doubt the statement of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that the Minister of Justice has looked into this Bill, still I think the Minister of Justice should be here and give an assurance to the committee that he regards the Bill as one that ought to receive the sanction of this House. But so far as I am concerned I do not think it should.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As for the preamble I think it is in a very much better shape now than it was before. It reads now as follows :

Whereas the West Canadian Collieries, Limited, hereinafter called the company, has by its petition represented that it was incorporated under 'The Companies Act,' 1862 to 1900, of Great Britain, and has been licensed under 61 Vic., chap. 49 (Dominion) to carry on mining operations in the Yukon and Northwest Territories by license dated the 6th October, 1903.

I assume that all that has been proved to the satisfaction of the committee to which the Bill was referred. Then the preamble proceeds as follows :

Whereas the company has filed a duly certified copy of the company's memorandum and articles of association in the office of the Secretary of State of Canada.

The memorandum and articles of the association correspond to the charter of the company as contained in an Act of parliament, and set forth the powers of the company and the purpose for which it was incorporated. The preamble proceeds as follows :

And whereas the company has, by its petition, prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition.

Of course we have to consider that in connection with what follows, we are on the preamble now. I do not see any objection to the preamble in its present form.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble with it is that it is an incorporated company under the Joint Stock Companies Act of England from 1862 to 1900, the Act as amended during that time. It comes over here and receives a license under the Land Act, empowering it to carry on mining, or grazing, or timber business. That license is an entirely different thing from an incorporation. Then we unite that license with the letters of incorporation and embody it in an Act of parliament here, leaving in it all the provisions which the original corporation contained. We do not know what the provisions of the Joint Stock Companies Act were, what powers they have under it, but whatever they are or whatever they were they are renewed here. It seems to me doubtful whether we should pass this Bill. The Minister of Justice above all others ought to be the one to examine it and guide us, otherwise we are practically going it blind.

Mr. OLIVER. I can assure the committee that the Minister of Justice coincided to a great degree with the remarks of the leader of the opposition, and took the responsibility of reviewing the Bill so as to bring it into line with the laws of Canada. I think the committee will remember that I asked him particularly : Do you take the responsibility of doing this, and he said he did. Now he has discharged that responsibility, the Department of Justice has reviewed the Bill, and some changes have been made in it at the request of the Justice Department. The Bill has gone through the Private Bills Committee and so far as the promoters of the Bill are concerned every requirement has been complied with in order to bring it within the rules of the

House and within the general procedure in such cases provided.

On section 1,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 1 is struck out and the following inserted :

The company shall be and is hereby recognized throughout the Dominion of Canada as a body corporate and politic by and under the name of the 'West Canadian Collieries, Limited,' but such recognition shall not deprive the company of the power to make such variations in its constitution as it may lawfully make in virtue of the Companies Act, 1862 to 1900, and under the statutes of the Imperial parliament in amendment thereof or substitution therefor ; and such recognition shall not be deemed to authorize or empower the company to exercise in the Dominion of Canada any power or to do any act for the lawful exercise or doing of which an Act of the parliament of Canada would otherwise have been necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be inclined to think this clause is fairly well guarded now. It has been pointed out that there might be possibly an objection to it. Really there is no very great object in enacting it at all. It practically does not differ from what the law would otherwise be because a company incorporated in a foreign country can in Canada, by virtue of what is known as the comity of nations, carry on its business and is recognized as a corporation internationally by the comity of courtesy of international law. Of course Great Britain has a different legislature from ours although it belongs to the same empire. The same treatment would be given to a company incorporated in a foreign country like the United States, or Germany, or France, so that this section does effect very much change. The section as drafted goes on to make this provision :

—and such recognition shall not be deemed to authorize or empower the company to exercise in the Dominion of Canada any power or to do any act for the lawful exercise or doing of which an Act of the parliament of Canada would otherwise have been necessary.

Therefore, the section does not really seem to me to add very much to what the company might otherwise do, and I suppose it is inserted for the reason that as powers are given further on, it is advisable in the first instance to recognize the company formally by statute, although that recognition does not seem to me as a matter of law to carry the company beyond the position in which it would have found itself under the law apart from this statute altogether. It is quite true that power is reserved to the company to make changes under the English Companies Act, 1862-1900 and to carry on its business in Canada, but it had the right to do that anyway. That is to say that a company incorporated in Great Britain which has a different legislature from our own or incorporated in any foreign country can come to Canada and carry on business, and carrying on business in Canada, it can by virtue of the legislature of this country or under the authority of the legislature of its own country make changes in its constitution or powers and after that, of course, as respects the powers of the company, they are limited by these changes. I do not think there is in the first section anything to which we might reasonably object. There may be a clause further on where very extensive powers are given the company to which some valid objection might be made, but as far as this section is concerned, I do not think there is any objection to be made.

Mr. SPROULE. What position would we be in suppose we wanted to wind up the company ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That depends on a careful examination of the Winding Up Act, but I imagine the company would have to be wound up in Great Britain where its head office is. The courts in Canada would be auxiliary to the courts of Great Britain for that purpose, and we would have the right in this country to see that the assets were so applied that no injustice would be done to Canadian creditors.

Mr. SPROULE. I have had little experience in dealing with a foreign company, and that very troublesome question came up. How should the company be wound up ? You have in the Winding Up Act a provision which sets out how the assets of the company shall be used for the liquidation of its liabilities, but there may be obligations resting upon the company in a foreign country and the question arose as to how the assets should be used. There was a conflict of jurisdiction. What authority would we have to deal with a foreign corporation and use the assets to satisfy the Canadian creditors, while the English creditors, or in the case that I have referred to, the American creditors, would not be satisfied ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A difficult and important question arises in regard to that. I am not prepared to say that the company might not be wound up in this country. I will not say anything about that at the present moment without investigating the statutes. In cases where companies incorporated in Great Britain have become insolvent while carrying on business in this country the question has sometimes arisen—it has arisen in my own province—whether liens obtained under the law of the province should prevail against the title of the trustee in Great Britain. In my own province we have held that liens granted under the law of our own province should take precedence of the title of the trustee. I do not know whether

the same would apply to other provinces. At all events the Canadian creditors would stand in the same position as the creditors in Great Britain. Their rights would be respected, they could file their claims and participate in the assets just in the same same way as the English creditors would. Of course, as far as the winding up of the company is concerned, there would be exactly the same difficulty if this company were not coming to this parliament for its Act of incorporation at all. The company might carry on business in this country without coming to this parliament under the doctrine that I have already mentioned, it might become insolvent and if it had to be wound up, the same difficulties to which my hon. friend has referred would arise in that case.

On section 4, subsection (n).

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it is hardly worth while striking out any of these words because I think that nearly every power that could be given to the company is given. I hardly think it worth while striking out a few words. I think we ought to have some members of the administration here to say that this is a proper Bill, that it has been investigated and examined and that the government is prepared to say that it has the approval of the departmental officers under whose notice it should come, because, to my mind, it is one of those sweeping, blanket charters that covers almost everything, and it will be a very strange matter indeed if it does not come in contact with private interests that we cannot detect from a cursory reading of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very sorry that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) should take the position which he does. I beg to assure him that the Department of Justice has reviewed the Bill, that the amendments contained are amendments suggested by the department and agreed to by the parties promoting the Bill. There cannot be anything more evident than that, by the very fact that the amendments which have been read have conformed to the suggestions then made by the leader of the opposition, and agreed to at that time, measurably at any rate, by the Minister of Justice. The whole of the amendments and the whole of the procedure has been in the last degree regular, and I would think it is hardly fair for the hon. member to practically say that my word in this matter is not good. I beg to assure the House that it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have stated that I was quite prepared to take the hon. gentleman's word, but it may be within the recollection of us all that not very long ago he read a very severe lecture to members on this side of the House for being absent when business came before the House. I objected to this Bill when it was last called simply because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) was absent, and I thought as he was so extremely particular that every hon. member on this side of the House should be in his place, that it was just as well that his Bill should stand over. I notice that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Minister of the Interior is present to-night, and surely one of these ministers should be here to vouch for the propriety of this Bill. Considering the strong position which the promoter of this Bill has taken with regard to members not being in their places when matters of this kind came up, I am disposed to follow his example and to insist that the proper minister be here to vouch for this legislation. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) chooses to read lectures to this side of the House, then when an opportunity occurs we have a perfect right to read a lecture back to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the powers enumerated in section 4 in conformity with those contained in the memorandum or articles of association of the company. I would presume they are, but it is important that we should have some assurance as to that. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) know ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in a position to answer the question. I repeat that the Private Bills Committee considered the Bill and reported unanimously in favour of it in its present shape. That is the only assurance I can give the committee on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In England there is practically no restriction to the powers they give to these companies and possibly the provisions of section 4 have simply been copied from the memorandum or article of association of the company as it is now constituted in which case there might be no very great objection to it.

Section agreed to on division.

On section 5,

Mr. HENDERSON. Section 5 seems to give this company extraordinary power. Could it come into the county which I have the honour to represent and erect telegraph and telephone poles through the villages without any restriction whatever. Surely the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) should imagine that the people of this country have some rights. I take no exception because this is an English company ; I am very glad indeed that they are investing capital here to develop the country, but I think there should be some restriction so that we can actually say that we have a little claim upon our own property and some right to go out and in. If it were a Canadian company these restrictions would be placed around it. I can hardly believe for one moment that the Minister of Justice has assented to this Bill, and I must protest against its proceeding to-

night until we have some further assurance. I move that the committee rise, report progresss, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FIELDING. The practice is that all these Bills are dealt with by committees representing the House, and I presume that the committee has inquired into this Bill and given it due consideration. I am not a member of the committee, but I accept the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) that the Minister of Justice has advised on this Bill, and if so, I presume that he has passsed on this section because there is some provision in the general Act which will protect the municipalities with regard to telephone and telegraph poles. I do not imagine that the Minister of Justice would permit a Bill to go through for the purpose of allowing a company to take possession of the streets of any municipality, and I am bound to believe that there must be some governing provision in the general Act. I am not familiar with the Bill and I cannot say that the Minister of Justice has given attention to all these things but I think it is a fair presumption. If there is any grave objection to the Bill I have no desire to see it pressed to-night.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be something in the statement of the minister, but I think further there is no provision in the Bill enabling it to enter upon public highways. As to constructing conduits : that is made subject to the consent of the municipalities. The power to construct telegraph and telegraph lines would not imply power to enter upon the streets.

Mr. FIELDING. Nor on private land without compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there would be much danger so far as that is concerned, but as to conduits I think the limitations in clause 4 are not quite adequate. There are districts in the Northwest Territories which have no municipal government and the provision as to municipal control would not have very much application. I should think it would be in the interests of the constituents of my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that there should be some further restriction in the Bill as to that.

Mr. OLIVER. If I were understood as saying that the Minister of Justice had personally overlooked this Bill, I did not wish to say so. I say that the officers of his department did.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what I understood.

Mr. OLIVER. And so, I suppose the Minister of Justice would be practically responsible for the amendments that have been made. I think that the point which the leader of the opposition has suggested is well taken. Where there are no municipalities that difficulty, however, could be cured very easily by providing that in such cases the government of the Northwest Territories, who really control all highways, should have the power.

Mr. FIELDING. We might insert the words 'or other authority.'

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would be proper to put in such words as are necessary to make the amendment.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that this Bill has not been before the Railway Committee at all. I find that under this particular clause the company are taking power to

> Construct, operate and dispose of telegraph and telephone lines for the purpose of its undertakings only.

Of course, the words giving the company power to do this for its own purposes form just the usual clause which is put in all Bills, but I think before a matter of this kind is passed in this committee it should be referred to the Railway Committee, which is accustomed to dealing with questions of this kind and which imposes certain safeguards. I also notice in clause 6 :

> The company may, for the purpose of any of its undertakings or for the promotion thereof, construct and operate all such railway sidings, tramways, switches or spur lines, not exceeding ten miles in length, as are necessary to connect the works and properties of the company with each other or with the line of any railway company incorporated by or under the control of parliament.

That is a matter which seems to me to be directly under the power of the Railway Committee. My attention has just been called to these provisions in the Bill, and I think that under the circumstances it should be referred back to the Railway Committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I supposed it had gone to the Railway Committee.

Mr. HYMAN. I am explaining that it has not gone to the Railway Committee ; it went to the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think it ought to have gone to the Railway Committee.

Mr. HYMAN. I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. In the meantime the Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. COWAN. This matter was fully considered by the Private Bills Committee. This company was an English company incorporated under the laws of England. We in Canada were simply trying to give them the powers which they already had under their English charter, so far as they were consistent with Canadian law. No power of expropriation, as I remember, is granted. They would only have the power to construct a line not to exceed ten miles in length, a spur line for the purposes of their

own business, and the telegraph and telephone lines were on the same basis.

Mr. LANCASTER. If they are given the powers suggested by the hon. gentleman, then, under the General Railway Act, they will be able to construct their road upon a public highway if they get the consent of the Railway Commission. It is not the policy of the Railway Committee to allow railways to run on highways without the consent of the municipalities, and that is another reason why it should go to the Railway Committee. I have no doubt that is what was in the mind of the chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Hyman) when he asked to have this referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. COWAN. We do not apply the Railway Act, and there can be no power to enter on highways under this Bill.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not desire to enter upon the merits but certainly clauses 5 and 6 refer to telephones and railways, and that being the case, the Bill ought to be considered by the Railway Committee before it is submitted to the House. That is my only reason for making this motion.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to point out to the committee that the question raised by the acting Minister of Public Works and Chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Hyman) was thoroughly considered by the parties who are promoting the Bill ; and as their enterprise is entirely a private one, and as they ask for no powers of a public character, they did not consider that it came under the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the hon. gentleman think that they could obtain the power to build ten miles of railway to connect their works with any line of railway incorporated by this parliament without coming before the Railway Committee ?

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose they would connect just as any other railway would connect or just as any crossing would be made over any other railway, and that would be by obtaining the consent of the Railway Commission. This Bill does not ask for authority to construct a telegraph or telephone or railway line as a public enterprise, but only to construct such for the purposes of operating their coal mines and coak ovens.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the difference?

Mr. OLIVER. There is all the difference in the world.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why should they not have that power ?

Mr. OLIVER. Why not ? These people are operating coal mines on a very large scale and also coke ovens. Is this parliament going to say to them : you shall not put up a telephone line between your two sets of coke ovens or coal mines. Or you shall not connect them by a railway ? They are a coal mining company, and they happen to be located some five or six miles distant from the Crow's Nest Pass branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in order to get their output to market, they must reach that railway by a railway line. They have a railway line from their present coal mines to the Crow's Nest branch under a railway charter, which comes under the Railway Act, and is a public enterprise. They have also other coal mines in other places which are not yet developed, but to which they are prepared to build other railway lines, also secured under charter from this parliament. Where they are building a railway line as a public enterprise, they come under the provisions of the Railway Act, but where they want to lay down a pair of rails for the transport of their own output, they are not asking to be put under the Railway Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that mentioned in their charter ?

Mr. OLIVER. Half the railway charters that come before the Railway Committee contain a list of powers given by the committee which are not connected with railroading at all. This company is asking to be empowered to do certain things but not to be empowered to do them over the heads of other people. That is the difference between the two conditions.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman would admit that if this company asks for power to do a certain thing, we have the right to say on what terms and conditions to sanction the doing of certain things, and this parliament has the right to determine on what conditions they shall be done, and as this is a matter concerning telegraphs, telephones and railway lines, the acting minister is perfectly right in saying that it should come before the Railway Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is now out of order. The only motion before the Chair is that the committee rise and report.

Mr. HYMAN. That is in connection with the end of clause 5.

Mr. OLIVER. I am trying very hard to show that the motion should not be agreed to. I submit that the question is a general one and must receive a general answer. In reply to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), the difference is between asking for a privilege and a power.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman seriously argue that when the company asks a privilege this House should not say on what terms that privilege would be granted ?

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then if it is a question of a railway, surely he will see that it is the Railway Committee which should deal with it. And the very fact that the hon. member promoting the Bill wants to avoid the Railway Committee may cause members to think that this charter is one that should be scrutinized by that committee. I think he had better accept the suggestion of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) and have the matter discussed on its merits in that committee.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be the last man in this House to deny the authority of the House to do as it pleases. Parliament is supreme ; it can take away to-day rights that it gave yesterday. I am not arguing against this Bill going before the Railway Committee, but I am arguing against the idea that those who promoted the Bill did not know what they were doing or that they tried to avoid going before the Railway Committee.

Mr. HYMAN. It is not the promoter of the Bill who sends it to the Railway Committee. The promoter comes before the House and asks for certain privileges, and the House refers the matter to the committee that it thinks has jurisdiction.

Mr. OLIVER. But the point I wish to make is that this Bill, according to good legal authority does not need, under the rules of the House, to go to the Railway Committee, inasmuch as it deals with a private and not with a public enterprise. At the same time, if the House says that it must go before the Railway Committee, certainly there is no objection whatever. But there is every objection to the idea being put forward, as was suggested by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) a few moments ago, and as was the logical outcome of the suggestion of the acting Minister of Public Works, that, in the nature of things, it should have gone to the Railway Committee, for we say that in the nature of the case it should not have gone to the Railway Committee.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me that the proposition of the acting Minister of Public Works is the proper one, if the Bill stands in the form in which it was printed. Section 13 expressly provides that section 195 of the Railway Act, 1903, shall apply to the powers given to the company by paragraph (M) of section 4 of the Bill. Paragraph (M) of the Bill deals with electric powers. And, turning to section 195 you will find many provisions there about municipalities and other matters that ought to be considered by the committee that deals with Railways and Telegraphs.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to section 6, I think the contention of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is correct. This only empowers the company to construct and operate such railway sidings, tramways, switches or spur lines not exceeding ten miles in length, as are necessary to connect the works and properties of the company with each other or with any line of railway. I doubt if it gives them power to pass over even a municipal road without the authority of the municipality or of the local legislature of the territories.

Mr. BARKER. But section 195 of the Railway Act expressly applies to lines and wires on the highway, and that section is the one that is applied by section 13 of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Further than that, though this Bill may apply only to a railway on the company's own land, there are some provisions of the Railway Act which it might be necessary to call into operation in connection with the work, as, for example, the provisions with regard to the safety of employees and with regard to the safety of the public, especially in the prevention of fires.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection.

Progress reported.

Mr. HYMAN. With the consent of the House, I beg to move that Bill (No. 80) respecting the West Canadian Collieries, Limited, be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked for certain information with respect to the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways during the past fiscal year. We have not the returns for the month of June—of course, my hon. friend knows that it is impossible to have them at this date. But I can give the figures down to the end of May. On the Intercolonial, the capital expenditure to the end of May was $1,507,975.86 ; and on the Prince Edward Island Railway the capital expenditure for the same period was $364,924.66.

Mr. HAGGART. And what was the expenditure on revenue account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given that.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has given it for the Intercolonial, but not for the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The revenue for the Prince Edward Island Railway to the end of April—we have not got the figures later than the end of April—was $189,894.67, and the expenditure was $255,166.41.

Mr. HAGGART. That is for ten months?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is to the end of April.

Mr. SPROULE. Before we dispose of that item, I want to refer to one statement that was made by the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). It is proper that I should do so, because of what I call his wholesale slander of the judges, especially those of Ontario. He stated that over 200 partisan revising barristers dealt with the old Franchise Act, and it was desired to do away with them. Now, there are 213 constituencies in Canada, and if there was a revising barrister for each one there would be 213 of them. In Ontario there are 92 constituencies, and if there were one revising barrister for each there would be 92 of them. In these 92 I am within the mark in saying that there were not 16 revising barristers in the province of Ontario outside the judges; most of the ordinary judges are doing that work to-day. That is an attack upon the judges that was unwarrantable, unjustifiable, and which comes with bad grace from a prominent lawyer. It seems to be only a bit of the parrot-like talk that has been indulged in by his friends without any proper justification. I wish to resent on behalf of the judiciary of the country this slander on men who are doing the same work they did for many years. In my riding there are three constituencies and only two judges, and you are obliged to appoint one revising barrister besides these two judges. The law required that the party appointed must be a barrister of five years' standing, because only a barrister of five years' standing was eligible to be appointed a judge. The barrister who did that work for years is now the judge of the county and has been for many years. All over the country the provincial lists where they are used to-day are revised by the very same men. They were judges of the county court then and they are judges to-day; and I have not yet heard, in my part of the country at least, any insinuation by Conservative or Reformer that when they went before these judges or revising barristers they did not get fair-play or were not satisfied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would also like to say a few words with regard to the observations of the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). He took occasion to refer to some gentlemen in the province of Nova Scotia whom I know very well, and characterized them as heelers. The gentlemen whom he named were Mr. Ernest Gregory, with whom I am very well acquainted, Mr. Charles E. Tanner and Mr. Simpson. I do not recollect any other names. I understood him to designate these gentlemen as heelers, if I understood him correctly. I can only say to my hon. friend and to the House that these are very respectable men in the province of Nova Scotia, and I think they will bear comparison with my hon. friend in point of reputation and ability.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think I used that word with regard to these gentlemen who are named. I did have occasion to speak of certain Conservatives, but I did not have these gentlemen in my mind at the time I used that expression. I do not think that what I said would bear the meaning the leader of the opposition seems to have put upon it. At all events, I did not intend that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad my hon. friend did not intend it. I do not see that his words could bear any other construction, because these were the gentlemen he named as having been in the county, and afterwards he referred to Conservative heelers in the county. He referred to some one else, but he did not name the other gentlemen to whom he referred. So far as these gentlemen are concerned, all of them whom I have named—I do not know what Mr. Simpson he refers to, but I do know Mr. Tanner and I know Mr. Gregory—they are accustomed to take an important part in the public life of the province. This was not the first occasion on which they have gone into counties where elections were in progress, and I suppose it is not the first occasion on which my hon. friend has gone into counties where he was not resident when elections were proceeding.

I would also suppose that if my hon. friend desired to make a fair presentation of the irrelevant matter he brought to the attention of the committee, he would not only have read the answer but the letter to which the answer was given, and the reply which was made to that answer. He characterized that answer as absolutely unworthy of notice, and yet one single paragraph of it, read by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell), absolutely disposed of a very important part of the charge contained in the letter or affidavit of Mr. Ross. In any event, I suppose it would be a fairer course to submit the whole matter to the judgment of the House than to read one side of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him? I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the House who made that answer. I have not yet been able to discover that any reputable person made any reply to Mr. Ross's affidavit, and if the leader of the opposition is able to tell us who it was, I would like very well to have his name.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no more knowledge of the name than my hon. friend. All I am suggesting is that if the statements of the writer were worthy of being dealt with to the extent of an hour's speech this afternoon, in a carefully prepared effort, with even the impromptu quotations carefully written out, one would suppose that the

words to which the answer was given might also have been given to the House in all fairness. Either the observations of this writer were worthy of attention or they were not; my hon. friend seemed to regard them as worthy of attention, and he read the answer to them, but he did not read the response made to that answer. As a matter of fact, he was entirely out of order in bringing the question up on that item. The subject was discussed on this side from a proper standpoint, it was discussed with regard to the action of officers whose salaries were then being voted. The discussion was perfectly in order until my hon. friend took the floor, and then, instead of dealing with the matter which was before the House, he entered into a long disquisition, from carefully prepared notes, upon a certain matter which was not in order at all, for some object best known to himself. The question of the Guysborough election was not before the House; the question before the committee was the action of officers whose salaries are paid by this country. That was the subject we were discussing, the subject which my hon. friend did not discuss except for about five minutes at the commencement of his remarks. I think he would have been of more assistance to the committee in forming a conclusion as to what should be done, if he had devoted his attention to the nine gentlemen—I have the names of twenty here under my hand—whose conduct was being dealt with by hon. gentlemen in this House. That was a proper subject to be discussed, and not the absolutely irrelevant question as to whether or not one party or the other had been guilty of illegal acts in this election. I made no reference, nor did any one on this side of the House, to the conduct of any person except officers of this government. My hon. friend, for some reason which I cannot understand, saw fit to drag in the names of gentlemen who were not officers of this country, whose salaries we were not discussing, and who had just as much right to go into that county and take part in that campaign as had my hon. friend himself. Under these circumstances, I do not think it worth while to deal further with the remarks of my hon. friend, except to say that I think the gentlemen whom I have named can well afford to treat with disdain any animadversions made by my hon. friend on their conduct during that election. I venture to say that any one of them has as honourable a record behind him, and has as good a reputation in the community to which he belongs, as my hon. friend himself, and in saying that I am not intending to make the slightest reflection upon him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the item is passed I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals as the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) is not in his seat, a question. The hon. member for Cape Breton made the statement this afternoon that: We might have dealt severely with the men who voted against the government. Do I understand from that that the patronage all along the line of the Intercolonial is taken from the members who represent the constituencies along that railway? The Intercolonial Railway is a national road and I think the members in Ontario have as good a right to have a say as to who should be placed in that railway as the members along the line, and I am sure there is not one of us who is anxious that it should be a political line but the best way to bring that about is to allow the members to dictate to the management as to who should be employed upon the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is impossible for me to explain to my hon. friend what he is to understand from the remarks made by any other gentleman. If I make a remark and he asks me what he shall understand from it I shall be very happy to tell him. It is refreshing to hear him speak in the way he does. He is certainly a very new member of the House when he ignores the manner of disposing of government patronage either in regard to government railways or in regard to any department of the government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. You approve of disposing of the patronage?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do. I am not going to be hypocritical about it.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a good deal of force in the contention that there should be no control over appointments on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a pity we did not commence that twenty years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. It is never too late to begin a good thing. This hon. gentleman pretends to fall back upon the old argument: You did the same as if that were all that was necessary. If it were wrong when done by his opponents it is equally wrong when done by himself. His friends declared that it was wrong during the time they were in opposition, that it was an improper principle, an unsound one and that the railway could not be properly managed as long as it prevailed. Now, when he and his friends get into power why do they not show their faith in their own contentions by adopting a sound principle? Is it too late to do that now? The attention of the country is drawn to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Constitutional usage would not permit now.

Mr. SPROULE. Has a Minister of the Crown not sufficient backbone in him to say that because a thing is wrong I will not allow it? If he has not, he should not be there. He is unfit for the position and his government are unfit for the position. As a minister of the Crown he ought to have

some moral courage to father his principles and his policy whatever it is. If he cannot take that responsibility he is not fit to be a minister of the Crown. I say the attention of the country has been drawn to this subject in such a way that public sentiment would back him up in the course which I suggest. The government railway under his control should be managed upon the same solid business principles that prevail in the management of other railways and when that is done we may hope to see the Intercolonial Railway have something to the good instead of deficits year after year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand the position of the Minister of Railways and Canals. I understood him this afternoon to state that all appointments were made only on the recommendation of the executive management of the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend so understood me he misunderstood me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the hon. gentleman say ?

Mr. EMMERSON. What I said was that there were not forced upon the management of the Intercolonial Railway any men who were not required to be employed on the road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would not seem to be going very much further to require that the men be subject to the approval of the executive management of the road. I do not think there is very much of an extension of principle there. If there is any thing in the principle which has been suggested by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) it certainly means that. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals seems to go half way towards that principle but beyond that he will not go. If the principle is good in one case why not in another ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be a most vicious principle if by political influence men were forced on the railway who were not required. But where they do not require men I will say that as long as we have control of the government in Canada and as long as we have a government operated road, the government being responsible for its management, will ask for recommendations from its friends and not for those who are opposed to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not the question.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well then my hon. friend is utterly incapable of understanding the English language.

Mr. EMMERSON. Possibly. That is a nice way of getting out of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a nice way of getting out of it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did state that he would act upon the recommendation and opinion of the management as I understood it in respect to the qualification of the men to be employed on the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is another question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not his principle.

Mr. EMMERSON. I never said that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is his principle ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that recommendations should be made to the management and that it was for the management to determine as to the fitness of the men recommended, and that we wanted to select these men.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have the situation defined to a certain extent. As far as the number of men to be employed is concerned the government is to act upon the recommendation of the executive management of the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. As to special fitness ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As to special fitness. Would my hon. friend state in so far as that is concerned if he is to act upon the recommendation of political friends ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He is not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what way do the recommendations from political friends come in ? When you come to the question of special fitness, are you to go to the executive management of the road or to the political friends of the government for the time being ? We are discussing not the management of this administration but the management of any administration in Canada. What is the principle ? Are you in the ultimate resort to be governed by the opinion of the executive management of the road, and is that to override the recommendation of the party friends or is the contrary principle to prevail ? Is the recommendation of party friends to override the objections of the executive management which may desire that the position should be otherwise filled ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the matter is very clear that the recommendations are made by the management. It is for them to determine as to the qualifications and fitness and for them to select those who are qualified. These recommendations are not merely made by one individual. There may be twenty recommended. From any number recommended the ones best fitted for the positions are selected, that being determined by the management. It is a question as to qualifications and fitness.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. From the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals we can readily see how it is that we have a very large deficit, and when the people realize that the Intercolonial Railway is a political machine practically from one end to the other they certainly will feel that there should be some change made in its management. The hon. member for Cape Breton made the statement this afternoon that: We might have dealt severely with the men who are on that road. He certainly must have connected with himself in that statement the members of the Reform party along the line of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a new doctrine introduced in regard to the appointment of parties to the Intercolonial Railway which was begun under the administration of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and his predecessors. When I was managing the Intercolonial Railway I never interfered with the selection of men for any positions unless perhaps an inspector or a chief officer. The officers of the road had no directions then to take the recommendations of friends of the government. I understand that instructions are now given that a political supporter is to be employed in all cases. That is new doctrine on the Intercolonial Railway introduced by the present government. Just fancy the idea of a government interfering to say who shall be a trackman, or who shall dig a ditch on the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Did the hon. gentleman adopt a similar policy with regard to appointments on the Welland canal?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember that there was any other policy. I do not know that I ever interfered with any appointment on the Welland canal; I may have, but certainly I never interfered with appointments on the government railways. I never gave the officials to understand that they were to employ supporters of the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. But they always did.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know what the practice of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was with regard to appointments on the Intercolonial Railway, but certainly on the Welland canal which was under his jurisdiction, it was notorious throughout the province of Ontario, that lockmen and other workingmen on the canal were appointed upon the recommendation of the Tory member for the constituency.

Mr. FIELDING. And I beg to say that it was quite right that the appointments should be so made. I do not endorse the idea that it was wrong to make these appointments on the recommendation of the member for the constituency. The first consideration must be fitness for the work, and there is a fair presumption that you could get men in either political party fit to discharge most of these duties. When the friends of the government of the day are beyond question fit to do the work, why should not the preference be given to them? What the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says about appointments on the Intercolonial Railway under the Conservative government, will be looked upon as a supreme joke along the whole length of that road. The idea that appointments were made to the staff of the Intercolonial Railway by the Conservative government, irrespective of politics, cannot be taken seriously. It was looked upon as legitimate patronage, and so long as capable and honest men were appointed there is no fault to find. If, on the Welland canal, or on the Intercolonial Railway, my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) appointed persons of capacity and character on the recommendation of the member representing the constituency through which the canal or railway ran, then he has nothing to apologize for. It was perfectly legitimate and fair, always provided that the persons so appointed were of good character and capable to discharge their duties.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Finance says that my statement may be looked upon as a joke. He has the manager of the Intercolonial Railway beside him, and let him ask if I ever gave instructions that the appointments be made from those recommended by the member supporting the government in that section of the country. I never did.

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask my hon. friend what difference would it make whether he gave the instructions or simply winked at the thing, when it was done for eighteen years? Everybody knows that you could not appoint a man to the smallest petty office on the Intercolonial Railway in the constituency of Cape Breton unless you had the recommendation of Mr. Hector Macdougall the member for the county, and it was the same everywhere. It is utterly preposterous for my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) to pretend anything else. Whether or not he gave instructions is a minor question; the main question is whether the appointments were made from the ranks of the government supporters. We all know they were, and there is no cause for complaint if the men appointed were honest and capable.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister not see the distinction between giving instructions to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway to appoint none but party friends, and giving them no instructions of the kind? Such petty things as that never entered into the management of the Intercolonial Railway in my day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How many Liberals were appointed?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know that there was one. But I do say that there were no instructions to the officers that a man employed to dig a ditch or to make small repairs should be recommended by a supporter of the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. In September, 1878, the Conservative party came into power and before the first day of November about 400 employees of the Intercolonial Railway in the city of Moncton were turned out for no other reason than that they had voted for Sir Albert Smith. From that day down to 1896 not a single man or boy was employed on the Intercolonial Railway who was in any way allied to the Liberal party. I challenge contradiction of that statement.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Railways has flatly contradicted his own statement made in the House this afternoon. In replying to the leader of the opposition about the production of a certain document which he referred to, he said that under the Conservative government the employees of the Intercolonial Railway who where Conservatives were marked one way, and those who were Liberals were marked another way and that he had seen a document to prove it. In view of that statement he now challenges any one to show that there was a single Liberal employed on the Intercolonial Railway. If his statement this afternoon was true ; if he was not drawing on his imagination ; then his statement to-night is absolutely absurd. His statement this afternoon meant that there were a number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway who were supposed to be Liberals and that they were prevented from voting for the so called Reform party. Let him put one statement against the other and see where he finds himself.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a very easy matter. While they dismissed some 178 there were a few who escaped ; and more than that—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend, I am sure, will be satisfied with my statement.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, I am afraid not.

Mr. EMMERSON. During the long series of years of mis-rule, a good many who were Conservatives in 1878 and who were appointed as such, became so thoroughly disgusted with the party in power, that they changed their allegiance.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, then they became Liberals and now, perhaps, the Postmaster General, who has brought in the Welland canal in this matter, would tell us what the government has done since 1896 ; will he venture to say that this government has appointed any one to any position on the Welland canal since 1896 who was not then and has since remained a very violent partisan of the Reform party ? Does he want the House to think that the present government are not doing the very thing which he wrongfully accused the Conservative party of doing. I live right where the Welland canal is, and the Conservative party have been criticised there, the hon. gentleman who represented the district until 1891 as a supporter of the Conservative government, was found fault with, because Conservatives were not always appointed to positions on the Welland canal. I want to know where the government stand on this question and I say that they have not appointed any but those claiming to be violent partisans of the Reform party whether they were or not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As I understand it the party system prevails in Canada and it is the practice of the government of to-day to remember their supporters in distributing public patronage. That practice has obtained in days gone by and I hope it is in full force to-day. I should greatly deplore it if the Liberal party, in the exercise of its patronage on the Welland canal or elsewhere, is neglectful of its friends and its own supporters. In my opinion appointments to-day are largely political, and I therefore trust that the Liberal party is living up to that principle in administering patronage on the Welland canal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the Postmaster General know that of all the outside scrutineers and agents and the active partisans in the elections in Lincoln, several are lock and bridge tenders appointed by him since 1896 ; that that is what they are doing instead of resting between night shifts on election day, that they go without sleep to attend the committee meetings and other matters of violent partisanship in connection with elections and does he contemplate dismissing them for taking that active part in politics ? Is he going to mete out to them the same sort of treatment as he metes out, for instance, to the postmasters who are directly under his eye and whom he dismisses for attending political meetings or doing some act that he thinks is going further than simply voting ? Will he dismiss these appointments of his on the Welland canal if it is proved to him that they are acting as partisans in elections ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would be glad to answer the series of questions that constitute the hon. gentleman s speech, but I would have to deal with them in a group for his speech seems to be made up of a series of questions regarding alleged violent partisans on the Welland canal, and seemed to think active partisanship was proved by their, as he said, acting as deputy returning officers.

Mr. LANCASTER. I said scrutineers, bringing in the votes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A scrutineer is one thing and bringing in votes is another, and acting as deputy returning officer still another. The hon. gentleman jumbles up all these alleged characters of men in the same sentence and asks if we are going to inflict punishment upon people who may be guilty, one of one transaction and one of another.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not mention deputy returning officers at all. I said scrutineers and agents.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but I understood him to indicate that some of them had taken part in the very legitimate work provided by law. I would ask him whether it is fair for him to characterize the number of employees that this government has appointed to the Welland canal in that wholesale way as partisans. Many men who were appointed to the service will probably have in the past taken an active part in politics. There are others who have not taken so active a part. I do not think that their being appointed to office warrants the hon. gentleman in making such an assault upon the class as a whole who have been appointed on the Welland canal. I believe that the men employed on the Welland canal and appointed by this administration are doing their duty well by the country. They are men in humble walks of life, but they are giving value for the pay they receive and they are good loyal citizens of Canada and good public servants. I think the hon. gentleman might be more generous to those in the humble walks of life in which these men are, and not stand up in the House to-night when they are not present to defend themselves and make an assault upon them insinuating that they are conducting themselves in such a way that they should all be dismissed from the Welland canal. I shall not proceed to defend them. They will have an opportunity in the future of defending themselves from the hon. gentleman. It will be sufficient, I suppose, to call their attention to the hon. gentleman's observations and they will be able to pass judgment upon his views, understanding just how generous he would be to them if by any unfortunate circumstance the Tory party should at any time have it in their power to dismiss them from office. I understand the hon. gentleman has now given notice before the House that these men are all to be cleaned out without a moment's hesitation should the opportunity be afforded to him to exercise that political power. May it be the good fortune of Canada to ward off until a long distant date the said day which the hon. gentleman says is coming.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the minister thinks it necessary to say what he has said in order to set these Welland canal employees against me I may tell him that he is not making much headway, because—I was going to say his friend Captain Sullivan, but I shall not say that as it might not be correct—Captain John Sullivan goes into Lincoln and tells them what the Postmaster General wants them to do. They sometimes do it and sometimes do not. I do not say that every employee on the Welland canal is a violent partisan. If I should prove to him that some of them were, would he chop off their heads as he does the heads of postmasters in this country for a good deal less than I could prove against several of the employees of the Welland canal in whom he takes so much interest.

The Postmaster General has brought up the subject. He could not allow the estimates of the Minister of Railways to go through without bringing in the Welland canal on an item connected with the Intercolonial Railway which, by the way hon. gentlemen opposite have seemed anxious to prevent going through. I do not know what the real reason may be for the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know whether the administration of the Intercolonial by the new minister is quite satisfactory to them or not, but we do know that nine-tenths of this day has been wasted by hon. gentlemen, supposed to be supporting the government, in obstructing these estimates by speaking about everything under the sun except the item before the chair. In that line of conduct they apparently have the approval of the hon. Postmaster General, who, finding that the Guysborough election was a worn-out subject, brought the Welland canal into the discussion and criticised the administration of that canal by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) before 1896. The hon. gentleman tried to make out that I had used the term 'returning officer' instead of 'scrutineers'. Well, I think that I am generally sufficiently clear in any remarks I make to this House, and I am sure that not even the Postmaster General could have misunderstood what I really did say. I never used the term returning officer. I did not accuse all the Welland canal employees of being active partisans, but I said that several who have been appointed since 1896 have shown themselves very active at election time. I do not say that they were all appointed because of their activity in elections, but they seem to be under the impression that if they desire to retain their positions they must do partisan service in obtaining votes for the present government. Does the hon. the Postmaster General think that these employees will make better lockmasters or bridge masters because they take an active part in politics outside of working hours? Evidently some of them seem to be convinced that that is his opinion. In any event we do not find any of them exercising their activity in securing votes for the Conservative party. Later on, when we come

to the proper item, I shall point out that the Postmaster General has not shown himself as good a friend as I am of the employees on the Welland canal. I had to make an appeal last year to have their wages increased, but I am not aware that in that appeal I received any support from the hon. gentleman. As far as I am concerned, I care not whether a public employee be a political opponent of mine or not, he should receive the wages to which his work entitles him as long as he is kept in the service and whatever I can do to enable him to obtain justice, I shall always cheerfully do irrespective of his politics. We did succeed in having a statute passed which recognized the claims of these men, but they have not since got that increase of wages to which they are entitled, and I hope that the Postmaster General will help me this session in endeavouring to have their just claims granted.

Mr. SPROULE. It is somewhat refreshing to have the frank admission from the Postmaster General that positions under the government are to be filled only by political partisans. He has laid down the principle that the government is bound to look after its own friends and would show themselves ungrateful if they did not do so, and that consequently all positions under the Crown shall be filled on that principle.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not all, but speaking generally.

Mr. SPROULE. By speaking generally, no doubt the hon. gentleman intended to include all. Is he prepared to say that when the government are about to appoint a judge, an essential qualification must be that he is a political partisan ? That is practically what it amounts to. Well, let me tell the hon. gentleman that one of the best men Canada ever produced, the late Sir John Macdonald, declared over and over again that he would select good men for the bench irrespective of political party, and he gave evidence of his sincerity in many appointments. Is the bench going to be prostituted by the carrying out of the opposite principle ? If it is, all I can say is that it is not to the credit of the Postmaster General or the government to which he belongs.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend's statement of the abstract determination of Sir John Macdonald in the matter of the appointment of judges may be perfectly correct ; but speaking within my limited sphere of observation, I can tell him that in the province of Nova Scotia the Conservatives never appointed a judge who was not of their party, and I can say the same with regard to all the maritime provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I can give the hon. gentleman instances which he must know himself.

An hon. MEMBER. Sit down.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the insolence to say ' shut up and sit down ? ' If he were outside, I would slap his mouth. I am within my rights and intend to exercise them. I want to draw the attention of the hon. minister to the appointment of Mr. Blake. Was he a Conservative or Reformer ?

Mr. FIELDING. I spoke only of the maritime provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood him to say that he believed the same principle was acted on in all the provinces.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that I only spoke within the sphere of my own observation in the maritime provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I have given the hon. gentleman one instance and could give him several others. Mr. Justice Maclennan was another, and I believe that Chancellor Boyd was another, but do not remember. I could mention several others if I had a moment to think of the names. That principle was carried out throughout the whole life of the late Sir John Macdonald, and it was never objected to by the Conservative party.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it can be said that whereas the late government occasionally appointed a Liberal to the bench, their prevailing practice was to select their own friends for such appointments. As regards the present administration, I might remind my hon. friend that we have appointed a member of his own party to one of the highest positions in this country. I refer to the appointment of Mr. Justice Nesbitt to the Supreme Court. When we took office there were very few judges belonging to the Liberal party. During the eighteen years the Liberal party was in opposition, all the appointments to the Superior Court bench were made, with a few exceptions, from the Conservatives ranks, and when this party came into power there were very few Liberals on that bench in Ontario. As regards the county courts, I should be very much surprised if it could be shown that one out of twenty of the numerous appointments to the county court bench during the eighteen years the Conservative party were in power, was a Liberal. I believe that the hon. gentleman could scarcely name a single Liberal appointed to the county court bench among the many appointed from 1878 to 1896. It has always been customary for the Conservative party to claim that they were equally generous regarding appointments to the Senate. They have always tried to prove that claim by pointing to the appointment to the Senate from the Liberal ranks of the Hon. John. Macdonald. Well, the Conservative party was in a majority in the Senate in 1878 when they took office, and when we came into office in 1896, the Con-

servative party had so entirely abandoned the idea of making appointments to the Senate from both sides that the number of Liberals in that body was nine as against seventy-two Conservatives, and we would not have had a man in the Senate even to be elected to the position of Speaker, had the Conservatives remained in office much longer.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to qualify an observation I made with regard to the bench. I had in mind the Supreme Court bench. I have been reminded that in that case of one county court judge in the maritime provinces, he had been chosen by the Liberal government, and I wish to qualify my statement to that extent.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Whatever may be the sins of either party in the appointment of their party friends to office, I think it is a disgraceful, degrading doctrine that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) has laid down in this House to-night. The standard of our politics and our public life must be getting pretty low when a government can placard one of the great public utilities of this country with the words 'No Conservative need apply.' Simply because a man differs from the party administering the affairs of this country, he cannot get work on one of the great national services of the country of which he is joint owner. Talk about prostituting the electorate and offering bribes to the voters. I think that of all the bribes that have been shown up this afternoon in connection with the Guysborough election and all the other elections in Canada fade into insignificance when compared with the enunciation of such a doctrine as that put forward by the Minister of Railways this afternoon. And I think that the fair-minded people of this country will not take kindly to the doctrine put forward by the Minister of Railways and endorsed by the Finance Minister and the Postmaster General. I can only stigmatize it as a rotten degrading condition of affairs when such a doctrine can be put forward on the floor of this House.

Mr. LOGAN. I am sorry my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) is shocked to such a degree that he can only express his feelings by stigmatizing the condition of our public affairs as rotten and degrading. You would scarcely imagine, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman's godfather, Sir Charles Tupper, in 1882 laid down such a principle as he did as governing the Intercolonial Railway and its officials. There was an election in 1882, and during that time a boy named Ryan, seventeen years of age, working in a minor position in the offices in Moncton was dismissed. On the 17th of November, 1882, his father, desirous of knowing for what reason he had been dismissed wrote to Sir Charles Tupper then Minister of Railways asking the question. He received no answer up to the following February when he wrote again. Not until April did he receive a reply from the then Minister of Railways. I will read a part of that reply of Sir Charles Tupper, and will commend it to the attention of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) who is so shocked at what he calls the present rotten and degrading condition of affairs :

> The reason for his dismissal was that he took a very active part in opposition to the government at the last election.

This was a seventeen year old boy.

> This, as you will readily understand, no government officer can be permitted to do, and your son's action was so conspicuous that it could not be passed over.

What does the hon. member (Mr. Lefurgey) think of this for a degrading condition of affairs ? This boy could not even vote, yet he was dismissed because he took part in an election in opposition to the government of the day. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has referred to the statement of the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) as a joke. It is a comedy, a farce, a comedy of farces, to hear the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals state that, prior to 1896, men were appointed on the Intercolonial irrespective of their politics. Why, Mr. Chairman, you might as well try to find an angel in the lower regions, as to try to find a Grit appointed on the Intercolonial by the Tory government prior to 1896. The hon. gentleman knows it—must know it. He says he did not write instructions to his officials to employ only Conservatives. Certainly not. His predecessor, the man whose shoes he was standing in, had written the letter which I have quoted laying down the conditions with reference to the employment and dismissal of officials. The former Minister of Railways and Canals might as well have written to his officials instructing them to answer letters he wrote them as to tell them to employ only political friends of the government. It was a well understood principle. And while the discussion here this afternoon and this evening, may be entertaining to members of this House and to people in this part of the country, it will seem ridiculous to people living along the Intercolonial Railway for any man to say that men had been appointed to positions on the Intercolonial Railway irrespective of their politics and irrespective to whether they gave fealty to the government in power. Such a thing must seem ridiculous to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) himself.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) talks about comedy but it seems to me if he will look into a

large sized mirror he will see a comedy. He is undertaking to defend the Minister of Railways and Canals who refuses to take action against officers of his department who have taken an active part in politics, and to support and improve his case he quotes a letter from Sir Charles Tupper who did the very thing we are arguing the Minister of Railways and Canals ought to do. That letter of Sir Charles Tupper enunciates the principle that a public officer—and his age does not matter ; it is not a question of voting, because the man referred to was not old enough to vote—must not play the part of an active partisan in elections. The hon. gentleman seems to think that by quoting Sir Charles Tupper's action in dismissing a man for active partisanship he is justifying the minister who refuses to do this very thing in any of eight or ten cases that have been laid before him, and he talks about comedies.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not care to discuss with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) the question of looking into mirrors. But I may be permitted to tell him that he has entirely misunderstood the quotation I have made from Sir Charles Tupper's letter. In that letter it is stated that the young man is dismissed because he took an active part in an election against the government of the day.

Mr. LANCASTER. The young man actively interferred in an election. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) mean to say that the Minister of Railways should commend a man for taking an active part in support of the government and condemn him for taking an active part against them ? I will take back what I said to the hon. gentleman about seeing a comedy if he will look into a mirror ; it is not good enough acting for a comedy ; it is a farce, a poor farce that he will see. He seems to think that it is justifiable to dismiss a man who even votes against the government, but not justifiable to dismiss a man who takes an active part in favour of the government—in fact his doctrine is that it depends altogether on whose ox is gored.

Mr. LOGAN. I have quoted to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) the doctrine of his former leader. It is the doctrine of the Conservative party that we are discussing to-day, and not the doctrine of a humble member of the Liberal party.

Mr. LANCASTER. It turned out that this young man had taken an active part against the government.

Mr. LOGAN. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) know ? There was no investigation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) will not object to my accepting the very statement that he makes and wanted me to undestand. Does he mean that I am to understand something different from what he has stated simply because I am on one side of the Speaker and he on the the other ? He wished me to understand that Sir Charles Tupper dismissed this man because he took an active part against the government. But against whom is merely incidental. Surely, the hon. gentleman understands that the dismissal was because the young man was an active partisan. That is the doctrine. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a man should be dismissed if he takes an active part against the government, but should not be dismissed if he takes an equally active part in favour of the government ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) seems to have a very short memory. I would advise him to go back as far as the election of 1891. I do not know who was the Minister of Railways at that time. But I have this statement of fact to make, that after the election of 1891 several employees on the Prince Edward Island Railway who did not take an active part in favour of the government, were dismissed—not for being neutral in that election but because they had not taken an active part. The employees of the Prince Edward Island Railway were looked upon as supporters of the government as a matter of course. They were terrorized and expected to take an active part in favour of the government. I think it was the late Senator Howlan who ran the election in Prince county at that time and was defeated. He had resigned his position of senator and had gone down there to run the election, and having been defeated, he came back and was reappointed senator. At that time some employees on the Prince Edward Island Railway were dismissed because they had been neutral in the election. Now I would commend that chapter in political history to my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) whose memory is so short and who pretends to be so shocked to-day.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy to-day ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. It has been explained to-night, it is certainly not so partisan as that of the old government.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman states something which he alleges to have occurred in 1891. It is curious that at that time none of these things were known to any one in the House. One of the charges made at that time was against the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper. What was the charge ? Not that he had dismissed any officials because they did not take an active part in suporting the government, no such charge or insinuation was made at the time. But now, 13 years afterwards, that charge is

made by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes). The reason given at that time for the dismissal of one of the officers was that he took a very active part in opposition to the government. There was not a single member in the House, whether Conservative or Liberal, who did not agree that the party deserved dismissal on all the facts that were disclosed. The only question upon which a debate arose was this : How do you know that he took an active part in opposition to the government of the day ? Was there an inquiry ? Was there any evidence offered ? Sir Charles Tupper stated in the House at that time that if he was mistaken, if the information he had received was incorrect, he would restore the man to his position. He acted on information which he thought was correct. But according to hon. gentlemen opposite he did not need to act upon it, according to them it is sufficient that a member of parliament should get up and state that a man has been an active partisan, and then without an inquiry at all that man is dismissed. All that a member of parliament need do is to state to the minister in whose department the man is employed that such employee has been an active partisan, and his statement is enough. The Conservative government at that time backed up Sir Charles Tupper. Every member of the House thought it right that no employee of the government should take an active part in opposition to the government, and if he does, he takes his political life in his hands and is liable to dismissal. The only charge made against Sir Charles Tupper was that he took his information perhaps from a member of the House supporting him and his government, and acted upon it. Sir Charles Tupper said the information he had received he thought was correct. The hon. member for Cumberland says that Sir Charles Tupper promised an inquiry into the case to see whether he had been an active partisan in the election. But what has that to do with the question? What answer is that to the charges made by us at this moment ? What we are considering is the bold statement made by the Minister of Railways that the patronage on the Intercolonial is to be exercised in a political manner, and instructions are to be given to the officers who have charge of the railroad down there that they must make their appointments from political supporters of the government. The only defence that the government can make is that the government that preceded them dismissed a person for alleged partisan conduct in an election. No more absurd argument was ever used in the House. The fact that Sir Charles Tupper in 1891 dismissed a person who was alleged to be an active partisan, is a justification for the present Minister of Railways giving instructions to his employees on the Intercolonial to choose none but political supporters. He may choose political supporters of the government, but let him not make the bold, open announcement to the country that no poor man who is anxious to work upon the railway for $1, or $1.10 or $1.20 a day need apply if he happens to be a supporter of the Conservative opposition. You may follow that policy, but do not boldly avow it to the people of this country as the minister has done on the present occasion.

Mr. INGRAM. I think it is pretty well understood now what the position of the political parties is on the question of patronage and on the question of public servants taking part in elections. The Conservative party, when in power, did not allow government employees to take an offensive part in elections. In 1897 we had the platform laid down by the leaders of the present government to the effect that every employee has a perfect right to vote as he pleases, but if he takes an offensive part in an election he is liable to be dismissed—after an investigation perhaps in some cases. It is well understood among the public servants of Canada that if they take an offensive stand in elections, should the government change hands, the same justice that was meted out to our friends in 1897 and 1898 will be meted out to them. Therefore, it is well understood, and they know what their position is exactly. But I want to draw the attention of the committee to this further fact. That is all very well as far as the two political parties are concerned; the Conservative party and the Liberal party, but there is a class of people in this country who are not very strong party men, who care very little about politics, but the question they are concerned in is that if the political parties abuse the power they have by employing a large number of unnecessary men, they are compelled to put their hands in their pockets and pay taxes in order to meet this unnecessary expense. Under these circumstances, they have a right to complain. I hold that in connection with one of the greatest public works that we have in the Dominion of Canada, namely, 1,500 or 1,600 miles of government railway, it should be no part of any political party's duty to select the men because they are either Grits or Tories who are to be employed on that railway. We have on the floor of this House the manager of the government railway, and if that gentleman were a member of this House at this moment and were permitted to get up and say whether or not he has been interfered with as general manager of that railway by partisans who are pressing upon him and his officers the employment of unnecessary help, I go so far as to say that he would confirm my statement in that regard. Two years ago, when Mr. Blair was Minister of Railways, I asked him the question if his officers were not interfered with by partisans anxious to have men em-

ployed upon the road who were not necessary at all. Mr. Blair's action on that occasion completely bore out the statement I made then, and showed that it was a perfectly true statement. It is all very well for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to sit and smile in his place. It is a matter of very little importance to him. He draws his salary for the least possible service imaginable, and he can sit there and smile with content, thinking he is carrying out his duties faithfully and well when he says that he is going to take recommendations from his political friends, that they are to have all the employment that is to be had on that railway, and that his officers are to select those who are specially qualified to fill the positions. He goes so far as to say that there will not be any man employed on the railway who is not required. I will leave it to the common sense of any man in Canada, I care not whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, to say whether, so long as you have partisan recommendations in connection with a large public work of that character, the general manager can act in accordance with his own idea as to the character of help that is necessary on the railway. In consequence of that condition, the people are taxed to the extent that they are, and we have a showing this year of a deficit of no less than $500,000 and odd, largely brought about by bad management. I am not going to accuse the general manager of being a bad manager, but I am going to accuse the system of being the reason why that manager cannot make the road meet its running expenses. Just as soon as this partisan administration of the government railway is abandoned, just so soon will the people have the pleasure of knowing that they have no deficits in the management of the government railway. We are going to have this question fully discussed during the coming election. We are going to discuss the Transcontinental Railway, which involves the question of government ownership, and which is an issue between the opposition and the government policy, and in that case what will be the argument of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House? There will be a change in their argument from that which they presented in former years. Mr. Blair has taken credit to himself for the administration of the government railway. He has been backed up by gentlemen representing the maritime provinces as being the best administrator of the government railway that this country has had for many years; in fact, the best we ever had. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite are going to change their tune; they are going to point to the government owned railway as being a failure, and in consequence of that failure they are going to say to the people: You are foolish to support the opposition policy of government ownership, because you see the results of government control and operation of railways in this country. But they will neglect and forget to say that the reason why the revenue from the government railway is not meeting the expenses is the partisan interference that is permitted in the management of the road. I am glad to know that there are many people outside of this House who believe in government ownership, and I will tell the government that so long as the people put up with partisan management of government railways, just so long will they have that interference. I would like to ask the manager of the road whether it makes any difference to him whether a man is a Conservative or a Liberal. Not one iota. If he wants to succeed in the management of the road, what has he to consider? If he wants a first-class engineer, he wants to get a man who is competent, and he does not care whether he is a Grit or Tory. If he wants a first-class conductor, or brakeman, or superintendent, or trackman, he does not care what his politics are, he wants a qualified man, and if he is allowed to get him he will be in a position to show something on the right side of the account at the end of the year. To-day and for years past this present system is and has been going on, and that is the reason why the management is not able to put forth a good showing. While hon. gentlemen opposite talk about their recommendations, what do they know about the qualifications of a first-class railway man? They do not know the first thing about it. But yet they will recommend and insist upon this man being employed, although they know nothing about his qualifications, if he is a political friend I think that when the general election takes place, and when the hon. leader of the opposition comes back to power——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. Now you are joking.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, I will tell you how I am joking. In 1897 and 1898 we heard these hon. gentlemen pounding their desks and saying: We are going to be here for the next twenty years.

An hon. MEMBER. So we are.

Mr. INGRAM. We do not hear that any more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. INGRAM. They play the old game that the Conservative party played previously to 1896. In the midst of their strength they were in their weakness, and when they had a hopeless case they came into the House and pounded their desks. But the Conservative party went out and the Liberal party came in, and I can see the handwriting on the wall. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will never pretend to assist his party in any way. No one will

pretend to say that he will ever be of any particular service to them—a man who came in to administer the Department of Railways and Canals, and who was afraid to open his mouth when the great transcontinental railway question was brought up in this House. But finally he did open his mouth. He got orders to do it; he was bound to do it, and after he did it, I do not think his friends took very much credit to themselves because of his effort.

Mr. SPROULE. He put his foot in it.

Mr. INGRAM. He always does put his foot in it. But circumstances have changed. Where are those provincial leaders of the government? Where are all those strong men who came in with the government in 1896? They have all gone, and they have taken in Henry the Silent, who dare not open his mouth on an important question. The same thing has occurred all along the line. The people recognize that, and when they get an opportunity of declaring themselves at the next election, we will find that the majority of the votes cast in this country will be for a good Conservative government and a good Conservative party, a party which are not afraid to stand by their principles. No matter whether their principles are appreciated or not, wherever they are they will stand up and say: These are our principles. The Conservatives had a leader who was protectionist from start to finish, and he proclaimed it everywhere. The Liberals have a leader who has been in favour of commercial union, free trade as they have it in England, a revenue tariff, and in Montreal the other day he proclaimed that he was neither a protectionist nor a free trader. Now the Liberals are playing the fiddle to both free traders and protectionists. Will some of these gentlemen over there tell us what their principles are on any question?

Mr. COCHRANE. To keep in power.

Mr. INGRAM. That seems to be their only object. They are not free traders, they are not protectionists, and they are not economists it is sure, because they spend $70,000,000 a year and faster and faster goes the money in their hands. At last we have a government railway that is going to be a political machine. This afternoon these gentlemen scouted the idea that government railways were being administered on partisan lines, but to-night they have proclaimed that they are running the Intercolonial Railway as a huge party machine. At every station on the Intercolonial Railway there will in future be a big placard inscribed: no Tories need apply. This afternoon at three o'clock they were running the Intercolonial free of party lines, and whatever occurred in the meantime, the minister comes in at eight o'clock and tells us that none but Liberals are to be employed on the Intercolonial Railway. I suppose he got his orders in the meantime, and being a docile gentleman he had to obey.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) told us that we were discussing the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party.

Mr. TUCKER. Louder.

Mr. BLAIN. What is that voice from behind the Speaker's chair? It is the first thing the hon. gentleman has said since he came to parliament. Perhaps he would be good enough to sit down until we get through. Lest the hon. gentleman from Cumberland should forget the policy of the Liberal party I will read from 'Hansard' of 1897, a few dismissals that have been made.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Give us the page?

Mr. BLAIN. Give my hon. friend a cigarette; some one has said he has softening of the brain now and perhaps he will get it a little more. It is page 2564.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Is there anything about tea-pots in it?

Mr. BLAIN. I am very sorry that I cannot supply him with tea in the chamber but let him wait until the House adjourns. At page 2564 of the 'Hansard' of 1897 I find the following:

Mr. QUINN asked:

1. Is it true that Michael Enright, an employee at Montreal on Lachine canal, was dismissed on 3rd April last without notice?

2. Was he so dismissed by order of the Minister of Railways and Canals?

3. On whose recommendation was he so dismissed?

4. Why was he so dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The services of Michael Enright, employed at Montreal on the Lachine canal, were dispensed with. 2. Yes. 3. At the request and upon the representation of the members of parliament for Montreal district. 4. No written complaint was lodged in the department.

Mr. GANONG asked:

1. Is it true that Michael Behan, storeman on Lachine canal, at Montreal, was dismissed on 30th April without any previous notice?

2. Was he so dismissed by order of the Minister of Railways and Canals?

3. On whose recommendation was he so dismissed?

4. Why was he so dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1. The services of Michael Behan, storeman on the Lachine canal, were dispensed with on the 30th of April last. 2. Yes. 3. At the request and upon the representation of members of parliament for Montreal districts. 4. No written complaint was lodged in the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

(a.) Have the following, or any of them, and which of them, if any, been dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway?

1. Alexander Stewart, section foreman at Linwood, Antigonish ?
2. John Chisholm, section foreman, Heatherton, Antigonish ?
3. Finlay Chisholm, section foreman, James River, Antigonish ?

(b.) If dismissed, was any investigation made prior to dismissal, and what was its nature ?

(c.) How long were these men in the service of the government and what was the record of each for efficiency and conduct ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The services of Alexander Stewart were dispensed with on the 7th of January last. (b.) No investiagtion was considered necessary, as it was explicitely and positively affirmed by Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that Mr. Stewart had infringed the rule laid down in respect to government employees. (c.) He had been in the service since September, 1880. Nothing recorded against him. 2. The services of John Chisholm, section foreman at Heatherton, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 12th of November last on the personal statement and representation of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that Chisholm had been guilty of active and offensive partisanship in the last general elections. There was no investigation. He had been in the service since August, 1884. Nothing recorded against him. 3. The services of Finlay Chisholm, section foreman at James River, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 18th of November last, on the statement and representation of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that he had been guilty of active and of offensive partisanship in the last general elections. There was no investigation. He had been in the service since June, 1879.

One of these men had been in the government since 1880 and no charge or complaint had ever been laid against him, yet he was dismissed on the suggestion of Mr. McIsaac stating that he had taken an active part in politics. These men were dismissed for active political partisanship without any investigation or any charge being laid against them. On this one page of 'Hansard' we find twelve men dismissed by the Liberal government on the recommendation of the Liberal members of parliament. And yet the member for Cumberland and his friends glory in that. We were not much surprised that such a policy should be upheld by some gentlemen on the other side. but when prominent men like the Minister of Finance, and the Postmaster General and the Minister of Railways join in it, it is a thing to be deplored. All these gentlemen stand up to say to the world ; the policy of the Reform government is that when a man wants an office the salary attached to which is paid out of the public treasury, one important qualification the man requires is that he is a supporter of the Reform party.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman attribute these remarks to me ? Does he seriously tell the House that I said that the first and only qualification is, that a man should belong to the Reform party ?

Mr. BLAIN. I did not say that these were the hon. gentleman's words.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman say that these were the ideas I expressed or anything like them ? The hon. gentleman, if he heard me, must have known that I said distinctly that the first qualification must be character and capacity, and if character and capacity were given, then preference should be given to members of the Reform party.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Finance will not say that there has been a case in the history of his government where two men equal in qualification made application for an office or where the Liberal-Conservative had better qualifications than the other applicant in which he selected the Conservative.

Mr. FIELDING. I say that I know of no case in which a man has been appointed to office who was not qualified and capable for the work. If there was a case in which a man was appointed who was not qualified and capable that would be a subject for discussion, but I say, given the qualifications of character and capacity for the work, the practice has been ever since Canada had a history as a Dominion to give a preference to the friends of the government of the day, and that practice, I hope, will be continued.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is enunciating the policy of his party.

Mr. GALLIHER. And I would not think much of him if he did not ; you bet I would not.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) says that he would not think much of the minister if he would not.

Mr. GALLIHER. And I repeat it.

Mr. BLAIN. And I repeat it. I am quite sure the House understands my hon. friend very well. That is a policy that seems to receive the approval and support of all the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. GALLIHER. They would not be supporters if they did not.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose that will apply to judges ?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend wants an answer to that I will give him one. I see no reason why a man who is a Liberal should be disqualified from sitting on the bench. If the hon. gentleman can show a case where a Liberal was appointed who did not possess the qualification of character and capacity for the position that would be a proper subject for discussion, but I do not see, because a man is a Liberal, that he should be disqualified from a seat on the bench.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not go so far as to say that no Liberal is entitled to an office in the

gift of this government. What I say is that when the Liberal-Conservatives were in power a charge was made against them that they were appointing political partisans to different offices in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite when in opposition condemned that policy ; they pointed out that it was demoralizing the Intercolonial Railway, and said that because my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)—they made the charge against him, I do not say whether it was well founded or not—adopted the policy of appointing friends to public offices, the Intercolonial Railway went down in the estimation of the people of Canada and was not well conducted. That is the charge that these gentlemen then made and the people of Canada would expect that when the Reform party came into office a different policy would be initiated by that party, who were trying to teach the Conservative party a better system of government. Yet to-day we find the Minister of Finance, one of their leaders, saying that the policy of this government is that their friends must be appointed to office and must receive the spoils of office.

An hon. MEMBER. That is right.

Mr. BLAIN. We are not condemning so much the principle that their friends should be looked after, but we are pointing out the hypocrisy of this government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is laughing ; I suppose he is only waiting until the House dissolves to see whether he will get some reward for his services.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not looking for anything, I am very humble.

Mr. BLAIN. I am glad there is one man on the other side not looking for office. He is an exception, of course, and we shall keep our eye on him for the next few years. I would ask the Minister of Railways if the policy of the government in respect of dismissals on the Intercolonial Railway is the policy that has been pursued by his predecessors, that when the member representing a county makes a charge against an official on the Intercolonial Railway, then without any investigation whatever, simply upon the word and statement of the gentleman representing the county the hon. minister will dismiss the official whether he is a Reformer or a Conservative.

Mr. EMMERSON. No cases have arisen since I have been in office.

Mr. BLAIN. We want to know the policy.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will wait, I said that no such cases have arisen since I took office. I shall consider what I should do when the matter is brought to my attention.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that as far as my hon. friend would go ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is as far as I would wish to go.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the management of this railway is injured by an official taking an active part against this government surely it is wrong to have an official taking an active part in favour of this government. He is then not only taking an active part in politics, but he is increasing the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, making it cost the people of this country more than it would cost if its management was in the hands of a more competent set of men who would doubtless make it pay a profit. Surely we are entitled to know if the minister will apply the same rule to those who take an active part in favour of his own party as he will apply to those who take an active part against him. We are entitled to know that so that no person will waste time in proving these charges until we know whether we have a loaded jury or not and whether the same rules are to be applied on both sides.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already answered the question which the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked me. I said the matter has not been determined by me and that as cases arise I shall deal with them fairly and do no injustice. While I am on my feet I want to say to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that I think he failed to understand fully what I said with respect to the recommendation. I said that a condition precedent in all cases of recommendations would be the question of qualification and fitness. I think that my hon. friend misquoted me when he said it was simply a question of politics.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GANONG. The hon. Minister of Railways has made so many contradictory statements that it is difficult to know really what he intended saying. Up to six o'clock he was posing as the very personification of justice, although he did go to sleep during that elaborate dissertation of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), which went so far afield of the item we are trying to carry.

Mr. EMMERSON. Surely my hon. friend does not mean to say that I went to sleep.

Mr. COCHRANE. You looked very much like it.

Mr. GANONG. Well, the hon. gentleman may have been posing as the personification of justice who is popularly supposed to be blind, but his eyes were so steadily closed and his features wore so placid an expression that I really thought he had gone to sleep.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure the hon. gentleman has no desire to mislead the House, and I think he should withdraw the statement.

Mr. GANONG. Of course, if he says he was not asleep, I must accept his word, and besides when he makes a request in a manner so childlike and bland it is difficult to refuse. There are just two things that occur to me in connection with this discussion. Either the Minister of Railways has given to us one of the greatest examples of conversion of a political sinner in history since the time of St. Paul or one of the most striking examples of colossal gall ever exhibted in this House. But there are some little matters which occurred to my mind when the hon. gentleman was telling us in his pleasant way of the belief which actuates him regarding the right to vote. Perhaps hon. members do not know the hon. minister as well as we know him in New Brunswick. He has a record, and what I am about to state, he will not dispute, or if he should, it is very easy to verify any statements I may make. He was at one time the leader of the government in New Brunswick and he was also at another time a member of the government in that province, though not its leader. We then had elections held under the New Brunswick election law ; and in that little pocket borough which he almost owned, as well as the one he represented in New Brunswick, the county of Westmoreland, the government of which he was a member had its employees put in carts and carted to the polls where they were called on to deposit special ballot papers which had been given them. Not only that, but they brought such influence to bear on the proprietors of the cotton mill in that county, that they forced the overseer to use his influence——

Mr. EMMERSON. Does the hon. gentleman say that I took voters in a cart to the polls ?

Mr. GANONG. I say that he was a member of the government that ordered this thing to be done.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does he say that the government did it ? I would like to understand his statement.

Mr. GANONG. I say that during the local elections these things were carried on by the government of which he was a member. The voters who were working for the cotton mills were taken in a van and driven to the polls in charge of partisans of the government who saw that they voted properly. They were provided with ballots and taken into the polls where they cast those ballots and were then carried back to their work. They were not allowed to go to the polls of their own accord and cast their ballots without being under any supervision. He also succeeded in educating another member of the government to go to the polls in Victoria Ward of St. John City and watch every labouring man who went to vote. Every railway or government employee down there had a special ballot paper put into his hand, and this member of the government stood at the polls to see that he deposited this special paper, and the voter knew that if he did not his head would be cut off. The hon. minister has since received his reward from the people of St. John, who the other day elected our hon. friend, Mr. Daniel, against the nominee of the government. I think therefore that we are warranted in receiving with suspicion the professions of the hon. minister and his sudden conversion. I took down the words of the hon. gentleman this afternoon. He said : 'Railway employees have the right to their feelings so long as they do not give effect to those feelings.' That means that they can feel politically as they like but they must vote Grit. That is the doctrine he puts forward to-day. It makes no difference how you feel, you must vote Grit or you will lose your job. It would be very interesting if we could have a picture of the hon. gentleman slaying recalcitrant civil servants before he was converted and then a picture of him a little later, when he became so honest and good that he would not care to slay any civil servant unless he were a Tory. I think, without being offensive at all, that we may say of this new convert, this Saint Henry of the House, that for ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, our newly fledged saint is indeed very peculiar. The hon. minister has also told us that the Intercolonial is not overmanned. I should like to have that statement confirmed by some of his officials. Why, down in the town of Moncton, the employees are tumbling over each other. This government boasts of surpluses aggregating $55,000,000 during the past few years, with one miserable small million of a reduction in the public debt. Well, it is easy to tell where the surpluses have gone.

They have robbed the people of $55,000,000. They have not accomplished any great work in Canada, but they have peddled out yearly $500,000 at least to useless officials—Grit officials according to the statement of the minister. That is the way a large portion of the money of which they have robbed the people has gone. The minister said something with regard to the dismissals in St. John, and I wish to ask him one question in that connection. You would suppose, from the way he spoke that he had pleaded for the lives of these poor men. He states that gentlemen of his own political party had written him letters to try and get him to reinstate them. Will he lay these letters on the table ? It would be most edifying to the people of Canada, and especially to the people of St. John, to have these letters which were written to the minister to

reinstate these gentlemen made public. I hope that before the session is through the minister will give us that information. We had two gentlemen decapitated without reason, except that they did not appear to be quite as active in the interest of Mr. McEwen as they might have been. It is a remarkable coincidence that they lost their jobs just after the election. And I am sure anything that the minister can do to allay the feeling in the city of St. John would help him when he next goes to find a candidate there—and he had difficulty in finding one in the last election—and it might help in that direction if these letters were laid on the table. I am sure we will use them to the best advantage to try to clear the minister's skirts, if possible, of the charge which seems to be positively made that interference from the minister's office resulted in the dismissal of these gentlemen from their positions on the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The very dignified way in which I have been addressed, being called by my Christian name with the prefix of "Saint' naturally calls for a return of the courtesy extended by my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong). The hon. gentleman has been kind enough to refer to my record in connection with the government in the province of New Brunswick and speaks incidentally of the election of 1899. I have some recollection of an election held in that province in that year. I appealed as premier of the province, and, out of forty-six members to be elected, the people were good enough to send forty-one to support me. I know that my hon. friend remembers keenly, very keenly indeed, that election of 1899. In the summer of 1898, he paid a visit to the city of Moncton, and there, with a boastfulness which, perhaps, did not do him very great credit, and which was very unfortunate for himself, stated that he was going back to the county of Charlotte, there, by his efforts, to elect four Conservatives to oppose the government led by me. He went back to the county of Charlotte and tried his utmost to carry out his promise. I am not going to refer to the means used in that election. But my hon. friend had the misfortune to find four good men and true, Liberals, elected in spite of his strongest efforts. He has referred to the campaign in Westmoreland in that election. I did not happen to be a candidate in the county of Westmorelad, but ran in the adjoining county of Albert. He speaks of the cotton mill in the county of Westmoreland. He must know that the cotton mill is controlled and operated by Conservatives. The hon. gentleman has not got his facts quite correct. These men who were carted up from the cotton mill to vote were carted there by the opposition machine to vote against the government. My hon. friend lives far away from the county of Westmoreland; he lives in a remote part of the province; and so he seems not to be familiar with the conditions prevailing in the county of Westmoreland. Despite the tactics of their opponents the Liberals carried three in the county of Westmoreland. It is true that in the whole province the friends of the hon. gentleman elected four men on that occasion, but they were men who were elected by accident. Now, I made the statement this afternoon that I cared not what the political animus or feelings of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway were, if they did not show their feeling or give effect to that animus in a partisan way. I would not complain. And I made the statement very distinctly—and I adhere to it and will repeat it elsewhere—that, as long as I have the honour to preside over the Intercolonial Railway, I will say to the employees that they shall have every liberty to vote as they please but that they must not show themselves to be partisans.

Mr. INGRAM. They are all Liberals.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) were to make that statement in Moncton, or anywhere in New Brunswick, or even in Quebec, say at Rivière du Loup, the people would laugh at him. He would blush for having made such a statement——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I think he is quite capable of blushing. But I think we understand fully the policies that have been laid down. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as enunciated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) when boiled down is simply this—the policy of the Conservative party when in power is to employ only Conservatives, but do not, for the world declare it; carry out the policy, but do it as hypocrites, and do not let the country know it. I made a statement as to the policy that I individually would pursue. I said that each political party is in favour of distributing its patronage among its friends. That was the policy of the Conservative party when in power, and I hope it will be the policy of the Liberal party now that it is in power. But I have this limitation to this policy—that capacity, qualification and fitness must be the first consideration. And, as an individual member of the Liberal party, and as connected with the government of the country, that is the policy which shall govern me.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I think it is about time that this committee got back to the question before the chair. We started at three o'clock not to discuss the question before the committee but to discuss party politics. And I think we have had to-day a fair illustration of the curse of party poli-

tics. We washed all the dirty linen of the county of Guysborough this afternoon and now we are engaged in washing the dirty linen of the Intercolonial Railway for the past seven years. I think it is about time that we passed those estimates if we have discussed them enough, but let us not discuss everything else but the estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now, that we have got rid of the bile.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. They are trying to get rid of you, and unless you behave yourself I hope they will. I hope that you will announce to the people on the Intercolonial, not from the pulpit, but put up a placard in every office and public building belonging to that road, that every man who works for the government, if he discharges his duty faithfully, need have nothing to fear, but if he does not, if he becomes an active politician, he will be discharged. Don't meddle with him merely because he votes Grit or Tory, let him have an opportunity in every election of voting for whom he pleases. If you will put up that in your offices, then the name of Henry Emmerson will be honoured. That is what we want you to do to-day. We want you to set an example of what you prayed for and squealed for so loudly when you were in opposition. Take your own medicine, and give to people their rights instead of telling them that if they don't vote so and so they will be discharged. Why, Sir, I am surprised at the condition of things down there. I am not surprised at Nova Scotia and New Brunswick losing so many of their inhabitants, at those provinces not being so thickly populated as they were ; I would not stay in a province where they acted like that, where, if a man does not vote as he is expected to vote, his head is chopped off. Just listen to those people talking about heads falling into the basket ! What will people say of us fifty years from now ? They will say that the people of our day were savages, that they used to cut the heads off the railway employees if they voted wrong. Let us treat men as they should be treated. I don't want to make a long speech. I want to cut it short. If these estimates are correct, let us pass them and not inquire about what this man's politics is or what that man's politics is, what this party did ten years ago and what the other party did ten years ago. Does that help the country? Are the people interested in that ? Indeed they are not. What they want is good government, and they expect it from hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not a partisan, but I want to say this, that the country is disgusted with partisanship, and when you give the people another chance to vote they will sit down on the whole gang of you—on both sides.

Mr. GANONG. The Minister of Railways has referred particularly to me, so I propose to refute him. I never made any such statement at Moncton as the hon. gentleman attributes to me. The first I ever heard of it in my constituency was from the hon. gentleman himself and Mr. Tweedie, in the town of Milltown. But although the statement was frequently refuted, the hon. gentleman carried it through their campaign, and perhaps it helped them. But there is one thing so far as the county of Charlotte is concerned that I want to say. It was not the mellifious tones of the minister that convinced the people of that county, it was chiefly a question of sympathy. The late premier had come from our county, and was a good Conservative, and the sympathy racket was played for all it was worth in the county in order to draw Conservative votes, and possibly that gained the election. But during the last week they got frightened, and then it was cash in uncut two dollar Dominion notes. The hon. gentleman can tell how much that election in Charlotte cost him. Directly across from the polling booth they had their headquarters in a tailor shop, with two pair of shears, and all day long they were dividing up $2 Dominion notes for use in the election. Where paid out they ran in serial numbers in a number of instances. The hon. gentleman knows, and it is currently reported that one of the souvenirs of that election to-day is a pair of gilded shears hanging up in the parlour of the hon. the Minister of Railways.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON. I have been listening to this debate attentively and I do not yet understand the position of the Minister of Railways. When they were in opposition hon. gentlemen opposite condemned the system of appointing Conservatives to office on the Intercolonial, and announced that if they were elected they would do the thing fairly, that there were two parties in this country, and if there was to be a deficit on the Intercolonial the two parties should pay for it. Their promise was that if they got into power they would divide the thing up so that both parties would be responsible for deficits on that railway. Now, I understand the Minister of Railways to say that if a Conservative employee on the Intercolonial takes an active part in an election he will be discharged. Am I right in that understanding ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that if a man became an active partisan in an election he would be discharged. I said he could vote if he pleased.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON. Now, then if a Liberal employee on the Intercolonial takes an active part in an election in favour of the Liberal candidate in the county where he may be working, will he be discharged

or will he be kept on? I would like to have that question answered.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already answered all those questions.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON. He has answered one side of the question, he has said that if a Conservative takes an active part against the government——

Mr. EMMERSON. The statement I made this afternoon that I was going to make inquiries, that I had had complaints on both sides, and I was going to inquire into those complaints, without regard to the politics of the persons complained of. I said I would first see whether they had transgressed, and then I would decide what should be done with them.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON. The minister has said that if a Conservative takes an active part in an election he will be dismissed; but what about the Liberal who takes an active part?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have explained my position.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON. I am just as far ahead as I was before. If it is a Conservative that takes an active part in an election it is dead sure that his head will be cut off, he is judged now. Now, if the same proof that would disqualify a Conservative from being an employee on the Intercolonial, is offered to the minister in the case of a Reformer employed on the Intercolonial, will he be dismissed too?

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister give us a statement of the number of employees on that railway at present, and the number in 1896?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot now.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this is a question that the hon. gentleman should be prepared to answer. We are discussing the item of the Intercolonial Railway working expenses.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have sent to Moncton for that information.

Mr. DANIEL. We have had quite a long debate so far. Perhaps the debate will not be without interest and probably some instruction to the country, and I think if it does nothing else it certainly makes very plain indeeed the cause of the enormous deficit we have had during the past year on the railway. However, I do not wish to prolong that part of the discussion but if the Minister of Railways and Canals would give me his attention I would like to ask him a question. I notice in the remarks which the hon. minister made yesterday that he referred among other things to the increased amount of expenditure which would be required to make repairs to engines, passenger, postal, express and baggage cars which is very largely increased over the expenditure of the previous year. I think it was on the 1st July that quite a serious accident took place on the Intercolonial Railway not far from Truro. I do not know what the cause of the accident was but in the newspaper account that I read it was assigned to the spreading of the rails. The hon. minister has stated several times yesterday and to-day that the road bed of the Intercolonial Railway was in a most magnificent condition. It certainly ought to be because no expense whatever has been spared and in so far as the expenditure of money is concerned it should be in no other condition than in first-class condition. It is a fortunate thing that in that accident no lives were lost, but at the same time the damage to rolling stock was very considerable. This particular accident took place after the 30th June—on the 1st July and of course is not in fiscal year we are considering. In the extended remarks which the hon. minister has given to us in regard to the Intercolonial he made no reference whatever to the accidents on that road. I think, to have made his statement complete, he should have given us a record of the accidents on the Intercolonial Railway during the year. I am not prepared to say now, speaking from memory that there were any other accidents, but I do not think the statement in regard to the Intercolonial Railway is complete unless that very important matter is dealt with in regard to it. I understand that much of the increased expenditure on account of repairs to engines, passenger cars, postal cars, baggage cars and express cars is due to accidents and not to ordinary wear and tear. Would the hon. minister give us some idea as to the cause of the last accident on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. The cars that are damaged by reason of accidents are repaired in the shops at Moncton and are paid out of the current revenue account. Unfortunately there are accidents. The hon. gentleman says that the accident of the 1st July was attributable to the spreading of the rails. That is a mere conjecture. As to the cause, that is being inquired into by the inspector of the Railway Commission. We had another accident within a few months. I refer to the one at Milford between Halifax and Truro. That was caused by the Canadian Pacific Railway train. The train became derailed and turned over and there was a serious loss of cars. That loss fell on the Intercolonial Railway. The cars were Canadian Pacific Railway cars, but they were being hauled by an Intercolonial Railway engine. The loss will be paid out of current revenue.

Mr. INGRAM. What brought about the accident?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was inquired into by Mr. Duval, the inspector of the Railway Commission, whose report has not yet been

laid before the department. I am expecting it every day. To what he attributes the accident I do not know at this moment, but it was a somewhat serious accident. The loss of the cars was not a loss of very serious moment. It will amount to perhaps $25,000 or $30,000, but there was an unfortunate loss of life. These things will occur. I may say that I have a telegram from a gentleman who came over the Intercolonial Railway in the new Ocean Limited from Halifax as an ordinary passenger. He is a gentleman I do not know, but I have learned that he was a very prominent broker in the city of Montreal and he took occasion to telegraph to the department to commend very highly not only the new Ocean Limited train, cars, cuisine and equipment, but he spoke especially of the very excellent roadbed of the Intercolonial extending from Halifax to Montreal. That is a general expression of opinion by passengers. I met to-day on the street car a gentleman who had come up over the road on the Ocean Limited and he took occasion to congratulate me for the department upon such an excellent train service and such an excellent road. The high standard of the roadbed is being kept up, and I trust we will be in a position to keep up the very high standard in respect to the train service. This train, starting on the 3rd July, has kept to the time table to the very second all along the line and comes in sharp on time at every station.

Mr. INGRAM. Was the accident due to carelessness ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In so far as I have any information you cannot attribute it to the carelessness of any particular one. I have no information as to that.

Mr. INGRAM. Does not the department have investigations as to how accidents occur and who is to blame ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The department did not have an investigation at Milford because that was handed over to the Railway Commission. There is a feeling throughout the country that the officials of the road or those associated with the management of the road are interested and that they are not the proper ones to hold the inquiry. I am expressing the opinion of the people who are interested in these matters. I felt in the Milford case that in justice to this expression of opinion, it was proper to get some person entirely outside the management of the road to make the inquiry, so that there might not be any suspicion that it was not disinterested. While the inquiries held by the officials are thorough and disinterested, yet it is a serious matter when these accidents result in loss of life, and in the Milford case I thought it well to take this course.

Mr. INGRAM. It is the duty of the officials of the railway to investigate these accidents in order to ascertain what employees, if any, are responsible. That is the only way to maintain discipline on a railway. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the good road-bed, but his explanation about the rails spreading would not indicate a good road-bed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said nothing about the rails spreading. I referred to the hon. gentleman's statement on that point.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be a very serious thing to have it go abroad that such was the case if it were true.

Mr. EMMERSON. The officials are responsible for the condition of the roadbed and the efficiency of the service, and they might naturally be supposed to being interested in shielding the management from a charge of negligence. It has been usual for the management to hold this investigation, but in the Milford case we thought it well to adopt this method. With regard to the recent accident, a request has been made to the railway commissioners to send their inspector to investigate.

Mr. INGRAM. Am I to understand that the department did not investigate this accident themselves ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. That is very remarkable, and I am sure the management of the road does not approve of it. Other railway companies suspend an employee when there is an accident ; investigate the circumstances immediately and punish the employee, if he is to blame. It is only by strict discipline of that kind that you can lessen the chance of accident.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the report as to the Milford accident ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Duval, the inspector of the Railway Commission has not yet made his report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the investigation held ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give the date exactly, but I think it was the first investigation Mr. Duval held after his appointment as inspector : it may have been some time in June.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that an immediate investigation should have been held. I happened to be interested because I narrowly escaped taking that train myself, and I came over the line a few hours afterwards and saw the cars lying there reduced to match wood. The train went off the track while coming round a curve and ran down a steep bank, the wonder being that more lives were not lost. It would seem to me that the cause might have been ascertained by making an immediate investigation. I would like to ask, in reference to an accident

which took place on the Intercolonial Railway near Windsor Junction about a year ago, and in which several lives were lost. I am speaking altogether from memory, but I think it was shown that some of the train hands had gone out with a train, while under the influence of liquor, and especially one man who was injured but afterwards recovered. I think proceedings were taken against him, but that he was allowed to leave the country and go to the United States, or at all events he did go. There was some criticisms at the time upon the act that precautions were not taken to have that man stand his trial. Does the minister remember the occurrence and could he give the committee any information with regard to it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. After the report was received the matter was placed in the hands of the Justice Department, and I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is correct in stating that the man was allowed to depart. Proceedings were taken, but before the Justice Department, had the man served or arrested he had escaped. All the others connected with that matter were dismissed from the employ. With respect to the Milford accident, I may say that there was an inspection by the locomotive men, the trackmen and other officers of the Intercolonial, who went there at once. The track was examined by the experts of the department and a number of the officials that very day. With respect to the recent accident, the officers of the department made a thorough examination as to the condition of the track. I am advised that it was found in very excellent condition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there any report of the officers who made the investigation of the track and reported the circumstances ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They made several visits and reported from time to time. They also gave their evidence at the sworn inquest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did they come to any conclusion as to the cause ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, they were not able to tell the cause. It was plain that on the one hand the cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway were defective, but there was no evidence to show that was the case, and no evidence, so far as I am informed, that would in any way indicate that the track was not in good condition. It was one of those unaccountable things.

Mr. INGRAM. Had the track been recently repaired, or was there anything of that kind at the place where the accident occurred ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; it was on a part of the line which had recently been laid with new 80-pound rails, and which had received the ordinary inspection and care given by the sectionmen in charge.

Mr. INGRAM. If the proper elevation was not given to the outer rail on the curve, the train would run off the track.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The engineer was held to be principally at fault for the very disastrous accident at Windsor junction, which resulted in loss of life.

Mr. EMMERSON. His name was Copeland.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would hardly seem possible that he could have gone away if immediate action had been taken, for my recollection is that he was confined to the hospital for some time before he was able to go out, and there was ample time to have secured his arrest if it was desired to do so, and if instructions had been given at the proper time. That is my recollection of the facts, and therefore cannot understand why this man got away if there was any real desire to secure his arrest and trial. There may be some explanation of which I am not aware, and what I say is subject to any explanation that may be given, but I do not think the government are quite justified in this matter. Two or three lives were lost ; and if the press accounts are correct, this man was very much in fault, and undoubtedly rendered himself criminally liable, because I believe he absolutely disobeyed a regulation of the road having the force of law and was sound asleep at his post, permitting his train to run past a signal which would have warned him to place his train upon a siding. The result was that the man who had committed the fault, while he received severe injuries, escaped with his life, whereas two or three men who were not guilty of any negligence lost their lives. It is a very serious condition of affairs, and would have justified every possible effort by the government to place the man on trial before a jury.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the man was taken to the hospital and the commissioner was sent down. As soon as they could get the evidence of that man and all the other evidence, they promptly made a report. The man was out of the hospital before that report was received at the Department of Railways, and when it was received and the facts were known the Minister of Railways instructed the general manager to dismiss these men and to have proceedings taken. The general manager sent the chief police officer of the railway to Halifax to arrest the men. This officer secured the assistance of the Halifax police, but before the man could be secured he had gone.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister has given me some information which I did not ask for,

but has not given me the information for which I did ask. I asked him if he could give us an idea of how much of this cost of repairs to engines, passenger cars, postal, express and baggage cars, freight cars and so on was due to accidents and not by wear and tear. That was the question I asked the hon. minister because the expense last year for those purposes was very much greater than the year before. We ought to have some idea of the loss accruing to the country through accidents and in that way get a better idea of the management than we could in any other. The minister talks of gentlemen referring to the good roadbed and good service on the Intercolonial. I may say that the last time I came from St. John, I came around by the Intercolonial and have great pleasure in testifying that I think the carriages ran very smoothly and the road appeared to be very good. But I thought that we ought to be able to travel a little faster. I think that twenty-three hours from St. John to Montreal is altogether too long. When you go by the Canadian Pacific Railway, you take not half that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is only half the distance.

Mr. DANIEL. I was glad to find that a new train was put on which is called the Ocean Express, which is said to do the run in a shorter time. How much shorter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About three hours.

Mr. DANIEL. It seems to me that this change should have been put in the time table.

Mr. EMMERSON. The train did not start until Sunday and it is in the new time table, which is out.

Mr. DANIEL. The train started before the time table was out. Would the minister give us a statement of the accidents which have happened on the Intercolonial and the increased expenditure they entailed ? I did not see in any statement of the minister where he procured the money to pay for the accident that happend to the Canadian Pacific Railway train. Where was that appropriation taken from ? It does not come in under 'Repairs to passenger cars.'

Mr. EMMERSON. The cars were taken to the shops and repaired.

Mr. DANIEL. What about those which were smashed beyond repair ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were sent to the Canadian Pacific Railway and were paid for by the Intercolonial. That would appear in the general repairs.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that included in the statement you gave us yesterday ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would appear in the general statement of the whole year.

Mr. DANIEL. Then the statement announced yesterday does not give the full deficit, because it does not include those cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know what the full deficit will be until I get the full returns for June. I am only speaking of the actual payments up to the 31st of May.

Mr. DANIEL. The payments have already been made for the train belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The general manager says he does not know whether they were paid for or not.

Mr. DANIEL. The item would be quite considerable.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I have said it would be from $25,000 to $35,000.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister does not know whether that is included in the statement he made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I have not the returns of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We sent the cars to the Canadian Pacific Railway. They make the repairs and the Intercolonial is responsible to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the cost.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think that the public will feel reassured by the statement of the minister with regard to the great length of time which has been allowed to elapse between the accident and the investigation into it. It will be rather depressing to the public to find that an accident can happen and no attempt at an investigation be made until a month later. I certainly would not look upon that as an evidence of good management. I would like to have an assurance from the minister that some sort of investigation has been made into the last accident which occurred three or four days ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. An investigation has been held by the officers of the Intercolonial and a further investigation will be held by the inspector, who will take evidence under oath. Parties will be heard under oath before him. The public will be invited to appear and give evidence and the railway officials will also be called upon to testify. Now, as to keeping any account of the cost of cars injured by accident as contradistinguished from the cost of cars that have been worn by use, I may explain that we do not keep a separate account. The only way by which we can get an idea of what accidents cost is through the estimate made at the time of each accident. We know that the accident at Milford will cost at least $30,000 in loss of cars, and there are other expenses besides.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the item passes, would the hon. minister inform me if in the statement of receipts and expenditure on

the Intercolonial for the eleven months the $140,000 due for rent on the Grand Trunk Railway is included ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is paid monthly and is included in the statement up to that month.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. The order for supply will be called, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) will be the first minister whose estimates will be taken up. If his estimates are disposed of early, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) will probably follow. If not then the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood from the Prime Minister privately that some Bills would be taken up in the forenoon of this week, between the time when he spoke to me and Friday. That has been departed from.

Mr. FIELDING. The programme will be as I have stated.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) be kind enough to bring down the papers in connection with the overrulings in the matter of Corry & Laverdure ? I wrote to the minister some time ago on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 7, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

THOROLD AND LAKE ERIE RY.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN moved :

That all rules and orders be suspended in relation to a Bill to amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act to incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.'

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. GERMAN. Unfortunately clerical errors occurred in the Bill. The names of three of the incorporators : Mr. Norcross, Mr. Taschereau, and Mr. Bigman were typewritten incorrectly, and section 10 of the Bill allowed this railway company to make traffic arrangements with the great lakes and St. Lawrence Navigation Company ; when it should have been 'transportation company' instead of 'navigation company.'

It is simply sought to amend clerical errors. There is a precedent for this procedure. In the journals of the House of Commons of 1887, in the motion of Mr. Kirkpatrick seconded by Mr. Hesson, a similar motion was made with regard to the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company. The Bill was presented to the House, received and read the first time ; a resolution was passed authorizing the second and third readings, and it was then ordered that the clerk should carry the Bill to the Senate and desire their concurrence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose my hon. friend is entitled to have the Bill read the first time, but I do not think the rules of the House should be suspended to a greater extent than that. I presume the facts are just as stated, and that this is simply to correct clerical errors, but as it is a private Bill and there may be interested parties, I think it would be unwise to suspend all rules at once and to say that the Bill should be carried through without further investigation. I would suggest that the Bill should be read the first time, and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders where it can be examined.

Motion agreed to, and Bill introduced and read the first time.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Bill was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

QUESTIONS.

INLAND REVENUE ACTS.

Mr. CLANCY—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. Has 53 Victoria, Chapter 23, section 4, which repeals 154 of the Inland Revenue Act, and substitutes the following :—'Every distiller who exports any spirits in the production whereof any malt is used, upon which any duty of excise has been paid, shall upon the production of due proof of such use and payment of duty, be entitled to a drawback equal to the excise duty paid on the malt used in the production of the spirits so exported ; and the amount of such drawback shall be determined in such manner as is directed by any Departmental Regulation in that behalf,' been repealed or amended ?

2. If so, when ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Not repealed or amended.
2. Not repealed or amended.

NAPANEE RIVER BUOYS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. Have the buoys in the Napanee river been painted ? If so, when, under whose instructions, by whom and what is to be paid for this work ?

2. Have the said buoys been placed in position ? If so, by whom, when, by whose instructions, under whose supervision, and what is to be paid for placing them in position ?

3. Have tenders for this service been asked for ? If so, when, and what is the last day for receiving tenders mentioned in the advertisement calling for tenders ?

4. What pay is to be given to the person superintending the above services ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes. Under instructions of the department. Painting included in cost of painting and placing.

2. Yes. Placed by R. B. Shipman under instruction from the department. Twenty dollars to be paid for painting and placing.

3. Yes. Posters sent out 24th June last. The last day for receiving tenders is the 7th July.

4. No arrangement has been made for paying any person for superintending the service.

MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Mr. MIGNAULT—by Mr. Proulx—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the section of the Montreal and Atlantic Railway between Yamaska and St. Guillaume is no longer being operated ?

2. Is it the intention of the goverment to take the necessary means to oblige the company to open that railway to traffic ?

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

1. The government have no official information that this section of railway is not being operated, beyond the fact that it does not appear in the sworn statistics of the Montreal and Atlantic Railway made to the department by the company.

2. The matter having only now been brought to the attention of the department, is being considered.

TRENTON HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Has any person been appointed to keep account, on behalf of the government, of the quantities of dredging now being done in Trenton Harbour, Ontario ?

2. If so, when was such appointment made, and by whom was it made ?

2. What is the name of the person so appointed ?

4. Was he appointed upon the recommendation of any person or persons ? If so, whom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes.

2. Appointed on June 17, 1904, by order of acting minister.

3. Mr. Josiah P. Shurie.

4. Appointed by order of acting minister.

RAILWAY ON THE BANKS OF THE LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to inquire from the government whether they have authorized the use of one side of the Lachine canal by the trains of any railway company ; in other words, whether they have given leave to build on the banks of the Lachine canal a track enabling a railway to enter the city of Montreal by this road. I have received a great many inquiries from interested parties in my county who are very anxious to know if that has been granted, and this is the reason why I put this question.

The Rt. Hon. Sir W. LAURIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think this permission has been granted a good many years ago. I could not say if some recent order has been added to that permission. I will give a definite answer to my hon. friend in a few days.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Summary report of the Geological Survey for the year 1903.—Hon. Clifford Sifton (Minister of the Interior.)

CORNWALL CANAL CONTRACT.

Mr. S. BARKER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister, whether he will have laid upon the table, the two Orders in Council referred to at page 6 of the Auditor General's report, dated the 18th of February, 1896, and the 12th of June, 1896. These are the two Orders in Council with respect to the original contract for light and power on the Cornwall canal. They will be needed in the discussion on the estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand these orders have been laid on the table already ; however, I will see about it.

Mr. BARKER. Those of 1900 have been, but not those of 1896.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Civil Government—Department of Trade and Commerce—salaries, including the accountant at $1,800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $18,200.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). The House will observe that there is an additional vote asked for of $4,000. This is principally by reason of the appointment of an accountant, who is a new

officer, at $1,800. Two officers were transferred from the ordinary charge for clerical assistance and put on the permanent list, making $1,000. The remainder is for statutory increases. The appointment of an accountant was rendered necessary by the fact that very large sums are now being disbursed through the department for bounties and other purposes.

Mr. CLARKE. Who has been appointed accountant ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. J. Code. He was formerly assistant in the Customs Department, and has been transferred to mine.

Mr. BLAIN. How long has Mr. Code been in the employ of the government ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About twenty years.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman mention in what cases the statutory increases occur?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A chief clerk, $50; a first-class clerk, $50; a second-class clerk, $50 ; five junior second-class clerks, $50 each; three third-class clerks and two messengers.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister explain to the committee that well-known phrase which we see so frequently now in the estimates: 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ?'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That refers to the case of the accountant. He was in the service of the Customs Department as assistant accountant at $1,600. On being transferred to this department, where the service required from him is more responsible and more important, his salary has been raised to $1,800.

Mr. CLARKE. Have all the clerks in the hon. gentleman's department who were entitled to the statutory increase received that increase?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the committee whether in the reorganization of the department the hon. gentleman has pursued the course laid down in the statute. I would also call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact of there being now two messengers instead of one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There have always been two messengers, only one has heretofore been paid out of the contingencies instead of out of the main vote.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman has not stated whether the statute has been complied with in the re-organization of the department. It is somewhat surprising to find an increase in this department of even $4,000, in view of the record of the right hon. gentleman at the head of that department as a public man, and in view of his explicit statement made on several occasions that it was a useless department on which the expenditure of public money could not be justified.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The major item is the increase for the accountant. That is due to the very large expenditures now paid through the department on bounties and mail subsidies. The $1,000 increase in the mail clerks has been caused by a transfer. It was formerly paid from contingencies and is now paid directly. The rest are all statutory increases. Touching the work of the department, it may interest the hon. gentleman to know that, if the correspondence is any guide, it has increased just 600 per cent within the last six or seven years. There is a great deal more done than in 1896. There are six times as many letters and almost six times as much work in other ways.

Mr. SPROULE. You have fifteen clerks instead of ten.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Three are mere transfers. The only new appointment is the accountant.

Mr. LENNOX. The right hon. gentleman has not answered my question as to the manner in which this alteration is made in the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The chief alteration was the appointment of a new accountant. The only other material alteration was in handing over the commercial agencies to the assistant Deputy Minister for special control. The rest is as before.

Mr. SPROULE. We have this fact established at any rate. The right hon. gentleman was wanting to say that this was a useless department and the money spent on it was wasted. Yet we are now asked to vote $31,800 on that department, including the salary of the minister. That is a large amount for the country to have to pay for a department which the right hon. gentleman has often declared is absolutely unnecessary and useless.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there is an alteration between 1896 and 1904.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, there is another occupant of the position.

Mr. LENNOX. The Civil Service Act stipulates that in order to effect a change in the organization of a department, such as is asked for here, certain steps have to be taken. There must be a recommendation from the deputy head to the head of the department, that recommendation must be

concurred in by the head of the department, and then laid before the Council. That procedure has, however, been neglected by the various departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all cases where there has been any new creation, a report of the deputy head has always been obtained. I have here a memo. from Mr. McGee, showing the practice prior to 1896. In several cases the reports of the deputy heads were presented to parliament and in almost all the others the appointments were made after parliament prorogued. I shall send my hon. friend the memorandum.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think that the practice in the past should be pleaded as an excuse for any remissness in the present. Take the right hon. gentleman's own political career. If he be right to-day, he must have been singularly wrong in the past. Section 2 of the Act provides :

First-class clerks shall only be created by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, setting forth the reasons for creating the office, and asking that the salary be voted by Parliament.

What I want to know is whether that course has been followed in this case or not. We have a first-class clerkship created at a salary of $1,800, and we should know whether the procedure, as laid down by the statute, has been complied with ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to Mr. Code, he was a first-class clerk in the Department of Customs. With respect to the other, the recommendation was made in due course by myself on the report of my deputy head. I do not want to enter into a legal discussion such as we had the other day, but I may say that the course which has been pursued is the one I have always known to be followed. The minister submits the estimates to Council under his signature, and after they have passed Council they are submitted to parliament. Then they appear before Council a third time and are finally settled. I am aware of the point my hon. friend has taken. He may or may not be legally correct. There was considerable discussion as to the meaning of the clause some time ago, during which the Minister of Justice took one view and some of my hon. friends another. But my hon. friend will find that the custom is as I have described it and has been followed ever since 1866.

Mr. LENNOX. The question is not the qualifications of an official, but the creation of the office, so that the fact that the accountant was in another department is not material. The statute provides, wisely or otherwise, that before this is done a certain course shall be pursued and among other things that the promotions or introduction of a new clerkship shall be upon the recommendation of the deputy head setting forth in writing the reasons why he makes the suggestion or recommendation. I am not arguing the question in the legal sense, but am speaking of it only as a matter of propriety in carrying out the provisions of the statute.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of course an Order in Council was passed authorizing this appointment.

Mr. LENNOX. What I object to is that there has not been a recommendation in writing by the head of the department as an initial step in the proceedings.

Civil government, contingencies, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $6,600.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a reduction here of about $400 in all. In 1903 the vote for clerical and other assistance was $2,500. That is now reduced to 1,500. Two sections were made of this, part of it being transferred to the main estimates. Under printing and stationery we ask $2,000 in 1903-4 and $2,300 now. My deputy informs me that the increase is on account of the various bounties required. There is a saving in the case of sundries which were $2,500 and are now $2,300. The total asked in 1903 was $7,000, the total asked now is $6,600.

Ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada, $260,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen will observe here that an increase of $85,000 is asked for under the new contract which has been made with the Messrs. Allan for this service. The Messrs. Allan have agreed to build two new steamers on the turbine principle for which they will receive at the rate of £2,000 sterling per round trip. They will besides these steamers employ the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' for which they will receive at the rate of £1,000 per round trip.

Mr. CLARKE. What do they now receive for the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian ?'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were receiving about the same for the winter service and £750 for the summer service.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the subsidy been raised by £250 for each round trip ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase for part of the year of £250. The other vessels receive from £500 to £750 as a rule if the service is performed. It is especially stipulated that the service shall be performed by the new steamers and the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian.'

Mr. CLARKE. What is to be the speed of the new steamers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are to have an effectual actual speed of 17 knots.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the speed of the 'Tunisian ' and 'Bavarian ?'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is supposed to be about 14½ to 15 knots. They seem to have kept that speed this year and a good deal better than in former times. Of late they have been doing a good deal better than last year.

Mr. CLARKE. For what reason was the increased subsidy given ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cut down their demands in the matter of the new steamers very considerably, and allowed them a little more in the case of the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian.' It was a kind of lumping business for the whole service. They complained that they lost money on the trips. Whether that is so or not I cannot say, but I made large reductions from the amounts they demanded for the new steamers and gave a slight increase for the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian.'

Mr. CLARKE. It means that we are giving an increase of £250 sterling per round trip to the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian.'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Provided always they live up to their contract. There is a special clause under which, if they fail, they are fined one per cent for each hour.

Mr. CLARKE. Has that fine ever been collected ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot enforce it in their case because the steamers have not yet been put on the service.

Mr. CLARKE. Has it been collected in any case ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, yes, I have several times imposed fines for failure to live up to the time stipulated in the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Where will I find the particulars ? Does the hon. gentleman remember how much the deductions have amounted to ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My deputy informs me that £10,000 were deducted last year. My hon. friend can see in the Auditor General's Report that the amounts paid were so much less than the subsidies voted. It was owing to their being fined for failure, to comply with the terms of the contract. Of course in each individual case there were different circumstances ; we examined into these circumstances and made what appeared to be a reasonable deduction for the failure to comply with the time stipulation in the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. For failing to make the time ? What was the average time made for the last twelve months and how does it compare with the time made during the previous twelve months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. During the summer of 1903 they appear to have made 30 trips at an average time of 7 days 12 hours and 47 minutes, that is fron Moville to Rimouski.

Mr. CLARKE. What does that mean in knots per hour ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All depends on whether they went south or through the Belle Isle passage.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman must have the figures before him. I would like to know what is the average speed per hour, and the hon. gentleman says that depends on whether they took one passage or the other. Of course, he has the distances by both routes before him ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From Rimouski to Moville, via Belle Isle, 2,287 knots ; and from Rimouski to Moville by Cape Race, the shortest possible route, 2,445 knots. That amounts to 7 days 12 hours and 47 minutes. With respect to Cape Race, that is probably shorter than the true time, because they are compelled to go further south in passing by Cape Race.

Mr. BELL. What is the tonnage of these steamers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 8,000 to 10,000 tons.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister state what arrangements have been made under this contract during the winter months for the St. Lawrence navigation ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the winter months they sail from St. John and Halifax, and a little longer time is allowed in winter—I think 12 hours additional time for the same steamers. The contract stipulates that in each case of these new steamers, the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian,' ten full round trips must be made. The hon. gentleman will understand that all these steamers have to be taken off for a certain time for ordinary repair, and this is done during the winter.

Mr. DANIEL. The old Beaver Line is not under contract now ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No ; our only contract for this service is with the Allans. This contract is expected to run two years.

Mr. SPROULE. In making a new contract like that it is a great pity that some arrangements have not been made for a faster service. I understood the minister to say that the new steamers would make about 17 knots an hour. That appears to be very slow compared with the speed that steamers make between New York and

Europe. We appear to be either wasting our time in some way, or to be unequal to the occasion in failing to provide a better service than we have. I think the country will conclude that there is something wrong when we cannot succeed in getting a faster service than the 17 knots an hour that the new steamers are to make. Surely we could provide a greater speed than that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend will note that there are two serious questions to consider. One is the enormously increased expense that an additional speed would entail. The other arises from the fact that fast steamers can carry only a small amount of freight. The amount, I believe, that is carried on a fast steamer is something like 1,400 or 1,500 tons in vessels of 10,000 tonnage or more; whereas, as he knows, other vessels carry a very heavy freight. I think I have mentioned to the House that we tried to ascertain what could be done for a faster service, but the only tenders submitted to us called for $1,000,000 in one case, and $1,250,000 in the other, for a 20-knot service, and they appended to it divers conditions which it was not in the power of the government to comply with.

Mr. CLARKE. As a matter of fact, taking the mean speed of last year, we have been paying these subsidies for a mean speed of 13 knots per hour. That is the best we have been able to do yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. If I have made the calculation rightly, for the longer passage of 2,455 miles, with a mean time of 7 days and 12 hours, the rate would be 13·6 knots per hour and for the shorter passage of 2,287 miles, 12·7 knots per hour. The average speed, taking both routes into consideration, during the past year, has been 13 knots per hour for the carriage of our mails. Surely we should be able to accelerate that speed in the near future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The question is one which has engaged a good deal of attention. I would just point out to my hon. friend that by the terms of the contract which I have made with the Allans, if they are complied with, we will have a service from Moville to Rimouski almost identical in point of time with the New York service. It will take six days with 17-knot steamers. With the exception of one or two of the 'greyhounds,' the time to New York is about six days. Now, it is a matter for serious consideration whether it is worth going to an increased expenditure, varying from three-quarters of a million to a million and a quarter, for the sake of shortening the time by 14 or 15 hours. I leave my hon. friend to consider that question. But I want to point out to him that the difference between 17 knots and 20 knots, taking into account the shorter passage that we have, amounts to almost nothing as between the New York passage and the passage from Moville to Rimouski. I may also point out that the average speed is a good deal reduced by the fact that if vessels like the 'Parisian' and 'Pretorian' were employed as subsidiary boats, as well as the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' we would attain a much better average speed than we are attaining with the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian' as the principal boats. Now, I find that the 'Tunisian' for the most part did the service in about six and a half days. In July the average was 6 days 21 hours; August, 6 days 8 hours; the next time, 6 days 9 hours. And in the fall, of course, when they had more difficulty with fog and sometimes with ice, the time was done to 7 days 8 hours. But, for the most part, the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian' did the passage in considerably under 7 days. The distances I gave the hon. gentleman are the shortest possible distances. But in passing along Newfoundland they frequently have to diverge considerably to the south, which lengthens the passage. I may mention also that I have felt rather doubtful whether I ought to insist too rigorously on the terms of the contract where they pleaded that they had to stop on account of fog. If you insist too much upon it, you may tempt these people to run at an increased rate of speed under circumstances which may imperil the safety of the passengers. Therefore, where they have been detained by fog and ice, I have dealt rather leniently with loss of time.

Mr. MONK. What is the intended tonnage of these two new turbine steamers, and is it intended that they are to come up to Montreal? And I may say to my right hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) that our friends about me here have suggested that he should not give himself the trouble to rise to answer each question that is put to him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am much obliged for the hon. gentleman's consideration, and, if I find myself tired, I will retain my seat. With respect to the points mentioned by the hon. gentleman, I may say that I believe that the tonnage of these vessels is to be from 8,000 to 10,000 tons. My deputy thinks they will be 10,000 tons. They are the turbines, which, as hon. gentlemen are aware, is a form now coming into considerable favour.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the contract provide what tonnage they shall be?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not specifically as to tonnage, but it provides for their effective speed, and that is about the least tonnage they can have to give that speed.

Mr. MONK. I did not understand the right hon. gentleman to say whether it is intended that they should come up to Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, so I understood from the Messrs. Allan.

Mr. MONK. Does the right hon. gentleman know whether there is any provision for cold storage accommodation ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, that is expressly provided for.

Mr. CLARKE. If I have taken the right hon. gentleman's figures correctly, the average speed of the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian' last year was not more than fourteen knots ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I do not think it was.

Mr. CLARKE. That is the rate, making the most liberal allowance. Now, we are to have two 14-knot and two 17-knot boats. The average speed will be a little over 15 knots. And we are paying £2,250 sterling for the round trip of each of the 17-knot boats, and £750 for each round trip of the 13-knot boats. It does seem to me that, in view of the large subsidies being paid, we have the right to expect an acceleration of the speed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have tried every possible means but I cannot induce the steamship owners to tender on better terms.

Mr. CLARKE. The situation will be this, as the right hon. gentleman knows is the case, unhappily, at the present time—that, while we are subsidizing vessels to carry the Canadian mails, the overwhelming bulk of our mails is being taken to New York and sent thence in British or foreign bottoms.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will note that there is a steamer going out of New York every day. Under these circumstances it is impossible for us to provide for more than a fraction of our own correspondence. Moreover, from points west of Kingston, the mails would naturally go by New York as being the shorter route. From Kingston eastward our correspondence, including the correspondence of Montreal and the maritime provinces, will go by the Canadian route.

Mr. CLARKE. There have been, as the right hon. gentleman knows, repeated memorials addressed to the government favouring the establishment of what may be fairly called a fast Atlantic line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, and as the hon. gentleman knows we have advertised and tried in every way to obtain terms for such a service. But the figures have been extremely high.

Mr. CLARKE. We went so far on one occasion as to secure the model of a new style of ship which, it was supposed, would revolutionize Atlantic travel. But that result does not seem to have been attained. But the right hon. gentleman will not say that 15 knots an hour is what is desired by the commercial bodies of this country, and he knows that our passenger traffic is being disintegrated because we have no vessels comparing in luxury and comfort with many of the steamships sailing from New York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will tell the hon. gentleman that the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian' are great favourites with the travelling public.

Mr. CLARKE. With the people of Montreal—they have to go by that route.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, they could go by New York. But in the summer these boats are well filled. As to the speed, I have made many inquiries, and I find that there are only a very small number of persons who are willing to pay considerably for the increased speed of 20 knots as against 17 knots. The hon. gentleman knows that all you gain by a 20-knot vessel would be fifteen hours in the transit between Moville and Rimouski. He can satisfy himself by making the calculation. It is a serious question whether it is worth while for the people of Canada to pay three-quarters of a million or a million more than we are paying now in order to shorten the passage by fifteen hours, particularly when we shall have to use vessels that will carry extremely little freight.

Mr. CLARKE. There is an increase of $85,000 in the vote, yet the mails will go practically as they have been going.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, but we get a very much better service than before. If we get these vessels to make the passage in six days between Moville and Rimouski on the average it will go far to give us the service the hon. gentleman desires. We find, on examination, that the vessels running from New York at the rate of 17 knots are very extensively patronized in comparison with the 'Lucania' and vessels of that class. The latter vessels, such as the 'Cedric,' I believe, are designed for 17 knots and not for an excessive speed. The cost of increased speed is enormous. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not examined that point, but if he has examined it he will know that every additional knot involves huge increased expenses.

Mr. CLARKE. To have a six-day passage from Rimouski to Moville, it would be necessary to obtain 16 knots on the average. It is not contemplated by the right hon. gentleman, however, that this service is to give much more than 14 knots.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is a little

underrating the speed of the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian.'

Mr. CLARKE. If we had the record of the passages of the last few months we could get at it exactly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can send it over to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) if he wishes to examine it. He was asking the average time from Moville to Rimouski. I have here the figures of the time of thirty trips from Rimouski to Moville, and I find the average is seven days five hours.

Mr. CLARKE. Of all the mail boats ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, of all the mail boats.

Mr. CLARKE. What boats are in the mail service ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The 'Bavarian,' 'Tunisian,' Parisian,' Pretorian' (occasionally), and the 'Ionian.'

Mr. CLARKE. What was the average speed of the 'Parisian' and the 'Ionian' ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The average of the 'Parisian' is nearly as fast as the 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian.' The 'Ionian' has made fair passages, but she is not quite as fast. I had a little memorandum made for my own information as to the relative cost of the various grades of steamers. The proportions are somewhat as follows: 15 knots would represent 34; 17 knot would represent 49; 20 knots would represent 80, and 22 knots would represent 106. It is worth noting that the cost of 20 knots is very nearly double the cost of 17 knots. It is hoped the turbine system will enable us to get a greater speed at a less cost.

Mr. CLARKE. We are practically adding 50 per cent to get one knot, or one knot and a half increased speed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About two knots. We propose that the 17 knot boats must do the service in six days and the others in six and a half days. The argument is that during the summer the two 17 knot steamers must make the passage in six days under penalties, and the 'Tunisian' and 'Bavarian' must not exceed seven days.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister expect that a larger proportion of the mail matter will go by the new steamers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt. While New York is sending out one steamer per day, I think the bulk of our mail matter will go that way.

Mr. BLAIN. The figures given last session show that only one-seventh of our mail matter went by the Canadian route and the balance by New York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think it is increasing by the Canadian route. I will have to apply to the Post Office for details, but I am certain there has been no material change.

Mr. BLAIN. You don't expect any material change from the increased cost ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so. I cannot venture to promise the House that there will be any alteration in that respect. We hope that with thoroughly comfortable and first-class boats there will be a considerable increase in the traffic, but I do not expect any increase in the mail matter and I think the Post Office has come to that conclusion too. Heretofore the passage has ranged from seven to ten days, and it will be a very material improvement if we can establish on ocean ferry not exceeding six days.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that for all time to come a very large proportion of Canadian mail matter will go via New York ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not in my department precisely, but I am afraid that a very large proportion will always go by New York. They have a steamer per day and they are rather likely to increase than to diminish, and under these circumstances we must make up our minds that a large proportion of our mail matter will go by that route.

Mr. MONK. A great object in having fast steamers between Canada and England is for the despatch of the mails. Whatever the reason for the change in public sentiment of recent years, the tendency of passengers going to Europe is to seek steamers which afford great comfort and accommodation, such as the 'Celtic' and 'Cedric,' rather than great speed. If we only have a weekly steamer of very fast speed it does not help us very much with reference to the mails. That is why it occurs to many people, that until we can have an extremely fast service between Canadian ports and European ports, we will not have very much use for a fast Atlantic service. If we had a three or four day service between Newfoundland and the coast of Ireland there is no doubt that it would have a material effect on the carrying of the mails by such a route, and I should think passengers too. The 'Tunisian' and 'Bavarian' now afford improved accommodation, and the securing of a large number of passengers through Canadian ports is a matter of some importance. I would like to ask the minister if he has made ample provision in the new contract in connection with these two turbine steamers, for really superior passenger accommodation ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. The Messrs. Allan have submitted the plans

to me and they have apparently made ample provision for the comfort and convenience of a very large number of passengers on these steamers.

Mr. BELL. What would be the time of these boats between Halifax and Moville ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a winter trip, and twelve hours longer are allowed than to Rimouski.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). The danger is that in coming to the banks of Newfoundland in thick foggy weather, when the banks are dotted with fishing schooners, these steamers have to reduce their speed for the safety of themselves and the other craft in these waters. Sometimes the fog continues until you get into the St. Lawrence, and I am not so certain that the speed of steamers on that route can be very largely increased over the present rate.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Do I understand that the subsidies are given only to these four steamers—the two new ones and the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian ?' Or would any of the old steamers be included ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They would be included at the reduced rates—from £500 to £700 as the case may be.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. All boats of the Allan Line ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All boats that are permitted to go ; but a special provision has been inserted that forty out of fifty-two trips must be performed by the new steamers or the 'Bavarian' or the 'Tunisian.'

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does the new contract cover all these vessels ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It covers the two new steamers, with the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' and as substitutes on occasion the 'Ionian' and 'Parisian.'

Mr. MONK. What is the time fixed for the first sailing of the turbine steamers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One is to start during the month of August next, and the second one on or before the opening of navigation in the St. Lawrence river in the spring.

Mr. MONK. Is there any penalty attached for their failure to keep the dates ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are to receive a much larger subsidy, and the Messrs. Allan, I believe, have been pushing the construction of these vessels with all expedition. They have had some trouble from strikes, and I do not know that we can depend on the vessel being delivered in the month of August. I am in correspondence with them on that subject now.

Mr. MONK. Are the vessels begun ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, yes. They are all but ready for delivery. My hon. friend is very incredulous.

Mr. MONK. We have been waiting a long time for that service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the contract was signed we had notice that they were under way.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They are not like the dredges for Nova Scotia which have been under construction for the last three or four years, but are not finished yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the 'W. S. Fielding' that my hon. friend is referring to ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Yes.

Mr. BELL. I suppose the hon. minister realizes that the people of Halifax, Sydney, St. John and other ports in the maritime provinces take a very great interest in this subject, and I would not like the impression to go abroad that the government have abandoned the idea of obtaining a really fast service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, no.

Mr. BELL. I rather judge, from what the hon. minister has said, that he looks upon a modern, up-to-date, first-class service, as good as they have in New York, as something beyond the means of this government to provide. Last year, when this matter was up, the premier, I think, said that a thoroughly up-to-date service of twenty-two or twenty-three knots would cost us $1,500,000 a year, which he seemed to think was an outlay beyond the ability of this country. In the maritime provinces, at any rate, I am sure there would not be a ready acquiescence in that view. The people there believe that with the establishment of a service which would be equal in speed, efficiency and quality to that which runs to the port of New York, a large part of the passenger travel and a full supply of express freight would be carried through our ports in the maritime provinces. Therefore the people of Halifax and of those other ports regard it as a matter of great importance to them locally that such a service should be established. A great many take a larger view, however, and look upon it as a matter of national pride and interest. They believe it would have the effect of advertising Canada extensively, placing it on the line of through travel between Europe and Asia, diverting a large part of the passenger travel of the world through Canadian territory, improving our position as a nation, placing us practically on the front street of the world's travel. That is a position which we might hope to attain on ac-

count of our geographical position between the two great masses of the world's population, that is, the European and the eastern Asiatic. Such a service would attract a large portion of the travel which is in a hurry. While it must be admitted that a great many men are choosing the larger, steadier and more comfortable steamers when they wish to travel, there are always a large number of business men and others to whom every moment of time is of great value, and who will therefore always take the line that will give them the assurance of saving a few hours or days. The figures given by the minister show that the most he hopes to attain is an average speed of 14¾ knots.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is putting it rather on the inside. In summer I hope to attain a great deal more.

Mr. BELL. Take the figures given by the hon. minister, that is what they average.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend will note that the average is very materially reduced by any single vessel making a long passage. The 'Tunisian' and 'Bavarian' as a rule make the passage in six days and from ten to fifteen hours, which gives a decent average speed.

Mr. BELL. Suppose the minister gets an average of 15 knots. That is not a speed which will attract any travel. At that speed the vessels will not take our own mails if there is a change of sending them by a faster route. It may provide an express service, but it will not have the effect which we had hoped for, of giving us a service which will attract any large proportion of the world's passenger travel. It seems to me that the government of Canada should be perfectly willing to spend annually $1,500,000 to secure a really fast service. The large disbursements which would be made by these steamers in this country and by tourists making their way across Canada would largely reimburse the country for the expenditure necessary to provide the service. I hope the minister will give us the assurance that the government had not made up their mind that such a service is hopeless. At the time Mr. Dobell announced to this House that he had made up his mind that not more than 18 knots could be looked for, even such a statement was very disappointing to the House and the country; but now the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce assures us that the best this government can do after eight years is to provide a service of 15 knots, which is a liberal estimate of its speed. It really seems as if, instead of making progress, the government in those eight years have been going back. It is perfectly proper that we should recognize the difficulties in the way. They are enormous, and I suppose they are aggravated to a certain extent by the class of steamers to be employed. The introduction of the turbine steamers will to a certain extent involve delay. There are of course reasons why ship owners should hesitate to put themselves to great expenditure, while this matter is still in the experimental stage, it is after all a disappointment to the people to find that instead of being able to realize the 20-knot service as promised in 1896, all that the minister can promise us, with an increased subsidy of $85,000, making $360,000 in all, is a 15-knot service. There is 50 per cent increase in the subsidy and no improvement in the service. It looks as if the matter were one the government are inclined to pooh-pooh, but I hope the minister will make every effort to give the country the service we require.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was partly in view of these considerations that I refused to extend the contract beyond two years, so that we might have time to do something in the direction the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. CLARKE. In what season of the year are the trips to be made by these faster vessels?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Chiefly during the summer months and the earlier part of the winter.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the slow boats will do winter service?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A portion of the time. It is not proposed that these vessels will all be laid off at the same time.

Mr. CLARKE. What will these slow boats receive per round trip?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. £500 during the summer and £750 during the winter.

Mr. CLARKE. But those slow boats will not be on during the summer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They might in the event of the others breaking down. If employed in the summer, they will get £500 per round trip.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman expect the passage will be made in six days from Rimouski to Moville?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, six days from the 1st of June to the 1st of November in each year covered by the agreement.

Mr. CLARKE. Does it require a 16-knot service to do that during the year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would require a 17-knot service.

Mr. WADE. I do not feel like agreeing with my hon. friend from Pictou that this is no improvement in the service. I think

it is a very great improvement, because of these two new boats, one will have an average speed of 17 knots and the other will be somewhat faster. I understand that the second boat, which is being built, is likely to be a little speedier, but at any rate we are getting two boats with an average speed of 17 knots. They will be very superior boats. I have had the opportunity of looking at the specifications and diagrams and I consider they will be a great improvement to the service. While it is most desirable we should have the speediest service we can get, there is a good deal in what has been said by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and that is that the travelling public to-day are looking more for comfort than for great speed. The favourite and most comfortable boats now running out of New York are the 'Cedric' and 'Arabic', and those large comfortable boats have not a speed of over 17 knots. Considering the condition of Canada and her population, if we are able to make from year to year, or every two years, a substantial advance towards securing these very fast steamers, we are accomplishing a great deal. It is a question whether a service of 17 or 18 knots would not be a service quite commensurate with the best interests of Canada. Of course if we could afford to have a daily ferry such as they have in New York, we would be in a position to attract a large proportion of the travel of the United states as well as of Canada, but we cannot hope to do that yet and it will be some time before we can.

Mr. BELL. How long ?

Mr. WADE. That will depend on the rapidity with which the country is opened up and advances. The trouble at Halifax was this, that the company could not secure freight for the larger steamers. The 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' had to sail out of Halifax several times with very little cargo. Besides the loss of running the ship, there is the danger of navigating a light ship in winter, and the company were forced to put on smaller and inferior vessels. The 'Tunisian' and 'Bavarian' are good boats, well fitted up, and with twin screws, and the 'Parisian,' while older and smaller, has always been one of the favourite boats on the Atlantic route. I think we may congratulate ourselves that we have the improvements which are manifest in this contract. When we are able to ship our products of the west from our maritime ports, we will be in a position to secure the very fast and continuous service we are hoping for, and we are confident that will be realized in the near future.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon gentleman's logic is defective. The minister says that these fast boats are not good freight carriers, but the hon. gentleman says that when we are able to secure the freight from the west we will have the fast boats. Which is right ?

Mr. WADE. I think I can make the hon. gentleman understand.

Mr. SPROULE. He was trying to put in a bar for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. WADE. Not necessarily. I will make my hon. friend understand by telling him that all big steamship companies run their very fast boats at a loss and make up the loss on their other business with their other boats. Not one of these ocean greyhounds, which run out of New York, is run at a profit, but the profit on the company's other business compensates for the loss on the swift boats.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member (Mr. Wade) to say that we have a number of slower vessels, making less than 17 knots an hour. The minister told us that the vessels were running at an average of 14½ knots an hour last year. That ought to be slow enough for anything. We have enough of these slow boats to carry all the freight offering, according to the information before us, and it is not detracting from their earnings if we get boats to make a high rate of speed, and induce the travelling public to use them and also have them to carry our mails. It seems to me that the position of Canada in this matter is humiliating. We have a shorter route than the Americans, and yet they have a faster passage than we have. Canadians in every other line of life have proven themselves the equals of their rivals in the rest of the world, but in this important particular we are not successful competitors with our neighbours to the south of us. We have to acknowledge their superiority or our want of enterprise. There is an important matter that is lost sight of in considering the need of a fast line and it is this : While it is said, and probably will be admitted, that the bulk of the travelling public crossing the Atlantic to-day take the vessels that give them the greatest comfort there is yet a large percentage who travel on business and with whom time is a matter of great importance. The man travelling on business wishes to make his trip in the shortest time he can ; a few hours may make the difference between a great gain and a great loss. It is not to be wondered at that those who are travelling for pleasure should consider comfort mainly ; they can easily afford to sacrifice time if comfort can thereby be gained. But the great interest of the country is its business, not its pleasure ; the important question is how rapidly its business can be done, how rapidly its business men can travel, and how rapidly its mails can be carried, for the majority of letters deal with business matters. So long as those going by the American route can make the best time in the trip across the Atlantic, so long will the man travelling on

business choose the route by way of New York in order to save time. And, for the same reason, business, men will send their letters by that route. Is it to be said that we cannot provide for sending our own mails by our own country when we have the shorter route as compared with New York ? It is a humiliation to Canadians that our men are not equal to the occasion and that we cannot provide that which other countries have provided that have not such great advantages as we have. It is said also that these boats do not carry much freight. Now the original contract made for the fast line of steamers provided that they should carry a stipulated quantity of freight with cold storage accommodation. Yet. though they would carry freight, they were to make a much higher rate of speed than those under the contract which has been signed or is about to be signed. Why could we not have done as well as was done under that contract ? Though that contract was made, the government refused to carry it out. It was said afterwards that the contract would not have been carried out by the steamship company. Well, at least the preliminary agreement was made and we had every reason to believe that the company with which it was made was able to carry it out had the government been ready to go on with the bargain. The minister tells us that we are making a substantial advance over what we have had in the past. What advance have we made in the last seven years in the rate of speed ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Speaking from recollection, I think the average passage is two or three days less.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that the average passage to-day was eight or ten days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I said that the average rate in summer was seven days.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that these new steamers would be so much in advance of the ordinary rate to-day that the difference would be practically the difference between ten days and seven days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was referring to the old times.

Mr. SPROULE. But he was speaking of the work done by the steamers in use to-day, the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian.'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have not taken ten days or anything like it.

Mr. SPROULE. He told us that the average speed was 14½ knots an hour. That was the very best he could say, and, after carefully revising his calculation, he said it would be 14¼ knots, or, perhaps it would be safe to say 14 knots. That does not seem to me to be much in advance of what it was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will find that the average rate is considerably in advance of what it was seven years ago.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the right hon. gentleman give us some data showing on what he bases that statement ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A few years ago the passages were made in eleven, twelve or thirteen days—eleven was rather exceptional.

Mr. CLARKE. What ships made that rate ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The ships of the various lines. We changed the service once or twice. Some of the Allan liners, some of the Dominion and some of the Beaver liners were employed. But they certainly were very inferior in point of speed to the average of the present day.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, the right hon. gentleman has the data on which that statement is made or he would not make it ? Will he be kind enough to bring the data before the committee ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Let us have it at three o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. Another element in the situation that we ought not to overlook is this : Under the present system people coming to Canada from across the Atlantic generally land in New York—in a foreign country. They pass through the great state of New York, and sometimes a great many other states, before they reach Canada. Many of these are intending investors, and, seeing the advantages of the United States and the attractions for investment there, they are apt to be induced to invest their money in the United States instead of in Canada. Why should we land our passengers in a foreign country ? If they landed in Canada and went four thousand miles across our country before reaching the Pacific, they could not but be impressed with the advantages offered by Canada for investment of capital. It seems to me that it would be of incalculable advantage to us to have passengers coming to Canada land in Canada direct.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How can you compel people to land in Canada ?

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot compel them, but if you will bring them quicker into Canada directly than via New York they will come in by the faster line. If I start from Toronto to come to Ottawa to do business, and there are three trains a day and one goes a little faster than the other, I

will of course take the fastest one. So it is with a business man. We are living in a fast age, in an age of speed, and we will take the fastest trains and the fastest line of steamers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But people who cross the Atlantic ocean generally do it for pleasure, and they prefer to go through a foreign port.

Mr. SPROULE. I said there was a percentage who travelled for pleasure, and in that case I presume they would look rather for comfort than speed. But the great enterprising business class of men, which is of value to us because they make their investments here, are the people that we should invite to land upon our shores instead of landing in New York before they reach Canada. These are considerations of immense value to the Canadian people, and we are not equal to the occasion if we allow this state of things to go on from year to year that has been going the last seven years, without any substantial improvement except what we are offered to-day in the shape of these two new steamers that are to be built, and even these I understand are only an experiment.

Mr. WADE. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to misquote me before the committee. I did not say that the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian' were fast enough, I said they were satisfactory to us.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member to say that the service had proved satisfactory to the public.

Mr. WADE. I said nothing of the kind, I said these two boats, the 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian,' were satisfactory to the people, and the 'Parisian' was an old favourite, these two boats as compared with the others would be a distinct improvement in the service and one that would be pleasing to the people. The hon. gentleman also said we had slow boats enough for carrying grain and freight. That is all very well, we have slow boats enough for carrying freight, but where is the freight to put in them? The freight was not there last winter, and as a consequence they could not run these large boats, the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian,' and they had to put on the 'Laurentian,' the 'Pretorian' and boats of that kind. Now if we can get freight to these ocean ports which will fill the slower boats, it will build up the business of the country and the company can afford to run swifter boats. Now with regard to the pretention of the hon. gentleman that the people want to travel by swift boats, he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make any such statement. I said no doubt those who travel for pleasure would look for comfort rather than speed, but I said that the great enterprising business class of men desired to go by the fastest boats.

Mr. WADE. I think I know something about the desires of people who travel across the Atlantic on pleasure bent. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. There is a certain class of business men who need to travel in great haste and will take the fastest line, but the great mass of the travelling public I am speaking about are looking principally for comfortable boats, which are not what we style ocean greyhounds. Now if we can secure two of these boats for this service running to Canada, it is going to be a great benefit, and a great advantage in other directions, it is going to improve the service. This contract expires at the end of two years, after which we may be able to make still more progress than we are making now. As I said before, if we are able to carry our products to the ocean ports for shipment there so that we can give these boats business and trade, there is no doubt but that we will get in due time the fast service that we are all so anxious to secure.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member evidently misunderstood me, at least he misrepresents me. I had not a word of complaint with regard to the proposed new steamers, because I think they are certainly a great improvement on the old ones, they are faster. But what I complain of is that we have made so little headway during the last seven years, and that the best that is offered us to-day are two more boats that will make but little better speed than the old ones.

Mr. CLARKE. As far as the item under consideration is concerned it doesn't make much difference as to whether people prefer to travel by a slow boat or a fast boat. We are asked to add fifty per cent to the sum that has been voted for mail subsidies, and we are only getting an accelerated speed of a knot and a half in the hour. The question is what will be the result so far as the mail service is concerned from this increased expenditure of $85,000? It will result in increasing the average speed by a knot or a knot and a half an hour, and that is all. What is the advantage to be gained by the people from this $85,000 of additional expenditure? This subsidy, as I understand, is given for the carriage of the mails; but if the mails continue to pass through the New York post office for the purpose of being transmitted to the old country by a faster line than we can offer, what advantage are we going to get? That is what we want to get at. The question is not whether the people prefer to travel by a slow boat or a fast one; we want to know what advantage we are going to derive from this fifty per cent additional expenditure so far as the carriage of the mails in concerned? If the mails are to be sent via New York what advantage are we to obtain from this increased subsidy? Before the item passes, I would

like the hon. gentleman to bring us the particulars of the acceleration of speed which has been accomplished during the past eight years. We have, I think, a record of the average speed for the year before last; we want to see wherein the average time of crossing has been reduced during the past eight years. The hon. gentleman must have these particulars in his office, and when the committee resumes at three o'clock I hope he will be able to give them to us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will see what we have.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The subject before the committee is the further consideration of resolution 153, ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before we proceed with the discussion of this item, might I ask the minister whether it is true that an official of the department has been sent up to Sarnia, to the Standard Oil Refinery, to look after the interests of the producers?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An official was sent up to report on the best method of distributing the bounty, if that is what my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then I understand that instead of going to the producing district, the agent was sent to the Standard refinery to find out the best way of distributing the bounty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand he went all over.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What might I understand from 'all over'?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He went to both parties, the refiners and the producers, and examined the mode of production in the district generally.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did he go to Petrolea?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The information I have is very different.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can only give the information that I have received from the department that he was there.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the minister been able to procure a statement as to the average time and average speed of the vessels during the last six or eight years? The right hon. gentleman said that the time had been cut down by two or three days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was referring more particularly to the time made in 1895 and 1897.

Mr. CLARKE. Will we be able to get a return for the average time in 1895 and 1897 and the names of the ships?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the names of the ships. But from Moville to Halifax in 1895 they took ten days and ten hours on the average, in 1897 ten days and 22 hours.

Mr. CLARKE. That was an improvement in favour of 1895 as against 1897. Has the hon. gentleman the times for the years since 1897?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No. I have not the time for the whole period.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of that statement that the time has been reduced by two or three days from what it was in 1896 it would be well to have it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall get that but it may take some little time to procure it.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the minister a reasonable assurance that as the result of this new contract with the Allans and the increase of the subsidies by $85,000 a year, the Canadian mails will go by these ships from Canadian ports?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A certain proportion but not more.

Mr. CLARKE. If the right hon gentleman has not a reasonable assurance that as a result of this increased subsidy of $85,000 a year the Canadian mails will go by Canadian ships what particular advantage is there?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course it is open to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) to move to return to the old condition if he likes. The advantage is that we get a much better service than ever before for passengers and freight and incidentally for the mails. The hon. gentleman knows very well that we do not profess or pretend that this will bring us any large additional proportion of the mails; I do not think that it is to be looked for. So long as there is a daily service from New York, as I have explained again and again, the vast proportion of the mails will go by New York and not by Canadian lines.

Mr. CLARKE. The fact is the mail subsidy is put on one side in this matter and that it is in order to have these steamers come to the St. Lawrence that we are paying £2,000 sterling a round trip to each vessel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For these vessels running 17 knots.

Mr. CLARKE. The two turbines?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. To induce the Allans to put on these two ships on the St. Lawrence

route between British and Canadian ports we have to subsidize each of them to the extent of £2,000 each trip.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is so.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The right hon. minister says that fresh contracts have been made within the last year. Has he made any provision to protect the shippers in regard to freight rates? Are the freight rates to be in the future as in the past season very much higher out of Montreal than on boats from New York, even although we subsidize these boats to the extent of $10,000 for each trip of the new boats?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a provision under which control can be exercised over them, but I cannot pretend to say that we will be able to obtain as low rates from Montreal as from New York. At the present time, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, the rates from Montreal are very low indeed, lower than from New York.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. There is very little freight going now and when there is little freight offered the boats always lower the rates. It is when a large cargo is going over that it is of the utmost importance to the producers that the rates should be as low as possible, but that is the time the steamboats raised the rates, when they could really afford to carry cheaper. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) complains that these boats get light cargoes from Halifax and St. John. That was not the case from Montreal last year; they went out fully loaded, but the rates were 20 per cent higher than out of Boston and New York, and I would submit that in making these contracts where large subsidies are given, the government might protect the producers in that by stipulating as has been done in some cases that they should not charge a higher rate than is charged by vessels of similar speed from Boston, New York or Portland, and I submit that unless that has been done in this case, a very great injustice has been done to the producer. The minister stated also that cold storage was to be provided on these two new boats.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I believe there is already cold storage on the other boats. Is there any provision in the contracts with regard to the temperature in these cold storage chambers?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Agriculture defines proper cold storage.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The Minister of Agriculture states that it is impossible for him to control the temperature of these cold storage chambers after the original contract expired. There was an opportunity when these contracts were made to obtain absolute control by the Minister of Agriculture of the temperature of these chambers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The stipulation is for cold storage, but there is no particular provision as to temperature.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. That is the essential feature of cold storage. Cold storage is of very little use, indeed, unless the temperature is absolutely as required for the various commodities that are shipped. In fact it is not cold storage at all in the proper sense unless it is almost perfect and kept at the mark required by the various commodities that go forward. The producers and shippers complain that although large sums have been spent by the government in assisting steamships to provide cold storage still there is no control whatever over the chambers. On some vessels and on some voyages the temperature is absolutely correct. The stuff is carried over under proper conditions but on others again it is a long way from being perfect, and the Minister of Agriculture complains that he has no control and no power. It seems to me that if he has no power, if these contracts have expired, there was an opportunity in the making of these contracts to secure proper control.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as the Allan Line was concerned, no complaints were made to us as to cold storage. I am not prepared to speak as to the other vessels that had cold storage accommodation.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I may say that they are a long way from being perfect. Some are very good, but many are far, far from perfect or what they ought to be, and the only way we can be assured that the temperature will be properly kept is for the government to have an absolute control over the cold storage. If the government have control over one line and can assure the shippers that they will get proper accommodation on one line, then of course the other lines which do not get subsidies will have to do the same thing or they would not get the trade. When the government is giving this subsidy to the one line and making this contract they have an opportunity to absolutely control the situation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In case the cold storage is imperfect I have power to reduce the subsidy under the terms of the contract.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Perhaps a more important matter than the cold storage is the ventilation of these ships. Almost all our cheese, which is one of our chief articles

of export, and our apples go over, not in cold storage and not in what we call cool air storage, but in the ordinary holds of the vessels, which ought to be ventilated. It is a very small matter to secure that ventilation and it appears to me that the government have no power over the steamships in this matter. All that has been done apparently is that the Minister of Agriculture has sent a letter asking the steamship companies to properly ventilate the holds. Some have done this and others have not. There was an opportunity when these contracts were being made to provide for ventilation of the holds. I would like to ask the minister if that has been done.

Mr. WADE. With regard to this particular line of steamships the apple shippers of Nova Scotia are not so much concerned; they do not carry very many of the apples from Nova Scotia, inasmuch as their destination is Liverpool, while our market is London. With regard to New Brunswick, I have heard of no complaint except in one case, that of a steamship which was in distress and put in at the Azores, with the result that her cargo was landed in bad condition. The Canadian Pacific Railway boats and other lines that carry fruit have landed their cargoes in good condition, and no complaint has been made about them. I would like to see the government retain a control over the rates charged by the steamship lines. I do not know anything about the rates on grain, but I think the government should have some control over the freight rates on fruit. I take exception to the statement made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that this vote is for a mail subsidy alone. It is a subsidy for a mail and a steamship service, and I think the freight service which we are able to obtain is very important, and should be well looked after. So far as my province is concerned, I must say that very good work has been done as regards the shipment of fruit. The stringency of the provisions of the contract which the government has exacted from the steamship people has compelled them to carry the fruit over in a very much better condition than formerly. Last year it gave absolute satisfaction, except in the case of one steamer, to which I have directed the ministers attention.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. How does the hon. gentleman know that fruit and apples and cheese are carried over in such perfect condition?

Mr. WADE. I did not speak of cheese; I referred to the apples shipped from the province of Nova Scotia and from New Brunswick.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. How does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. WADE. I know it in the same way you would know anything; from information I have gathered. I have been at pains to inquire. I have been on the docks in London and have seen the fruit delivered from the steamers. I have been at the market, and have seen the fruit there. I have conversed with the leading shippers throughout the Annapolis valley, and from their testimony I am justified in forming my opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this subsidy given for the shipping of apples, or is it a mail subsidy? What we want to know is what advantage the country will get from this additional mail subsidy of $85,000.

Mr. WADE. The steamship lines that carry the bulk of the fruit from Nova Scotia are the Furness-Withy and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and a subsidy has been granted to them. I do not say that they do not get any cargoes in St. John or Halifax. I said they did not get sufficient cargo, and that is a fact. I went over in the 'Pretorian' myself when she had only one-third of a cargo, and I speak feelingly on the matter, because the steamer rolled a good deal in consequence.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) seems to think that because he saw some apples landed in good condition on the other side, our shipments of apples have been carried over in perfect condition. The fact is that, although a good many apples may have been carried over in good condition, there also have been a good many carried over in bad condition.

Mr. WADE. From Nova Scotia?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. WADE. What ship delivered her cargo in bad shape, and whose fruit did she carry?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I could give the hon. gentleman the information with a little trouble. Some of these same steamers went from Montreal and the ventilation was not much changed in the meantime. It is a very easy matter to prove this by putting one thermograph where the fruit is carried and another thermograph on deck, so that the temperatures might be compared. The Minister of Agriculture told us that he had no power to control the ventilation on these vessels, but the time to get that power is when you are making these contracts. The contract has now been made for another two years, and there is no provision made that the Minister of Agriculture or his officers shall have power to board these vessels and see that the regulations are enforced. Again the government have let the opportunity slip by them.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has announced that he is satisfied with an Atlantic service of about fourteen and a half knots, and he has

also announced that we will have to content ourselves with the fact that possibly for all time to come the bulk of our mails will be carried by way of New York. I do not accept either of these propositions as being correct; and I do not think the people of Canada will calmly agree that we are not to have a fast Atlantic service, or that the bulk of the Canadian mail matter must be carried by New York. In 1896 both political parties had committed themselves to a fast Atlantic service, and the Conservative government before leaving office had made a contract for such a service by steamers of 20 knots or 21 knots an hour. That is confirmed by a statement made last session by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and which is reported in 'Hansard,' page 14161. When the Liberal government came to power, for reasons which have never been satisfactorily explained to the country, they saw fit to put an end to the proposed arrangement with the Allans, and they told us that they would secure faster vessels with better accommodation for passengers and freight. Accordingly, in 1897, the minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) brought down a resolution with reference to the Petersen contract.

At that time the present government thought that any service of less than twenty or twenty-one knots was too slow, and that it was an absolute necessity in the interest of the country that we should have a fast service. What did the hon. gentlemen then promise to the country? They promised to furnish steamships of 10,000 gross registered tons instead of 8,500 tons, and to maintain on the line from port to port across the Atlantic an average speed of 500 knots per day, or twenty-one knots per hour. They promised, in connection with such service and forming part thereof, to provide and maintain fast tenders of the torpedo-boat type, of a speed of not less than twenty-two knots per hour, to meet the steamers on their approach to Canada, to act as pilot boats, so as to ensure in the navigation of such ships both safety and speed, and that the said steamships should be constructed, fitted and maintained in all respects equal to the best Atlantic steamers now afloat. That contract was said to have been consummated, and it was represented on that occasion, not only by the right hon. gentleman who introduced it, but by those who followed him, that it was absolutely necessary in the interest of the country. To-day we not only have the right hon. gentleman intimating that we shall have to put up with having the mails of this country carried by American vessels, but that 14½ knots an hour is a respectable service for Canada; and we have other hon. gentlemen—for instance, the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade)—saying that it is a mistake for any government to think that a fast Atlantic service is desirable—that what the people want is slow and gentle travelling—not to go very rapidly, but to go with exceptional comfort. What the Petersen contract was said to secure was both exceptional comfort, high-class travelling, and a speed of twenty-one knots an hour. That we had secured that was announced by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, in a speech which he made on the 6th of October, 1897, in the city of Toronto. With a considerable flourishing of trumpets he said that we were going to have an immediate end put to the Americans carrying the mails of Canada, and Canada was going to secure her own carrying trade and also the carrying trade of a great portion of the western states as well. This is what the right hon. gentleman said on that occasion:

> Sir Frank Smith's government had undertaken to give to that service a bonus, a subsidy, of $750,000 a year. We thought it was too much. We thought we could do it for less, and we succeeded in making a contract with a firm for a subsidy of $500,000, saving to the country therefore the sum of $250,000. We contracted with the firm of Petersen, Tate & Co., a Newcastle firm, a firm composed as we ascertained, of men of the highest honour, of the highest integrity, and the highest competency in their profession.

This is almost like the Transcontinental Railway question. When the right hon. gentleman speaks of any man with whom he makes contracts, he always refers to him as a man of the highest integrity, the highest honour, and the highest qualities of every kind. But in the case of the Transcontinental Railway it may turn out as did that of the fast Atlantic service, that he had not investigated as fully as he thought. The right hon. gentleman went on to say:

> Mr. Petersen and Mr. Tate have had a good many obstacles to overcome, as is always the case with men who launch a new idea into the world. Their idea was a new one, and therefore it met with objections and with discouragement from more than one class of people; and not later than a few few weeks ago, or a few days ago only, it was stated that the scheme of Mr. Petersen had fallen down, that it must be considered as absolutely a thing of the past. Mr. Petersen and Mr. Tate were at work. They work as men always work when they want to succeed. They said nothing; they answered no accusations; but to-day I have a telegram from my friend and colleague, Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, to this effect: 'Petersen has made to-day the deposit required by the contract.' (Loud cheering and great enthusiasm.)

And yet these hon. gentlemen are prepared to tell the people now that they were all wrong on that occasion, that there is no necessity for a fast Atlantic service, and that we ought to be content with 14½ knots an hour and with seeing the bulk of our mails go by American boats. Further:

> It is with joy indeed that I welcome this explosion of satisfaction at the announce-

ment that this scheme had not failed, but that it is to be carried through. I know that in some quarters this idea of having this passenger traffic amongst us was not popular; but, Sir, let me say to you that if there is a patriotic idea in the land it is the idea that we should not only carry the freight, but carry the passengers between America and Europe. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We can do it, we ought to do it, and now it is no longer in doubt.

Further on he said:

This line of steamers shall be completed probably within two years, certainly within three years. And when we have this class of steamers afloat on the ocean I have no hesitation, such is my confidence in the scheme—and it is a confidence which must be borne by every man who has looked into the subject—that we shall have the great bulk not only of Canadian traffic, but of American traffic as well. Sir, remember this, what I say is no idle boasting. Remember that the St. Lawrence route is the shortest of all routes. Now, as you know, all men have an aversion to the sea—I know I have—(laughter)—and my experience is not exceptional in this respect; all men have a terror of the sea; but when tourists know and are aware that upon the Canadian line, with a class of steamers having a speed of twenty knots an hour, equal in comfort to the best afloat on the ocean, there will be no more than four days between land and land—(applause)—the Canadian line will be patronized as no other. (Great cheering.) What will be the case when this line is in operation? The case will be this: that a passenger taking the steamer at Moville, say, if Moville is to be the Irish port, within less than four days will be in the strait of Belle Isle, and then within less than one day, or twenty-four hours, will be in the harbour of Quebec, and one day's sailing on the beautiful St. Lawrence with its magic scenery and free from all discomforts of the sea. (Applause.) When we have this line with us we shall not only have the entire Canadian traffic, but we must as a necessity have the larger proportion of the American traffic. This that I say may perhaps seem presumptuous. It is not. At all events, if it is, I have such an unbounded faith in my country that I believe every word that I say now and I am sure it will come out to be true also.

I am not finding any fault with the language of the right hon. gentleman in Toronto. It was intended as a campaign speech. He speaks a little wide of the mark, according to the contract his government had entered into, even if they had succeeded in consummating the bargain. What I am complaining of, and what will disappoint the country after so many years, is that it turns out to have been mere vain boasting, for we are not securing our own traffic or the carriage of our own mails, and we are about to spend enormous sums of money, not for securing the traffic of the Orient through this country, while the government are allowing the traffic of Canada to be diverted into other channels. Instead of making a retrograde movement, we ought to make a movement in advance. We had a better contract with the Allans in 1896. Even the Petersen contract was an improvement on the present one, as under it we were entitled to a 21-knot an hour service, and we should now be looking for something better than a weekly service. Having regard to the improvements that are being made in other countries and the keen competition that must always exist between this country and the United States, we should be taking a step in advance and demanding greater facilities for the export of our products than we contemplated securing in 1896. But instead we are advancing in the fashioin of the crab, backwards and I regret exceedingly that the minister has seen fit to express his perfect content with present conditions. I regret that he should contemplate so philosophically a service giving only an average of fourteen and a half knots per hour, owing to which our mails are still being carried to a large extent by steamers sailing from the United States. And in answer to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), the right hon. gentleman complacently assured us that as far as he could see we would have to look to a continuance of this state of things.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of past experience, it seems to me that this contract is very loosely drawn from the point of view of the interests of this country. We had very elaborate information given us by the Minister of Agriculture regarding the contracts he had made with steamship companies for the carriage of Canadian produce. But as regards that matter, I find this short clause in the contract:

It is understood and agreed that each steamer, while running under this contract, shall be fitted with adequate cold storage accommodation to the satisfaction of the minister.

There is no provision that the company shall keep the cold storage at any particular temperature suitable to the requirements of the class of produce sent or that they will provide any extensive plant of cold storage or to what extent. That is altogether optional with them. They do not say how many or how few tons they will provide to carry by cold storage. There is another very important omission, and that is what rates shall be charged those who use the cold storage. A few years ago we found that our shippers could not avail themselves of the cold storage plants because the rates charged were too high, and they fell back on the old system. Afterwards the Minister of Agriculture took credit for having provided against all these contingencies by a specific contract in which fixed rates were stipulated. But in this contract, we find no such safeguard. All that is provided is that these steamers when running under this contract shall be fitted with adequate cold storage accommodation to the satisfaction

of the minister. Are the courts to determine what is adequate cold storage ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will be determined by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. If the company provide cold storage, they will probably stand on their rights and say they have complied with the contract, no matter whether the cold storage they have supplied is suitable for the people or not. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has told us that there was an admirable system of cold storage provided for the carrying of apples from Annapolis.

Mr. WADE. Not cold storage, but forced ventilation.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that he was talking cold storage.

Mr. WADE. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, ventilated chambers if you will.

Mr. WADE. Not ventilated chambers, the whole ship is ventilated by forced ventilation.

Mr. SPROULE. They are all ventilated in any event.

Mr. WADE. No, they are not.

Mr. SPROULE. But whether that ventilation is suitable is another thing.

Mr. WADE. It is suitable to the shippers.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has told us that he knows all about it, and when I asked him where he got his information, he told us he was standing on the dock and saw Canadian apples being landed in England.

Mr. WADE. I got my information from the shipper.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's information does not agree with the Minister of Agriculture's Report, which says distinctly that a great deal of the fruit was spoiled.

Mr. WADE. That the fruit shipped from Nova Scotia was spoiled ?

Mr. SPROULE. From Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada I understood.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. No fruit from Nova Scotia was spoiled last year except one cargo, and that was a case in which the ship broke down and had to put into another port.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's denial of the minister's report, I do not accept as of any value. I am taking the report of the minister.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). The agents in London have been sending out circulars describing the splendid condition in which the apples of Nova Scotia arrived. They say that these apples were packed much better than the apples from Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I can give my experience right from the county from which I come. A gentleman shipping apples both from Ontario and Annapolis is my authority for the statement I am about to make. He told me that he sold apples from the Georgian Bay district higher than the best apples from Nova Scotia. I will give that gentleman's name. He is a Mr. Carson, who has been several years engaged in the trade. He said that if we would provide suitable cold storage for the carriage of fruit, we would get much more remunerative prices. In this contract there is no provision for ventilating chambers or for anything except adequate cold storage, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce is to be the judge. But you require different temperatures for different kinds of freight. Professor Robertson told us a few years ago that when you ship butter, you must ship it in cold storage of about 35 degrees Fahrenheit. But if you ship apples you must have a different temperature. The temperature must not be too low or the fruit will be injured, and when brought to the air will deteriorate very rapidly and be all covered with moisture that spoils it. Grapes require a different cold storage, tomatoes require a different cold storage, and so with peaches ; and, if suitable cold storage or ventilation chambers are not provided, the shipment of fruit by this method will be a failure. It is because of this information coming from officers employed by the government who may be regarded as experts in this line that my attention is drawn to the fact that no adequate provision is made in this contract for the shipment of these various kinds of fruit. If provision is made for cold storage suitable for each kind of fruit, I cannot find it in the contract. I have already drawn attention also to the fact that no provision is made for rates. The vessel owners may charge any rates they like, even if they make them prohibitory. Unless a proper provision as to rates is made when the contract is entered into, no ordinary business astuteness is exercised in making the contract. Another thing is that this contract is to be for the carrying of the mails. The minister has told us more than once that he does not look for any great change in the carriage of the mails in the future, but that the bulk of our mails will continue to go by New York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I spoke of the duration of this contract. I think I said it plainly enough to be understood.

Mr. LENNOX. I think there is a mistake. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if we were to understand that for all time to come the mails would continue to be carried as now, and he said ' Yes.'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said nothing about all time to come. I was speaking of the duration of this contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that the fact that a steamer left New York every day while we had only one leaving every week was sufficient reason why the mails should go by New York.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was speaking of the present time and of the contract now under consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. gentleman certainly put the question how we could not hope to carry the mails from Canada while we had only one steamer a week, while in New York they have a steamer every day. And he said that for that reason, if for no other, that route would certainly be taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SPROULE. Yet, this contract is to carry the mails. But if the vessels cannot carry the mails what is the use of our spending the money ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) move that the vote be struck out and take the sense of the House upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. But why should I do that ? The improvement, so far as there is an improvement, is one that I desire to see made. But I wish to ascertain whether the country is not paying too much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My opinion is that the country is not called upon to pay too much, but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is of a different opinion let him take the sense of the House on the question.

Mr. SPROULE. I am simply giving the reasons that lead me to believe that we are paying too much for what we are getting. But I also desire to bring out additional information, and am only making use of the information that the minister has given us with regard to the contract that he asks us to consent to by voting this money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are getting a contract under which, instead of 14½ knots, a speed of 17 knots is provided for during half the year and nearly as good during the remainder of the year for two vessels, and 15 knots for the other two vessels. And, in that you are getting a great advance on the present condition of affairs.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand the contract, there is only one fast vessel to come on in August and the other to come on in the spring, so we do not get two vessels for half the year. If the new invention proves a success of course we shall have the higher speed for a portion of the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will note that the payments are strictly on their performance. They do not get the extra payment unless they give the extra service.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) seemed to think there was no foundation for the statement that goods are not carried in good condition. I would like to read an extract from a despatch to the Toronto 'Globe,' dated June 26th :

> According to a report received by the extension of markets division of the Department of Agriculture, a shipment of Canadian cheese was recently landed at London, Eng., in a heated condition, due to being carried across the ocean from Montreal in a poorly ventilated part of the ship.

Mr. WADE. Did I say anything about cheese ? Why attribute such statements to me ? Surely I repeated it twice showing that I had no reference to cheese but was speaking exclusively of apples shipped from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But the conditions which would carry cheese over in bad condition would carry apples in bad condition. It is not a question of cheese or apples, but a question of the condition of the vessel, and whether proper advantage was taken of the opportunity afforded by the making of this contract to provide for such matters as this. This is a simple matter, but a matter of very great importance to the shippers of this country. The government had the opportunity to secure what the Minister of Agriculture says they have not now—control of the situation with regard to this matter. Failure to control the situation means an enormous loss to the producers of cheese and apples and other perishable products simply through these compartments not being properly ventilated. Some of them may be properly ventilated, but the vast majority of them are not so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be interesting to have this question settled. Perhaps the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) would tell us how many days he spent on the docks, how many visits he made to the markets, and what proportion of the shippers he consulted.

Mr. WM. ROSS. (Victoria). And how many apples he ate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not accused my hon. friend from Annapolis of having eaten a whole cargo. I am talking about his knowledge.

Mr. WADE. I will answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he wishes to be answered. I must say it is not a very brilliant way of asking questions even if it does come from the hon. gentleman. I suppose he is aware that I did not spend

many days on the docks in London. But I did spend several hours there. I also made visits to the market at Covent Garden, and could give some testimony as to the superiority of the Nova Scotia fruit in the opinion of dealers there, for Nova Scotia fruit was bringing a higher price in the market than the Ontario fruit though the Nova Scotia barrel is considerably smaller. But most of my information I got from shippers and growers. I have talked to scores and hundreds of people in the Annapolis Valley, in the hon. gentleman's native county of King's as well as in my own native county of Annapolis. I have communications from many of these people expressing satisfaction with the way the service is performed, with the exception of this cargo of which I have spoken. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) would believe that I would rise in the House and make a statement of that sort unless I had something to base it upon. It is a matter of vital importance to the people of the Annapolis Valley that their fruit should be transported in proper condition. They are constantly writing and talking to me on the subject, and they are grateful that the service has been improved and are satisfied with it. The fruit has gone forward in good condition and it is only proper that I should state that to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All this is beside the question. No one has disputed that a very large quantity of apples went over in good condition. But that is not the point, though it is the point to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) addressed himself. The statement he undertook to make was that all the fruit——

Mr. WADE. Not at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) will allow me—as I understood him, all the fruit went over in good condition, with the exception of one cargo from Nova Scotia. I say he has not shown any information which would justify him in making that statement. There may have been fifty cargoes, for anything he has said, that went over in bad condition. He will not undertake to say that he has investigated even seventy-five per cent of the cargoes that have gone across in any such way as would justify him in making such a statement——

Mr. WADE. I have examined them in such a way as to justify me in making that statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Seventy-five per cent ?

Mr. WADE. Yes, more than seventy-five per cent. I say the whole has gone over in good condition, with the exception of one cargo. I know where to get the information and I have taken the trouble to get it. There are officers of the government who are watching these shipments, and there are shippers who are interested in the results and who are constantly getting the returns from the other side. Surely these men know whether their fruit has reached the market in good condition or not. If any cargo did not turn out well would it not be known inside of a day ? Would there not be a cable message here telling the parties interested of the result ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is the kind of investigation the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) talks about——

Mr. WADE. I suppose the hon. gentleman wants me to pick over every apple——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not want the hon. gentleman to do anything of the kind. or anything at all except to confine himself in speaking to matters about which he knows something.

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) say that there was one cargo taken over in bad condition except the one to which I referred ? Will he make any statement in contradiction of what I have said ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can name half a dozen shippers in one little district in the county of King's about the condition of whose shipments the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) has made no investigation and does not know the first thing. I have some personal knowledge myself as to some of these shipments and I venture to say the hon. gentleman does not know any thing at all about the condition in which these apples arrived in England. And when he ventures to stand in his place in parliament and state that he knows the condition of every cargo of apples that crossed the Atlantic from the province of Nova Scotia, he makes demands on my belief that I am really not able to satisfy. Now, I would like to ask what standard of cold storage the Department of Trade and Commerce has provided for. It is provided that the cold storage is to be to the satisfaction of the minister. That being so, I suppose the minister has his scheme provided and knows what he intends to demand, or, at all events that he proposes to take up that matter in the very near future. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) says he relies very much upon the words 'To the satisfaction of the minister.' That is what I gather. Without such words, of course, the provision would be simply illusory. The contract does not state definitely what cold storage is required, but simply gives a principle upon which a contract should be framed. The words of the contract are very good as a principle upon which to frame a contract, but they are almost useless, in fact meaningless, except for the words that he speaks of which have some value though, not, perhaps, as a matter of law, the value which the right hon.

gentleman thinks should be given to them. But if we are going to depend upon these altogether, we surely should have some statement as to what the minister proposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On that point I intended to confer with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who has had that matter under his special charge and has been making very careful inquiries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know to what extent the Minister of Agriculture will be of assistance to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Some of the opinions expressed in the House as to his efforts in regard to cold storage in the past would not seem to recommend him as an authority. Possibly the Minister of Trade and Commerce has weighed these matters and he may have——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister of Agriculture and his officers have a good deal of information and probably correct information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Possibly. Even giving to these words the fullest possible meaning, the contract does not seem to have been very carefully drawn. 'To the satisfaction of the minister'—in what respect?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That the cold storage shall be adequate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not say in all respects. I should suppose that a carefully drawn contract would have provided that the cold storage accommodation should be satisfactory to the minister in regard to the extent of it. Is the entire steamer to be fitted up with cold storage or is it only to be such portion as the minister requires?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The usual proportion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not say so. The provision is remarkably bald.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is a good lawyer. I think he will admit, that, in drawing such a contract there is danger of falling into pitfalls if you attempt to draw the contract too closely. A discretionary power properly used especially where it is to the interest of the steamship company to provide good accommodation, will secure better results than by attempting to confine them too closely under the contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is some force in what the right hon. gentleman says. Still, I think that more than three lines of the contract might have been devoted to the subject if the department desires to be safe. It says :

It is understood and agreed that each steamer, while running under this contract, shall be fitted with adequate cold storage accommodation to the satisfaction of the minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had it in mind that, in having the cold storage accommodation made to my satisfaction, I would consult the Minister of Agriculture who, as the hon. gentleman knows, has been fitting up a great many vessels with cold storage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, apparently, if my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) is to be regarded as possessing any information on the subject, with no very great results.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not had any complaint of the adequacy of the cold storage so far.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But it would seem that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) is going to an authority who has not produced the best results in the past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) will have his own opinion. I cannot induce him, perhaps, to regard my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) as right except on militia matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will be content to believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) knows as much about this as he does about militia matters, if that will be any satisfaction to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce might appeal to his colleague (Mr. Fisher) on these matters with just as much confidence and probability of securing good results as was found when that hon. gentleman was called in to administer the affairs of the Department of Militia. But the question is whether the country will be satisfied with these results, however much the Minister of Trade and Commerce may be satisfied with them. For instance, this cheese which went over so late as the 26th of June, has gone over in a bad and heated condition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I don't think it went over in an Allan boat.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am talking about the results obtained by the Minister of Agriculture, results which have been detailed in an organ of the government, which I am sure the right hon. gentleman will not question, the Toronto 'Globe,' which is more to him than the Bible, and he more to it than a prophet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not so regard it, nor any other paper that ever was published.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The extremely intimate relation between the hon. gentleman and that organ would justify me in appealing to it, and that journal has shown that

this cheese went over in a bad and heated condition. Yet the Minister of Trade and Commerce will go to the Minister of Agriculture in order that a line of steamships may be fitted up in precisely the same way. That does not seem to promise very good results. However, it is possible that even the Minister of Trade and Commerce may repent and seek some better source of information, and possibly he may be induced to obtain a modification of this contract so that definite and precise provisions may be included, perhaps by a supplementary agreement, and that there may be something substantial upon which we may call the contractors to account in case the results are not satisfactory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may say to my hon. friend that I had some conversation with some of his legal confreres in the Department of Justice on that point, and they rather intimated that it was inexpedient to go into minute details in the matter, for the reasons I have given, and which I think we must admit, always supposing I can secure an opinion from my colleagues, will have some force.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I submit that the contract affords no protection whatever. The clause which the minister has pointed out as being a protecting clause is of no practical utility at all. We have facilities on every boat that has cold storage, the plant is there, the refrigerating plant is there the insulating chambers are there, the facilities are there, but they are not put into operation, and that is where the weakness of this contract comes in. The contract simply provides that the boats shall be fitted with adequate cold storage accommodation. Even if they are fitted with cold storage accommodation, we have no surety that we shall have any particular temperature. That is the point; the government should have control of the temperature. No matter how good the facilities are, how good the chamber is, or how good the refrigerating plant may be, if they do not provide you with a proper temperature they are of no earthly use, the goods may arrive in any sort of condition. That is the crux of the whole question. I say the government should have provided in this contract to retain control over the temperature, with power to insist that the temperature shall be so and so for the different products. Then it would be of some use. That clause simply provides that they shall put cold storage chambers on the boat, but we have no surety that they will be effective.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What system of cold storage is to be placed on these boats?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The same system that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture introduced into the various vessels to which he has given contracts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What system might that be?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not quite sure of the name; it is an English system, I believe.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The minister has admitted that the facilities to be provided are similar to those that have been provided in the boats we already have in operation, and we know from experience that these are far from being effective. Many of these boats carry goods in an excellent condition, but many other boats do not. The trouble is that the government has no power to say what the temperature shall be, whether it shall be 10, 20 or 50 degrees. As a matter of fact, some of them do not maintain a temperature that will carry the stuff over in proper condition, yet the minister says the same facilities are provided in this new contract. Therefore, I think the minister has been derelict in his duty in making this contract, because he should have provided that the government shall have control of the temperature.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister understand that a part of this subsidy is to cover the expense of providing cold storage on these vessels, that is to say, that that was one of the considerations?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was provided before, as I understand.

Mr. SPROULE. I find in the Auditor General's Report, page D—117, that we paid last year $9,432 for fitting up the steamer 'Tunisian' with cold storage, and we paid for the 'Bavarian' $8,900. Now, it seems we are paying double for this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; that was before the contract was made. This particular clause the hon. gentleman refers to has no reference to the two new steamships to be built.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood these were the steamships that had to do the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The expenditure the hon. gentleman refers to was incurred and paid prior to the contract we now have under discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are using the same steamships.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they have got it already, they will not require any more.

Mr. SPROULE. We are giving them a consideration for fitting up and providing what we paid them for last year, and they are practically agreeing to do what they have already agreed to do and been paid for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But we are not giving them any more.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are paying, without any consideration of this subsidy condition, for cold storage, a portion of which has been paid for already. Then there are two new boats provided for in this contract, two new 17-knot boats. The provision had more especial reference to these two boats, the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian.'

Mr. SPROULE. Our information was that all of these boats had to provide cold storage for perishable products.

Mr. CLARKE. In answer to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the minister stated that these steamers were all running from Montreal ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not optional with the contractors whether they should run from Montreal or not ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, they would go to Montreal.

Mr. CLARKE. The contract distinctly says that it is at their option; the voyage may terminate at Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact there is not the slightest doubt that the steamers will go to Montreal. The Allans invariably start from there even although they are not able to get a full cargo there.

Mr. CLARKE. The contract provides that they may run from Montreal at the option of the contractors ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is the phrase, but as a matter of fact the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the Allans always run from Montreal.

Mr. CLARKE. But it is at the option of the contractors, whether they shall run from Montreal or not.

Then it is provided in clause 2 :

> It being understood and agreed that if from any cause it should be proven impossible for the steamers running the service to secure cargoes from St. John in the winter season, the minister in his discretion may relieve them from going to that port.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has occasionally occurred, I do not think it will occur frequently.

Mr. CLARKE. It is not yet quite clear to me why this increased subsidy has been given to the two steamers already in the service, the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian.'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I explained that when this proposition was originally made a very considerable larger sum was asked for the 17-knot steamers. That I declined to give, but I agreed to give for the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian' a little more, an amount not at all equal to the reduction I made from the sum demanded for the others.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand, the subsidy to these two is increased by 33⅓ per cent ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not so much, I was paying £1,000 during the winter always.

Mr. CLARKE. And how much during the summer ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. £750 during the summer. It is during the summer only that the increase is made.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the minister to say this morning that in the winter these steamers would run to St. John and Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Not that it was optional with the department to allow them to finish the voyage at Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under special circumstances they may be relived if it is not possible to obtain cargo at St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. As a matter of fact that was tried last winter. The Allans stated they could not get sufficient cargo at St. John and so went to Halifax for cargo. We have all heard the statement of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) that these steamers could not get sufficient cargo at Halifax, and I am quite prepared to maintain that if the steamers cannot get a sufficient cargo at St. John they certainly will not get it at Halifax. The freight which is given to these steamers in the winter time comes very largely, as we all know, by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have their own line of steamers, to which I presume they will give the first choice of cargo. But so far as relieving the steamers from going to the port of St. John is concerned, I do not see how they are going to get cargo at Halifax if they cannot get it at St. John. Halifax is served by the Intercolonial Railway, and St. John is also served by the Intercolonial Railway and if that traffic is to be carried to Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway it certainly could be much more readily and more cheaply carried to St. John than to Halifax, because the haul would be so much shorter. No doubt there would be some local cargo from the province of Nova Scotia, but there would be this at St. John too. A great deal of the province of Nova Scotia which borders on the Bay of Fundy is served better and more cheaply by St. John than by Halifax, and I do not see why the steamers should be relieved from going to St. John. Of course we all know that pressure is sometimes brought to bear in these matters apart from business considerations. I did not know until I heard the hon. member (Mr. Wade) make the statement to-day that the Allan steamers were not able to get any cargo at all at Halifax.

Mr. WADE. No, I did not make the statement that they could not get any cargo at all, I said they could not get sufficient cargo.

Mr. DANIEL. For my part, I do not altogether approve of the change.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless there is cause shown they certainly will not be allowed to skip St. John.

Mr. BLAIN. What increase in the subsidy was necessitated by the providing of cold storage accommodation ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to these new boats, no special allowance was made.

Mr. BLAIN. No special allowance ? Then I have the right to assume they would have been fitted up with cold storage even had the government not entered into a contract with them ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Agriculture has been fitting up most of the vessels from Montreal with cold storage appliances. In this particular case I do not propose that he should pay any more.

Mr. BLAIN. I have to call attention to what the Minister of Agriculture said on that point. At 7612 of last year's 'Hansard' after discussing the question of cold storage and the amount of money the government were spending the hon. minister concluded his remarks by saying :

> The ship-owners themselves have put in a great many of these cold storage plants without any assistance and without entering into any contract with the government.

The hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks here was taking credit to the government for having spent a large amount of money with the steamship companies for cold storage and now they have reached the point that the vessel-owners will fit their vessels with cold storage without assistance from the government at all. I gather from my hon. friend's remarks that these vessel-owners would have fitted these vessels with cold storage without the assistance from the government at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not sure what they would have done with these particular vessels.

Mr. BLAIN. My right hon. friend will not say that because they were to fit them up with this so-called cold storage they had been given an increased subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I would not say that.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the committee must assume that if these are up to date vessel owners, as I supppose they are, they would have fitted them without increased subsidy. As the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) has pointed out, this cold storage system is entirely out of date. I might make that statement because it is not to come up to any standard ; therefore, I do not think it is right to give any subsidy on that account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The subsidy is paid for increased speed.

Mr. BLAIN. The increased speed is not very great and therefore the amount should not be very large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Every increase of a knot over a certain rate means an enormous increase of expense.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we to understand that all this additional subsidy is on account of the new boats that are to be supplied ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A large part of it, practically all. They are paid double what any other craft are paid.

Mr. SPROULE. We will only have one of these boats from August to the end of the season.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they make the trips they are to be paid double what the 'Tunisian' or 'Bavarian' are paid.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is possible to conceive that these new turbine boats will cost £500,000 sterling, then for 10 trips a year the government of Canada proposes to pay four per cent on the cost of these vessels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The extra running will cost quite as much as the subsidy.

Mr. CLARKE. They are only bound to make ten round trips and for that service they get £20,000 sterling, which is four per cent on the cost of the vessels. Is there any provision in the contract that there shall not be discriminating rates against Canadian products and in favour of American products which may be shipped on these steamers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is any provision of that kind.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any undertaking that when these vessels deliver the mails at Halifax or St. John they shall not proceed to Portland ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not permitted to go to Portland.

Mr. CLARKE. What provision in the contract prevents them ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a clause in the contract to prevent them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Clause 14 of the contract reads :

> The steamers employed in carrying out the provisions of this contract shall not on any voyages either outwards or inwards, call at any foreign port not specified in this contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that all the prohibition there is ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be quite sufficient to prevent them going to Portland. As a matter of fact it would be practically impossible for them to do so and carry out the terms of the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. As a matter of fact the Allan liners now go to Portland as their final port of destination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not the case. I believe the Allans do run ships to Portland, but not these ships.

Mr. CLARKE. What provision is made by the government to provide these vessels with cargo at St. John ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The government do not undertake to supply them with cargoes ; they must do that for themselves.

Mr. CLARKE. They are not bound to go to St. John if they cannot get sufficient cargo there ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They may be excused. Of course they will desire to obtain cargo at St. John if they possibly can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They might desire much more to obtain it somewhere else.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then they could only obtain it in Halifax.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes ; the contract provides that they must go either to Halifax or St. John, and the government can only excuse them from going to one place or the other.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand the contract these steamers must call at Halifax in winter under any circumstance, and at the discretion of the minister they may be required to go to St. John.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would put it the other way ; they must go to St. John and Halifax, but they may be excused under certain conditions from going to St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. Under what circumstances would the minister excuse the steamers from calling at St. John ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would excuse them only when it became perfectly evident that they could not obtain cargo at St. John. The Canadian Pacific Railway have a line of their own at St. John to which most probably they will give the preference. It has happened, perhaps owing to snowdrifts or other causes, that there has been absolutely no cargo at St. John in one or two cases ; I hope that will not often happen, but it would be only in an extreme case that this clause of the contract would be invoked.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister told us that it would be practically impossible for these vessels to carry out their contract and go to Portland. I do not think that statement can be sustained. It is more than likely that the 'Bavarian' or the 'Tunisian' would alternate with one of the turbine boats, which would give each of these vessels two weeks to cross the Atlantic, and as they are bound to make the voyage from Moville to St. John or Halifax in seven and a half days they would have no difficulty in proceeding from one of these Canadian ports to Portland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They would have to stay a certain time at St. John or Halifax, and I do not think they could carry out their contract if they called at Portland. Even if the hon. gentleman were correct in his contention, I hold that the contract prevents them from going to Portland at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the minister is satisfied that the contract binds them not to go to Portland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is the slightest intention on their part to go to Portland and I certainly would call them to task if they did.

Mr. CLARKE. There has been nothing done to prevent Canadian shippers being discriminated against by these contractors in the matter of rates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have not had any complaints of discrimination in the case of the Allan Line.

Mr. CLARKE. When the hon. gentleman's estimates were under consideration last year, we made some statements as to discrimination in rates, and, if my memory serves me, the hon. gentleman sent some of his officers to Boston and other points in the eastern states to ascertain if it was a fact that discrimination was used against Canadian shippers and in favour of foreign shippers. Has the hon. gentleman the report of his officers who made that inquiry, and if so, what did they find ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that the inquiry was made.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the railway officials in Boston in fact admitted that there was discrimination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman is in error on that point.

Mr. SPROULE. There was another reason why it seemed probable. When we were discussing the question of cold storage with the Minister of Agriculture and desired to know the rates that would be charged to those who might avail themselves of the cold storage, he gave us rates on certain lines, and he said the space was to be held

for Canadians for a certain length of time, but that if the whole cargo was not obtained within that time, the vessel was to receive freight from wherever it could get it. Then the question was asked whether freight was to be taken from Americans or others who were not paying any share of the cost of fitting up these steamers with cold storage, at the same rates as Canadians ? The hon. gentleman's answer was : What can we do ? The vessel requires a cargo, and if it cannot get a full cargo from Canadians, it should be allowed to get the balance from other quarters, and to carry it at the same rate as it charges Canadians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid it is almost impossible to avoid that.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the hon. gentleman make any inquiry as to whether or not it was a fact that discrimination existed against Canadian shippers on freight going either by Atlantic ports or by the Pacific?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, we caused some inquiry to be made, and we found that in general there was no discrimination. I am not prepared to say that there might not have been some in two or there isolated cases.

Mr. CLARKE. The statement I made in the House last year was based on information which was obtained from shippers and published from time to time in the newspapers. In one of the Toronto papers, I think the 'News,' there appeared a special despatch of the 23rd of February last, from its correspondent in Montreal, in which it was stated :

> Mr. W. R. MacInnes, freight traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was asked yesterday whether it were true that the Canadian Pacific Railway were giving shippers in United States manufacturing centres a better rate to Vancouver than was given to shippers in Montreal and Toronto. He replied that the rate on such American shipments would be a slight advance on the rate from the same American port to Seattle, the exact advance depending on the classification. It might in some instances be lower than the rate from Montreal to Vancouver. Anyhow, the situation was just the same now as it always had been. If any discrimination existed, they had existed before the American roads raised their tariffs, and were followed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The increase in rates by the Americans had been uniform, and applied to all routes between Chicago and points east of Chicago), and the Pacific coast.
>
> The contention has been made that discrimination also exists with regard to east bound freight—that better rates are given to shippers from Chicago by the railroads and the steamships than are given from points in Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not on the steamships. The railroads in their desire to compete, may give better rates, but I do not think the steamships do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With reference to the cold storage machinery, are tenders asked for ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of the old steamers, the machinery was provided under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. In the case of the new steamers the matter has been left in the hands of the Messrs. Allan.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did the Department of Agriculture ask for tenders ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That I could not say.

Mr. BLAIN. Before one o'clock I asked the hon. minister in regard to the prospect of more Canadian mail matter being carried through Canadian ports. I understood him to say that there was no prospect of an improvement in that direction. Since the recess he has qualified that to a certain extent, and I would now ask him what is the prospect of an increased proportion of our mail service going by Canadian routes instead of such a large proportion going by United States routes ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The department despatches mails to England by the quickest route. There are not vessels leaving Canada every day, and if the despatching of letters via American ports will result in their reaching their destination sooner than if detained for Canadian vessels, they will be sent through the American ports. I suppose the same rule is adopted by foreign post offices in despatching mails to Canada. The greater the improvement in our own service, the more mail matter will be sent by our own route. I understand that the Allans are building a turbine steamer which will have a speed of 17 knots per hour. That will be a considerable advance in speed over any of our present steamers and will cause a good deal of the mails, destined for eastern Canada at least, to come by our route instead of via New York. As to the mails for points west of Montreal, it would be rather difficult by any improvement in our own steamship service to get them into Ontario more quickly by Canada than by New York. There will always be a good deal of mail matter go by New York simply because you do not have steamers leaving on the Canadian route every day.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the difference in time in the case of a letter leaving Montreal by the Canadian route and one leaving New York ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It would depend upon what steamships were sailing.

Mr. BLAIN. Assuming the average mail service from New York and Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Take the Allan Line, which sails from Montreal on Friday. The mails are put on board at Rimouski, which is 130 miles east of Quebec and 250 east of Montreal. That steamer which takes those mails Saturday morning will reach perhaps Moville in about a week from that day or on Sunday morning, and the mails will not be in London before Monday morning. If they were sent by New York and happened to catch the 'Campania' or 'Lucania,' of the Cunard Line, they might reach London Saturday morning. Sometimes those two steamers reach Queenstown on Friday night. If they do, it is sometimes the practice of the English post office, which controls the handling of the mails, to have special trains waiting at Queenstown. The mails are put on shore there and sent from Ireland across by the fast packet, and they will reach London on Saturday morning. That, however, is a comparatively rare occurrence. The mails usually remain on board and only reach London on Saturday afternoon at the earliest. If on the other hand those letters were sent from New York by the steamers 'Umbria' and 'Etruria,' they would not reach London any quicker than by the Canadian route.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that speaking generally there is an advantage of about forty-eight hours in favour of New York ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not possible to speak about averages when you have vessels of entirely different speed and there are other disturbing circumstances. On the whole the mails that leave Canada by the Allan Line and those that go via New York reach London pretty much the same time. There are chances of the mails from New York reaching London on Saturday, but they are not always realized, and we prefer to give the public the benefit of those chances.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that it is only by chance that the mails leaving New York reach London quicker than by a Canadian port ? If that be true, it is difficult to understand why such a large portion is sent by New York.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It takes longer for a letter to go from Toronto to Rimouski than from Toronto to New York. You can post a letter in Toronto on Friday and it may catch the outgoing steamers on Saturday morning at New York, but if you wanted that letter to catch the steamer at Rimouski, it would have to be posted at Toronto much earlier.

Mr. CLARKE. The policy is to send the mails by the route which will bring them quickest to their destination ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of course.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any increase in the proportion sent during the past year by the Canadian route as compared with previous years ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have not got the figures but can get them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have a memo. here of the amount of mail matter that was sent by our own steamers this past year :

	Lbs.
Letters and post cards..	9,986
Newspapers..	74,336
Parcel mails..	62,649

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. gentleman a memorandum showing the weight of letters, cards and newspapers that went by New-York, the total weight despatched during the year ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT : 147,171 pounds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the total amount of subsidy payable under this contract to these two vessels ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About £60,000 sterling when they are all at work, and provided they carry out the stipulations of the contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So it is within $170,000 of what the government propose to pay for a fast Atlantic service five or six years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To Petersen, what Petersen offered to do it for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is amusing to hear the hon. gentleman talking about the failure of Petersen ; it would be more correct to regard it as the failure of the government. We were then told that the $750,-000 annual subsidy which had been proposed by the late Conservative administration, was absolutely absurd and unnecessary, that the proposal could not be carried out, and that this government could accomplish it at once at a saving to the country each year, for twenty years, of $250,000, or $5,000,000 altogether. That was the contract paraded to us in the House and all over the country ; and now we are engaged in the project of giving a subsidy of $330,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite a difference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, and quite a difference in speed and accommodation.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And in the cost.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The cost is about two-thirds, $330,000 as against $500,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think the estimated cost of the old project was $750,-000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of which $250,000 was furnished by the government of Great

Britain. The original proposal was $750,000 of an annual subsidy for 20 years by this government, which was to be supplemented by one-half that amount for the same period of time as an annual grant by the imperial government, making altogether $1,125,000 per annum of a subsidy. Well, this government said that was too much, they would not entertain that proposal, they would not go on with it, although the contract was with the very company was then ready, subject to a short delay to enable them to make their arrangements, to carry out that proposal. The proposal was deemed an extravagant one, $500,000 a year was considered ample, and we were treated to the bottle-necked vessels proposal, which was announced as an accomplished fact by the Prime Minister in Toronto after he had received a conveniently timed telegram from the Minister of Finance. Now some six years after, after the fast Atlantic service has been dropped by the government—because that was the effect of the statement of the Postmaster General last year—we are coming back to a proposal for a subsidy of $330,000 a year for a service of 17 knots for two steamers in the summer, and something less in the winter, and a service of 14 knots for the other steamers. I do not know whether my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce feels inclined to congratulate himself upon this magnificent result of eight years effort by a businesslike government. I am inclined to think that if he were disposed to congratulate himself upon this result, he would not find very much company among the people of Canada. I think it is a very pitiable result of all the efforts of this government for eight years, that we are now paying two-thirds of the amount which they said was amply sufficient for a fast service, and they are paying it for what would be regarded in New York as no better than a third-class service so far as speed is concerned. There may be some consideration present to our minds which should make us realize the importance of what one might call a fast freight service as well as a fast passenger service. But it has been the policy of the government as I understand, until within the last two years at least, to establish a fast Atlantic service, regarding it of so much importance that the Prime Minister himself was selected to heard the consummation of that project to the city of Toronto and the country. Now, either they have changed their minds or they have made a bad mess of it. I can appeal with confidence to the Minister of Trade and Commerce to join with me in that regret, because I know his own mind with regard to it. It is a pity I think that the government was so hasty when, on coming into power, they rejected what had been carefully thought out by their predecessors. If they had had a little more modesty, a little better comprehension of their own ability to deal with matters of this kind, they probably would not have taken the course which they did. If they had not taken that course, but had adopted a contract which might have been carried out, the country would have been enjoying a fast Atlantic service during the past five or six years, instead of being, as it is to-day, obliged to pay two-thirds of the amount which the former government proposed, and getting after all a third-class service. Have the government an idea of the average length of the passage twenty years ago, as compared with that which has prevailed, say during the past two or three years ? A writer in the public press of Halifax who professed to be familiar with this subject and who gave illustrations, citing the names of vessels, told us two or three years ago that the average rate of passage from Halifax to the mother country was practically the same to-day as it was 35 years ago, in 1867. I do not know whether his statement is correct. I think I brought the same statement to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can give the hon. gentleman a memo. of the time occupied in 1895 and 1897 from Moville to Halifax. It was ten days and ten hours on the average in 1895 and ten days and twenty-two hours in 1897.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And during the last year for instance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In 1892-93 it was ten days and four hours.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A slight improvement on the other record. I think it was not more than that thirty years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may remark to my hon. friend that from Moville to Halifax, from November to January the memo. I have here shows an average of eight days and six hours, that is in present seasons. That was on a voyage in 1903.

Mr. CLARKE. In the fall of 1903 ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the fall of 1903, yes. Then from Halifax to Moville it was much the same, 8 days and 6 hours. There has been an improvement in the present year.

Mr. DANIEL. I think that as far back as 1866 or 1867 the Cunard Line of steamers running from Halifax made the voyage in 8 days, occasionally 9, while 10 days would be an exceptionally long voyage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was very much surprised at the comparison when it was made. It dated as far back as 1866, and I think possibly a little beyond that, and showed practically that the length of passage at present is the same as it was thirty-five or forty years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say I should not be surprised in the case of the Cunard liners.

Mr. CLARKE. Am I to understand that the minister had an investigation made by the officers of his department with respect to discrimination in freight rates ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Has he received a report from those officers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had inquiries made ; I am not sure whether there is a report in form.

Mr. CLARKE. If the officers were sent out to make an investigation, they surely must have made some report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They reported generally upon the subject, but I do not think I have a formal report in detail.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any information which you could give about that report ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The information as to discrimination was what I gave the hon. gentleman ; that in a general way, so far as the steamships were concerned, they did not discriminate against Canadian shippers at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Am I to understand that the minister, having sent officers to make inquiries, the only report received was a verbal report ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there was any formal report.

Mr. CLARKE. No letter or communication, nothing of which we can get a copy, available in the department to show what kind of an investigation was made, and whether it was a fact or not that American shippers, either in the New England states or Chicago, can get better rates by rail and steamship for their products than are given to the Canadians, who are subsidizing these vessels ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There may have been some isolated cases in which, for various reasons, the Americans obtained a preference, but, as a rule, there was no discrimination.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to lay on the table a copy of the report, or letter, or memorandum, or communication, that was received by him ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will cause inquiry to be made about the letter.

Mr. CLARKE. There must be some written statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not sure that there was, but I shall make inquiries. An inquiry was made, that I know.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the proposed turbine steamer of the Allan Line be able to make 17 knots an hour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps she may make over 17 knots, but that is all that is stipulated for.

Mr. HACKETT. Is she intended for carrying the mails across the Atlantic ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. She will carry the mails, of course.

Mr. HACKETT. And freight ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And freight.

Mr. HACKETT. Are the lines from New York that carry Canadian mails subsidized for doing so ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but certain payments are made by the Post Office Department for the carrying of Canadian mails.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are obliged to pay rates according to the schedule of the Universal Postal Union, which are payable by one country to another. When our mails are sent via New York, from the time they enter the United States they are incorporated with the United States mails, and we have afterwards to account to the United States, they in the first instance paying the cost of transportation across the sea. That is the way it would work out.

Mr. COCHRANE. It seems to me a remarkable position for a business government to be in, that after subsidizing a line of steamers from Canada for a large amount the greater proportion of our mail goes via New York, and we are paying for carrying it from that port across the Atlantic. I think it is a humiliating position. Why do you not get some go on, and have a fast line of steamers ?

An hon. MEMBER. Now you are getting it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes ; you sit there and grin, and you go it blind and slap your hands, and say it is a business government, and swallow it holus-bolus, but you do not know a thing about what you are doing. Out in the country they would call the position of the government lying. I cannot use the term, because it would not be parliamentary, but I would like to know what word would express it.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. Hear, hear. There is another silly. He is exercising all the judgment the Almighty gave him, and he is making a fool of himself. I ask the Postmaster General if he does not feel humiliated to think that as Postmaster, Sir William Mulock, he has subsidized a Canadian company to carry the mails across the

Atlantic, and yet the greater portion go by the United States? Why is it? We are told we do not want a fast Atlantic service, it is comfort the people want, they do not take into consideration the speed so long as they have comfort. A business man in Great Britain or the United States is not going across the Atlantic for comfort. People are not willing to loll along at 16 or 17 knots an hour when they can go from their own country at 20 or 21 knots, and they will not take a slow passage because it is comfortable. I think that the hon. gentleman who is filling the position that he used to call the fifth wheel of a coach—and the fifth wheel is taking a great deal of oil to run it, and it does not amount to much—must be humiliated to think that he must pay the amount that he does when he used to be so very fond of preaching economy and telling how the farmers were bled white for a useless government. He says all things are changed. There has been no change for the better since he ridiculed the position. As a Canadian, I am willing to pay more money for an efficient service, which will take us out of this humiliating position described by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Postmaster General. I have no sympathy with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because he talked so much formerly and has accomplished so little—he doesn't seem to care whether he does anything or not, so long as he gets his salary—but I sympathize with the Postmaster General, because the ambition created in his breast by being Sir William Mulock, to bring the name of Canada into world-wide respect, must be sadly disappointed.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there anything in the new contract to prevent the shipping companies discriminating against Canadian shippers?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year when this matter was being discussed the following discussion took place:

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any contract made with this company which prevents them discriminating in freight rates?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is some regulation of that kind.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any provision made by which the exporters of Chicago shall not get better rates than those of Toronto, Montreal or Hamilton?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a provision that they shall not discriminate against Canadian shippers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was another contract with reference to which these statements were made.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, but the principle is the same. Why is it necessary to insert such a provision in one contract and not in another?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No complaint has been made with respect to any discrimination on the Allan Line.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it is rather a serious matter that such a provision should be omitted from this contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there has been any alteration made in these contracts with the Allans for a considerable space of time. There are clauses in several of the other contracts bearing upon that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should they be omitted from this contract?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the present moment there is very great difficulty in obtaining freight and the service is being carried on at rates which the ship-owners represent to be utterly unremunerative. There would be great difficulty in interfering too much with the filling up of these vessels with cargoes. All the information I have leads me to believe that there is no discrimination against the Canadian shipper on the part of the steamship lines, but I am not prepared to say how far that may be the case with respect to the railroads. I do not think the steamship lines do discriminate at all to the detriment of Canadians. If my hon. friend will look at the previous contracts, he will, I think, see that they are just the same as this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would not the officer of the department be able to give us an absolute assurance as to that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He informs me that there is no difference in the Allan contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is necessary to have such a provision in the Furness-Withy contract, would it not be equally necessary with respect to steamers which during a portion of the year sail from the same port?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There had been complaints of discrimination with respect to the Furness-Withy, and one or two others, and we put in a clause to guard against it. We have had no complaints with regard to the Allans, and I do not think there has been any discrimination.

Mr. CLARKE. In the event of the ships proceeding to Portland to receive and discharge cargo, will the minister cancel the contract?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not believe that any of these ships have ever gone to Portland.

Mr. CLARKE. But in the event of their doing so?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should regard it as being a violation of the clause contained in the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. And the contract would be probably cancelled if the minister considered it a serious breach?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister seems to be satisfied that these vessels will not proceed to Portland ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am. I do not think there is the slightest risk of their doing so.

Mr. CLARKE. It does not make the slightest difference whether the discrimination is by the railway companies or the steamship companies so long as Canadian exporters are placed at a disadvantage. The people who contribute to pay these subsidies should not be discriminated against by either railways or steamships.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The steamship rates have been extremely low for the last year or two.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister will appreciate the point that when the people of Canada pay these subsidies they should not be placed at a disadvantage by a discrimination which would give the advantage to their American competitors in the English market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does my hon. friend wish to exclude American products from Canadian railroads and Canadian steamships ? Does he think that would be in the interests of the people of Canada ?

Mr. CLARKE. I am certainly most desirous to see the volume of trade increase on our Canadian railroads and on our Canadian ships, and I care not whether that trade comes from the Orient or from the United States through Canada. I think it is a reasonable proposition to suggest to the hon. minister that if we have to make special arrangements to establish this steamship service and have to increase the subvention by fifty per cent this year over what we paid last year, our people should not be discriminated against in rates—that they should not be placed at a disadvantage by either railways or steamships.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That sounds very reasonable and fair, no doubt ; but the hon. gentleman has to consider this point, that trade starting from Chicago has the choice of going by the Canadian Pacific Railway, or direct to New York to ship there. In that case you cannot get more for the freight than the rate offered by the New York steamships.

Mr. CLARKE. The contract made last year with Furness-Withy & Co., contained a clause that the contractors shall, at least three weeks prior to the first sailing under this contract, furnish to the minister a schedule of the freight rates proposed on both east and westbound trips, which schedule shall be approved by the minister and, after being approved by him, shall not be changed without his consent. It also provides that the minister may at any time, if he deems it advisable, fix the maximum rates to be charged to passengers and on any article or class of goods, and the contractor shall carry, on all steamers under this contract, passengers and freights at rates which shall not be in excess of such maximum rates fixed by the minister ; and in no case shall any discrimination be made as regards rates or otherwise, directly or indirectly, against Canadian merchants or shippers, who shall always have precedence for their goods over all other merchants and shippers. It seems a pity that a similar clause is not inserted in this contract and that the ships are not prohibited from going to Portland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that they shall not go to Portland.

Mr. HACKETT. In regard to the shipment of goods from Canada to Great Britain, it is of the greatest importance, especially to the people of Prince Edward Island, that their cheese and butter and farm produce generally shall be shipped across the ocean and landed in London or Liverpool in good condition. Now, I find in the Toronto 'Globe' an item which is very important :

> According to a report received by the extension of markets division of the Department of Agriculture, a shipment of Canadian cheese was recently landed at London, Eng., in a heated condition, due to being carried across the ocean from Montreal in a poorly ventilated part of the ship.

I would like to ask the hon. minister what ship that cheese was carried in ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know anything about it. No complaint has been made to my department about any such cargo. I do not think that occurred in connection with the Allan Line. There are other steamers carrying cheese, as probably the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is very deplorable. The government have been boasting of what they have been doing in supplying cold storage in steamships ; yet there is not a member of this government able to tell us on what steamship or by what line of steamships this shipment of cheese was landed in London in that condition.

Steam service between Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Liverpool, from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, $20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the usual vote for this service. It is carried on by the Furness-Withy Company. The steamships employed are the 'Ulunda,' 'Damara,' 'Peruvian' and 'Rhenania.' The trips are made every seventeen days.

Mr. CLARKE. Do they carry mails ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Post Office Department chooses to send them, but the mails sent in such a case are very few.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Have these boats cold storage chambers ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have not, but they are ventilated.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What system of ventilation ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Each vessel has steam-driven fans, I am told.

Mr. DANIEL. These steamers are rather small, are they not ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One is 1,000 tons, another 1,145, another 2,022 and the fourth 1,156, net register.

Mr. DANIEL. They make about twenty trips in the year ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. So that the subsidy is about $1,000 a voyage ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Roughly.

Mr. LENNOX. When was this service established ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Eight or nine years ago. There was no service prior to that time, I think. This, I believe, was established before we came into office.

Mr. J. D. REID. If this line is not used for carrying the mails, and if it has no cold storage facilities, I cannot see the advantage of subsidizing it at all. Probably the minister can explain what advantage we are getting from these boats.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know of none except the promotion of trade between the province of Nova Scotia via Halifax and Newfoundland.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has it increased the trade ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a fair amount done but not a very large amount.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the increase sufficient to warrant the continuance of the subsidy ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for the House to decide.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the House is to decide according to the statement of the minister, it will come to the conclusion that it is not necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman is of that opinion and it is shared by the hon. member for Halifax, I dare say the government will take it into consideration.

Mr. J. D. REID. We are supposed to act on information we get from the minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The subsidy has been applied for by the Board of Trade of Halifax several times. That body has pressed upon us the desirability of continuing the service. There is a certain amount of trade done but not very much.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see any reason for raising any objection, but would be glad to have the opinion of the minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Newfoundland is a place which consumes a very fair proportion of our goods considering its population. The trade of Newfoundland is a very desirable trade. The population is not large but they do consume a very considerable amount of our produce. I think the total trade averages something like $2,000,000 a year, and a very considerable part of it is done through the medium of this line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this is the line by which a great deal of the apples are shipped from Nova Scotia to Great Britain. Although the trade is not rapidly increasing it is perhaps a little larger than the minister suggests it is. I think there is a gradual growth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The trade last year in our produce amounted to $2,380,000 out of a total of two and a half million dollars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The port of Halifax and the other maritime ports have not specially good service with the mother country during the summer months. During the winter months, when the Allan boats run they have a somewhat better service. But during the summer, the service is not very high class via St. John, Newfoundland and Halifax.

Mr. FIELDING. Just now it is not desirable that we should withdraw any subsidies we have granted to promote trade with Newfoundland. In our trade relations with that colony, it is much better that we should err on the side of liberality than in the other direction.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the view I take and I only asked whether there was an increase of trade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There has been some but not a large increase.

Mr. LENNOX. We desire to promote the most cordial relations with the colony of Newfoundland in the hope that some day these will lead to a closer connection.

Mr. DANIEL. In making the statement that the trade amounted to two and a half million dollars, what does the minister mean ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mean that our export trade to Newfoundland amounted to two and a half million dollars.

Mr. DANIEL. That is just the trade between Canada and Newfoundland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. That does not take into consideration the trade by the same vessels to Liverpool ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No. I think that what they take from Newfoundland consists chiefly of lumber.

Mr. DANIEL. I am heartily in accord with the remarks that fell from the Minister of Finance. I believe that the trade with Newfoundland is one which we should encourage by every means and that we should make sure, not only of the present business, but if possible of a great deal of increased future business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The total volume of trade amounted to about $3,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This trade is regarded as so desirable from a Nova Scotia point of view that it was established by a local company, and after a time one of the great English companies came and took it off their hands, and consolidated it with their own enterprise. It was originally established by a Halifax company in 1896.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think that any one in this House wishes to do anything that would not tend to increase trade between Canada and Newfoundland. All I desired was to obtain some information. I had no desire to have the item struck out, but I considered, from the way the minister spoke, that he was not giving us the information we are entitled to. As far as this subsidy is concerned or any other that would tend to increase our trade, I have no hesitation in supporting it.

Steam service between St. John and Glasgow, $15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This was formerly a fortnightly service and is now weekly. We pay the Donaldson line $750 per trip.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is $3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not the whole year, only the winter.

Mr. BLAIN. This item was increased last year to $15,000. Is it the same this year ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. They used to give a fortnightly service at $750 per trip and are now giving a weekly service at the same rate.

Mr. BLAIN. Originally it was a monthly service, then a fortnightly and now a weekly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Originally a fortnightly service, I think—certainly in my time.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the trade in this direction increasing ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the trade at these various points, Glasgow, Dublin, and the others, show a fair increase. Trade varies from year to year according to the stuff that we have to export, but on the whole, it is increasing fairly well.

Mr. BLAIN. What kind of goods do these vessels carry and what is their return cargo ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They take a mixed cargo, partly timber, and partly grain and other agricultural products.

Mr. BLAIN. No manufactured goods ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A portion of the trade is in manufactured goods, but it is chiefly in timber and agricultural products. I do not think they have much as a rule. They claim that there is a great difficulty in obtaining a return cargo and that is one of the grounds on which they ask a subsidy. The return cargo is small.

Mr. BLAIN. What is it composed of, small as it is ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There used to be a considerable amount of iron, but I think that of late that has been rather going the other way. The return cargo is made up of merchandise, dry goods and so on.

Mr. BLAIN. Do these vessels carry the mail ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Post Office chooses to send it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the Post Office send any that way ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very little.

Mr. FIELDING. These are slow vessels and would hardly do for the mail.

Steam service between St. John, N.B., Dublin and Belfast, during the winter of 1904-5, $7,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is with the Ulster Steamship Company, Limited, known as the Head Line. There is no difference in the amounts as compared with last year. It is a fortnightly service with a subsidy of $750 a trip.

Mr. LENNOX. Could this and the service we have just been discussing be combined to advantage?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think so.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought that by having one line a better class of vessels could be had to make the round trip. Of course, I do not know whether it could be done or not.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the present system is better than the one suggested. It is bet-

ter to have direct lines, where you can, rather than to have steamers callling at a number of ports.

A line or lines of steamers to run during the summer months between St. John, Halifax and London, and during the winter months between St. John and London direct, and Halifax and London direct, $40,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to change the phraseology of that. This is divided into two, the Furness-Withy do part of the service and the Canadian Pacific Railway the other part.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is allowed to each ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Furness-Withy get $25,000 and the Canadian Pacific Railway $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they supply an equal number of vessels?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Furness-Withy supply a little the larger portion.

Mr. DANIEL. Can the minister give the details of the arrangement?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Canadian Pacific Railway steamers are the 'Mount Temple,' the 'Montcalm,' the 'Montrose,' and the 'Lake Michigan.' I desire to strike out the words of this vote so as to leave it read, 'for a line or lines of steamers to run between St. John, Halifax and London.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. As these boats will carry apples, I would like to ask the minister if they are mechanically ventilated, and if so, how ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These steamers are to be suitably provided with cold storage accommodation.

Mr. DANIEL. How frequently do the steamers of the two lines run ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Furness-Withy at intervals of not more than fifteen days, and the Canadian Pacific Railway at intervals of not more than seventeen days. As a matter of fact, I believe, the Furness-Withy go every ten days. The clause of the contract with effect to the cold storage provides that the steamers shall be fitted with suitable accommodation for carrying perishable cargo, such as apples or other fruit, dairy products and other provisions without deterioration by means of a forced circulation of air by electric or steam fans which will maintain a uniform temperature.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the hon. minister allow me to look at the contract ? and, if there is no objection while I consult it, the minister might call up another item.

Mr. DANIEL.

Item allowed to stand.

Steam communication between St. John and Digby, from July 1, 1904, to June 30th, 1905 $12,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is done by the 'Prince Rupert' as heretofore—two round trips daily during June July, August, September and October.

A line or lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America, $80,700.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the Pickford and Black Line, a steamer of 1,780 tons net.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the trade over this route increasing ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is increasing, but not very fast. It is only a regular service. This route is to Kingston, in the Island of Jamaica.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this service does not extend to South America at the present time, or beyond Demerara.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They go to Trinidad, and then they go on to Demerara. This service is carried on under a joint agreement with the British government. We supply $65,700 and they supply an equal amount. We have to call, under the agreement with them, at a great number of the West Indian Islands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has been a valuable service, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Fairly so. If the British government had not been so exigent in making us call at so many places, the service would not be so long as it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Representations have been made to me from several quarters in my constituency as to the great importance of extending this service if possible to South America, both to Brazil and Uruguay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a great deal to be said for that, but I am doubtful whether we can manage that with the imperial government.

Mr. FIELDING. The extension of this service to Brazil would make the route so long that it would be unsatisfactory. It might be desirable to open arrangements with Brazil, but I am inclined to think that an almost independent service would be necessary. The difficulty we have already with those distant ports, such as Trinidad and Demerara is that the stoppages on the way makes the voyage a long one and prevents that quickness of communication which is so desirable in the transportation of our products. I agree that it is desirable to open up trade with Brazil, but I

doubt whether we can do it as an extension of the existing line. I almost think it would need an independent service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said an extension of this steamship service. I notice some articles in a trade journal published in Halifax, and I have also had some communication from others, all leading to the same conclusion, if their arguments are correct, that a profitable trade might be done between Canada and South America. They say that a considerable trade is done at the present time, but the difficulty is that the goods have to be reshipped either from England or from the United States, and this handicaps the efforts of exporters to a great extent. They point out some results which have ensued from the establishment of steamship lines between South America and other countries. It is a pretty large proposition, no doubt, and one that should not be hastily entered upon. I merely mention it now, because these representations have been made to me, possibly they may have been made also to the government, and perhaps the government have them under consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. More particularly with respect to the Argentine Republic. With respect to Brazil, I am not quite sure. The chief exports from there would be articles that we do not use much in Canada. The Argentine Republic would be worth considerable.

Mr. LENNOX. Could the minister mention about the rate of speed attained by these vessels ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is ten knots.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will read a few lines from one communication which has been addressed to me :

At the present time considerable quantities of Canadian and Newfoundland goods find their way into the South American markets, but as they are obliged to take circuitous routes by United States and English ports through the hands of middlemen who get their commissions and brokerage, the trade is necessarily of a fluctuating and uncertain character, must be conducted at a minimum of profit, and in a practical sense can hardly be said to exist. All of such goods, moreover, are invariably reshipped from the United States or England as products of those ccuntries, and the benefit to Canada in the way of advertisement and the creating of a vogue for Canadian products is of course entirely lost. It will be seen that if direct transportation were obtained between Canada and those countries, not only could the lines of goods now sent there be sold at greater profits, but many other lines of Canadian manufacture which we learn are peculiarly adaptable to the trade, could find a permanent and lucrative market in that direction. We have also ascertained that there are many commodities exported from the South American ports, and especially from those on the eastern coast, which could be taken in exchange by the Canadian consumer and manufacturer, and should an attempt be made to establish closer trade relations, the feeling of the South American people and the conditions that would govern the trade would at the present time be specially conducive to success. It is moreover not amiss perhaps to remember that the Canadian ports of the maritime provinces are nearer to the ports of Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina than are any of the shipping points of the United States, while the ports of eastern South America, lying as they do in almost a straight line southward from Halifax and St. John, are by far the largest and richest of any on the southern continent, constituting as they do the distributing points for some thirty-five millions of purchasing people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The matter is well worth looking into.

Mr. DANIEL. Referring to item 157, where there is a divided service, I see it refers to the contract for steamers calling at Halifax and St. John. Is that the case with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract as well ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway contract is to St. John, the terminal point of the Canadian Pacific Railway is at St. John. They call on their east bound trips at Halifax, and on their west bound trips at Antwerp.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been requested by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he would be good enough to bring down the return that was made last year with regard to the discrimination against Canadian freight, on these subsidized steamers, in favour of the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. It is now six o'clock, and I may say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will not resume his estimates this evening, but probably the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will do so, or probably the Minister of Railways and Canals.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Intercolonial Railway, Windsor branch, $30,000.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is cost of maintenance. This branch is rented to the Dominion Atlantic Railway, and is a portion of the railway between Windsor and Windsor Junction. The Dominion Atlantic operate it for a rental and the government maintains it. It is part of the Dominion Atlantic system between Halifax and Yarmouth.

Mr. SPROULE. What rental do they pay for it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. One-third of the gross earnings.

Mr. SPROULE. What was that last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year we received as our proportion $42,560.81.

Mr. BARKER. I understand there has always been some profit on that line for some years back.

Mr. SPROULE. Did we spend more than $30,000 to keep it in repair ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The maintenance of way cost $17,843.39, leaving a balance of $24,717.62.

Mr. BLAIN. What has been the profit for the last three or four years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Our proportion of the gross earnings was $49,604.59, and it cost us $16,152.55.

Mr. SPROULE. That would seem to show that when a part of the Intercolonial is taken by a private company it will pay.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is operated by politics, if any part of it is, I suppose ?

Mr. SPROULE. No; it is operated by a company.

Mr. EMMERSON. We keep it up and pay all the expenditure on the track.

Mr. SPROULE. But some one else employs the hands.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a very lucrative section of the Intercolonial Railway. It is at the entrance to the famous Annapolis valley, and is closely connected with Yarmouth. There are thickly settled communities in the district, and it is a very prosperous section. There are large mining and lumber interests in that section, and the earnings are large. In some of the other parts of the Intercolonial, especially in the northern section, we travel over great spaces that are very sparsely settled and where there is no local traffic.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there not the further difficulty on the Intercolonial that very low rates are charged for passengers and freight as compared with other companies ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The passenger rates are practically the same on that line as on the Intercolonial. I cannot speak of the freight rates.

Mr. LENNOX. What are the average passenger rates on the Intercolonial Rail way ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Three cents for first-class, two cents for second class, and one cent for Indians and clergymen.

Mr. LENNOX. That does not bring us to the point I referred to at all. It is the average rate per mile that I am anxious to find out. The other railways of Canada say that their average rate is not two cents a mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. The average passenger earnings on the Intercolonial Railway are about $1.70, that is including the Indians and clergymen.

Prince Edward Island Railway, working expenses, $330,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the reason for this additional amount of $30,000 for the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The wages have been very largely increased, and it is expected that the Murray Harbour branch will be opened before the end of this fiscal year, and, of course, that will require more operating expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. How many men have you employed on the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is included in the additional operating expenses that will be necessitated by the opening of this new branch. This increase is not confined to labourers; the wages of the sectionmen, conductors and trainmen on the Prince Edward Island Railway have been made equal to those on the Intercolonial.

Mr. SPROULE. What wages are being paid ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The maximum pay for yard section foreman is $2.25 per day; regular section men from $1.40 to $1.50; section foremen from $1.85 to $2; foremen of extra gangs, $2.75; foremen of track carpenters, $2.50; track carpenters and skilled mechanics, $2; ordinary rough carpenters from $1.50 to $1.70. For some years prior to 1904 the maximum to section foremen was $1.85, whereas it is now $2.25. In 1896 the maximum to section foremen was $1.30. In 1896 the wages paid section men was $1.15 and it has since been increased to $1.40 and $1.50.

Mr. HACKETT. Why was Mr. Robert McLean, section foreman at Alberton dismissed in 1896 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That seems ages ago. I do not suppose my hon. friend would expect me to know, but if he wishes I will get the information later.

Mr. HACKETT. The minister will remember that in 1896 a change of government took place.

Mr. EMMERSON. I remember that distinctly.

Mr. HACKETT. And the best employees on the Prince Edward Island Railway were dismissed. Why was Peter L. Chasson, section foreman, of Tignish dismissed in 1896 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Even the memory of the general manager is not equal to remembering such an important detail as that. I cannot give the information now.

Mr. HACKETT. I regret that very much.

Mr. EMMERSON. The regret is mutual for I would like to give it to my hon. friend if I knew.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the hon. minister intend continuing that second train a day between Summerside and Tignish which has been in operation about a year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I know of no reason why it should not continue.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am pleased to know that the wages of the workingmen on the Prince Edward Island Railway have been increased. I wish to call attention to something which took place before the by-election in Queen's county last fall.

Mr. EMMERSON. We heard something about that the other day.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am going to tell you more about it. A number of men were employed filling in a hole for no other apparent reason than that their votes were wanted in the election. This particular piece of land had been vacant for thirty years ; there was no necessity for filling it in, because the location for the station has not been decided on yet, but in order to secure votes they started the men to work there. The government paid the poor labouring men the pittance of $1 a day, while private individuals in all parts of the island have to pay $1.25, $1.35 and $1.50. This munificent government paid the labourers only a dollar a day.

Mr. EMMERSON. That would not get us many votes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That was the intention all the same. The government came in and cut down the price of labour.

Mr. EMMERSON. In order to get their votes ; remember that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Never mind that ; there was no other idea than to keep these men on the string until the election was over and as happened on many other occasions, the work was stopped immediately after the election.

Mr. EMMERSON. The work was finished.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Your man was elected, but the work is not finished yet. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that some three years ago there was a scheme on foot for pensioning the employees on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway. Has this scheme been dropped or what has been done about it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Prime Minister stated the other day that in all probability a Bill relating to a pension scheme for the employees of the government railways would be brought to the attention of parliament during the present session and I hope to be able to carry out that idea. The only reason why I have not done so is because of the delay in securing information with respect to the Prince Edward Island Railway. The actuaries who are perfecting the scheme have been unable thus far to get the information. When I assumed the duties of my present position, I took hold of this matter and have been working very assiduously, with the assistance of the officers of the department, towards having the scheme perfected. It is one of importance which requires great study of detail, and we have not quite completed the work. I hope, however, to bring to the notice of parliament such a scheme as will be in the interests of the country and the employees and will meet with the approval of parliament. With respect to this other matter, I explained the other day that, if we have any foresight with respect to the station at Charlottetown, that hole had to be filled up. To do this it was necesssary to have brush, and it could be obtained cheaper by having it hauled across the harbour when the ice was firm. The men employed were paid by the load. The work was done during the short days of winter, and the other men, of whom there were very few, who were employed in placing the brush, could only work during certain hours and were paid proportionately. I think the sum paid for the short hours they did work was $1 per day. The men were satisfied and that seemed to be the ruling rate. But the permanent employees and the extra men employed from time to time are paid very much higher rates than those that were paid in 1896.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are they paid the same scale as on the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Precisely the same. I want to say with respect to this pension scheme, that I have received from time to time during the session, since the work began, very pressing petitions from the Liberal members asking that it be brought to an early conclusion. I have been endeavouring to meet their wishes, and I hope that my hon. friends opposite will show the same interest in having it brought to completion. The employees on the Intercolonial are very much interested and very anxious, and in the Intercolonial I include the Prince Edward Island Railway. The members from that island have spoken to me repeatedly with regard to the scheme. I may add that a very unfair method of prejudicing the minds of the people against the Intercolonial is being pursued by my hon. friends opposite. I am sure that my hon. friend who has just spoken, the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), would not be a party to any such

tactics. There has come to my notice within the last twenty-four hours a little circular which has been circulated, I believe, by hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to the wages paid on the government railway. This circular is marked No. 8. It says :

Starvation wages paid by the Liberal government.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have just given one instance.

Mr. EMMERSON (reading)——

Workingmen, the Liberal government tells you it is giving you growing times and an era of prosperity. How does this prosperity square with the wages which the government has been paying the labouring men in its employ ? Turn up the last Auditor General's Report, and you will find (page W—161) that on the government railway such wages have been paid as these : Labourers, $1 per day ; freight porters, $1 per day ; trackmen, $1.10 per day ; cleaners, $1.15 per day ; firemen, $1.20 per day. These men must have been getting fat on the government's prosperity, must they not. If they had been railway grafters instead of mere railway labourers, they might have done better.

Mr. COCHRANE. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend applauds this statement.

The government is going to spend over $200,000,000 of your money on the Grand Trunk Pacific grafter scheme, because Cox cannot wait, but the labouring man has got to wait, because Cox cannot.

This reads like a dime novel.

And this is the government that says the workingman should be grateful to it because it is paying the Minister of Labour $8,000 a year. Is it not time for a change ? Put the Conservatives in power and get a living wage for the labouring man. The Conservatives paid for their errors in 1896.

This is a litttle admission—a sort of confession of faith.

The Liberals must expect punishment for their vastly greater sins, and the government that succeeds theirs must be dealt with on its merits. In other words, turn out one government after another until the mandate can go to the world that the conscience of Canada is awakened.

This is a remarkable document. In the first place, there are in it one or two very glaring untruths, and it resolves itself down to one magnificent and colossal untruth. It says : 'Turn up the last Auditor General's Report,' Now this document is being circulated to-day in several constituencies in Canada.

Mr. COWAN. What is the number ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Circular No 8.

Mr. COWAN. What are the other seven like ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No doubt they are fit companions for this one. It says : 'Turn up the last Auditor General's Report, page W—161. That would be the Auditor General's Report for 1903. And it adds, 'you will find that on the government railways such wages have been paid as these'— enumerating the wages I have just given.

Mr. BELL. Did the minister turn up the report ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did, and strange to say, I cannot find on page W—161 of the last Auditor General's Report the slightest reference to any wages paid on government railways to anybody, much less to the labouring men. I do not know whether that would be called lie No. 1, or whatever might be the number of the lie, but it is circular No. 8.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the date ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has no date. It has not even the signature of my hon. friend. It is anonymous. Whoever wrote it was ashamed of it. He was ashamed to date it and ashamed to sign it.

Mr. COCHRANE. A very nice way to get your estimates through.

Mr. EMMERSON. Reference is made to the wages paid by the government on the government railways, and then the circular says :

And this is the government that says the workingmen should be grateful to it because it is paying the Minister of Labour $8,000 a year.

Is that true ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is his salary ? I do not know.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Postmaster General receives $7,000 a year, I think.

Mr. COCHRANE. $8,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; $7,000 as salary, and I believe he attends to the duties of the Department of Labour without pay. Hon. gentlemen opposite would, of course, have the people of the country believe that we are paying the Minister of Labour $8,000 a year in addition to the Postmaster General. I am simply showing the error in this circular. I do not wish the people of the country to have any misapprehension with respect to that matter. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee and of the country to the actual wages that are being paid, not merely on the Intercolonial proper, but also on the Prince Edward Island Railway. Section foremen in 1896 received $1.60 per day, in 1902 the rate was increased to $1.65, and in 1904 to $1.85. Section men received in 1896 $1.15, in 1902 $1.20, and in 1904 $1.40 and $1.50.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask the minister a question while I have it in mind ? I think it would be advisable if he would kindly state to the House the details of the

excursion to Peterborough on Saturday morning to see the opening of the lift-lock.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is more interesting to my hon. friend, I know, than what I am now stating. I think it is unfair that the government system of railways should be prejudiced in that way, and I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to the actual conditions as against this fiction which is being circulated throughout the country with a view to damaging the railway, and, I suppose, incidentally doing some injury to the government.

Mr. BELL. When were these wages raised ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were raised last November.

Mr. BELL. I presume that was about the time the circular was issued. No doubt it had a stimulating effect on the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. This circular has been sent broadcast within the last month. The gentleman who received this one received it, I am informed, within a few weeks from some hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is a serious reflection on the Postmaster General. That is the literature he held up last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; that was very bulky literature. This is apparently a very harmless little document that goes so stealthily that the attention of the Postmaster General would not called to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was all posted last year, and the Postmaster General is responsible for its not getting to its destination.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do not let us get away from the main point, that this is being issued by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This rubbish is in the hall, and is going out now. It is being posted by hon. gentlemen opposite from their rooms.

Mr. EMMERSON. If it had been sent out last year, it would not be true of that year. If you look at the Auditor General's Report for 1902, at page W—161, you will not find any items corresponding with this. It would not be true, because at that time the government was not paying any wage on the Intercolonial as low as that. The wages of the section men were increased in 1902 to $1.20, and afterwards, if I mistake not, to $1.30.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the hon. minister admit the other day, in answer to a question, that he was paying a dollar a day in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that several men who were employed simply for a few hours were paid $1 each—not for a full day, it was not a full day. If those men had been paid, as was insinuated, for the purposes of an election, I am sure the government would have been generous enough to have given them more handsome pay. If the government were paying them less than private corporations or individuals on the island, it would not secure many votes, because it would be looked upon as niggardly treatment.

Mr. LOGAN. I would like to ask the minister, is it not a fact that the wages of the Intercolonial trackmen have been raised on three different occasions since 1896—I think first in 1898 to $1.20, then in 1900 to $1.30, and in 1903 or 1904 to $1.40 and $1.50 ; and not, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) says, only once, and that in last November ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The wages were raised on three different occasions. The gem of this circular is in this sentence :

> Put the Conservatives in power, and get a living wage for the workingman.

Put back the Conservatives, who were paying $1 and $1.05, and never more than $1.15, in place of the government, who are paying $1.40 and $1.50. Yes, the Conservatives paid 90 cents a day, and then they paid 99 cents ; they would not even pay a dollar ; they kept the odd cent off.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The minister should remember that during the time this government has been in power the cost of living has increased fifty per cent and, in some cases, one hundred per cent. So, they can well afford to increase the wages of the labouring man fifty or seventy-five per cent.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not yield the floor to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey), but thought he wished to ask me a question. I think that if the request to put the Conservatives back into office were yielded to by the people, the new government would probably put the wages back to the old figure, and the country would certainly be put back very much more.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The minister is simply occupying time in which he should be attending to the business of the country by dealing with the estimates, but his conduct will be very much his own funeral. I rose to get information, but have not gained any. The minister spoke of this pension business but has no information from the actuaries in Prince Edward Island. The matter was brought up three years ago. What has he been doing all this time ? It is in this as in everything else they have taken hold of, from the fast line service on—mere delay and vacillation. As to their paying $1 a day to labourers in Prince Edward Island, that is an absolute fact while the winter wages at ordinary employment were from $1.25 to $1.50 regardless of the hours—the men work-

ed as long as they could. Not only is this kind of injustice done to the workingmen of Prince Edward Island, but in the government's big project of the Grand Trunk Pacific foreigners are brought from across the line to take the leading positions.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is the evidence given before the commission appointed by the government—that positions are given to foreigners while our own engineers, who are perfectly competent for the work, are refused employment. I have received a communication from the railway employees of the Prince Edward Island and Intercolonial Railways at Moncton. It is addressed to me and reads as follows :

Moncton, N.B., March 15th, 1904.

Dear Sir,—At a strongly representative meeting of all classes of employees of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, held at Moncton on Tuesday, the 8th instant, it was decided to call your attention to the following matter, and the chairman and secretary of the meeting were by unanimous vote authorized to sign this communication :

About three years ago the Minister of Railways and Canals had a scheme prepared for the pensioning of employees on the government railways, something similar to that in operation on the different American and Canadian roads, but it was not brought up in parliament. The different brotherhoods and orders, as well as the employees generally, have now taken the matter up, and are pressing it through the present Minister of Railways and Canals, the Hon. H. R. Emmerson.

The orders are as follows :—

Order of Railway Conductors,
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen,
Order of Railway Telegraphers,
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen,
Brotherhood of Railway Trackmen,
Order of Railway Clerks,
Union of Blacksmiths and Blacksmiths' helpers,
International Association of Machinists.

The western orders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway, are assisting those on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways.

In connection with the above we may say that the railway employees are not in the civil service, and cannot participate in the civil service superannuation.

All the other railways have pension schemes for ther employees, with the exception of the Grand Trunk scheme, are wholly supported by the companies without contributions from the men. The Grand Trunk employees contribute to the scheme, and the company also contributes very liberally. All the employees on the government railways wish to contribute to the proposed scheme in order that the benefits may be more material, and ask the government to contribute and assist them.

We trust that when this matter is brought up in parliament you will give it your careful consideration, and, if possible, your hearty support. You will observe by the number of orders represented that should the scheme be put through this coming session, it will be very popular with all classes of railway employees ; and your help will be much appreciated by all concerned.

Yours sincerely,

J. J. WALLACE,
Chairman.

I trust that the minister will have a comprehensive scheme brought forward that will do justice to the men employed on the government railways. As to the conduct of the Prince Edward Island Railway, the vote for which is now before us, we are not at all satisfied with the management in many respects. I had occasion to wait upon the minister at one time myself and bring to his attention a case of gross inattention to the interests of farmers and working men of an important part of Prince Edward Island as well as of failure to properly manage the affairs of the road. I refer to the distribution of cars for the haulage of mussel mud and wood, two large industries carried on in the western part of Prince Edward Island. I gave the minister at that time some statistics in regard to the carriage of these products. The mussel mud is used as a manure by the farmers, and is a very necessary element to keep their land in condition. It is very extensively used along the whole length of the line. There are quite a number of truckmen and labourers engaged in digging this mud and hauling it to the railway. During the greater part of last winter, when they should have had twenty-seven cars per day, they had twenty-seven cars per week to carry this material. And this occurred in spite of the protests made. I myself wrote on several occasions to the superintendent, but got no relief for the men. It was not until I came up to interview the minister and when the winter was practically over and the wages of these men had been lost for the season that some relief was promised. Not only was this the case in mussel mud, but it was the case in the haulage of cord wood. In many cases people on the western end of the line had to put their cord wood in box cars to get it to the selling point. Now, this is, possibly, a matter of small import to the Minister of Railways and Canals and to this government, but it affects very materially the class of labourers and others who are dependent on this industry for their livelihood. I understand that there were ample cars on the road if proper foresight had been used in sending them where they were needed.

I understand the cars were on the Murray Harbour branch, and early in the season the superintendent promised to have these cars brought over and put into this service, but they were never brought over. The excuse given at the end of the winter was that there was a snow blockade, but even if there had been, it was not heavy enough to prevent a business management from operating the cars and putting them

at the disposal of those men. This is a state of affairs that I trust the present Minister of Railways will look into more carefully than he had occasion to at the time. The people are not at all satisfied with the explanation given by the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, nor do I myself believe that it was a legitimate excuse for the shortage of cars in that locality during the whole winter. There is another matter I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways, and that is the fact that the service from Boston and western Canada down to Prince Edward Island via Point du Chêne—the largest part of the tourist traffic and the largest part of the summer travel goes to Prince Edward Island by this route—has been for years past disgraceful. It is not certainly up to the equipment on any other branch of the Intercolonial, and is not fit for the growing travel to Prince Edward Island at the present time. The cars which run from Point du Chêne down, are not certainly of a class to induce the better class of tourists to patronize that line. They are usually the oldest cars on the line. There are no parlour cars that western travellers can take. I have a communication from the Charlottetown Development and Tourist Association, dated July 5th, asking that this matter be brought to the attention of the minister, and with the permission of the House I will read the letter and the resolution :

Sir,—At a meeting of the executive of this association held last evening, the inclosed resolution was passed, and copies thereof ordered to be forwarded to the Minister of Railways, to the members of parliament for this province, and to D. Pottinger, Esq., general manager Canadian government railways. I have been instructed to respectfully state that the resolution was moved because of several complaints reaching members of our executive with refereence to (1) the lack of accommodation obtainable in first-class coaches between St. John and Point du Chêne.

Mr. EMMERSON. To whom is that addressed ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. This letter is addressed to me.

Mr. EMMERSON. The resolution ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. The resolution was sent to the Minister of Railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who sent it, and when ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. The letter is dated July 5th, and the resolution was passed and copies were forwarded, as I understand to the Minister of Railways, to the general manager of the Canadian government railways and to members of parliament.

(2) the necessity of providing a parlour car upon the road between these points.

This is a very necessary step, because people travel in parlour cars from the United States and from the western provinces, they have parlour cars nearly all the way down except over that strip of line. As the minister knows, the strength of a chain is its weakest link, and there is a weak link in this road running down from St. John and Painsec to Point du Chêne.

(3) because of the difficulty some travellers have experienced in obtaining information regarding the departure of trains from St. John to Point du Chêne. This resolution is therefore respectfully submitted in the hope that you will do what you can to have the matter arranged in a manner more beneficial to the interests of this province.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
A. C. IRWIN, Secretary.

Now it is a fact that this state of things has been protested against for years but apparently the difficulty has not been removed. This not only occurs in winter but in the summer time.

The resolution reads as follows :

Resolved, that in the opinion of the Charlettetown Development and Tourist Association, it is desirable to have a parlour car run through from Boston to Point du Chêne each day during the continuance of the through train, the present service being wholly inadequate and detrimental to summer travel to Prince Edward Island.

I bring this forward with due respect to the minister and the general manager, in the hope that they will look into these matters. I think the minister will realize that the travel coming there now, and which is increasing, requires more attention than has been afforded it over that portion of the line. I had occasion last year to speak of the extension of the railway along the water front in Charlottetown. I understand that nothing definite has been arrived at by the government in this respect. The last two years I have been bringing this to the attention of the government, and the people of Charlottetown, the board of trade, and the city council are a unit on the necessity for this work. The merchants throughout the whole island who have to use the Charlottetown wharfs for the transhipment of their goods to different points on the island, are put to an expense that is not fair to them, they are inconvenienced in the transhipment of their goods along the Prince Edward Island Railway, and they have been working for this extension for a number of years. I submit that this is a matter that cannot wait, we cannot wait five or six years more for these improvements that the people demand at once. Also in respect to the railway station the minister said the hole was being filled up for a railway station. I understood he stated in the House the other day they had not decided on a location for the railway station ; then why are they filling in this hole before the location is decided upon. A great majority of the better class of the people of Charlottetown, the board of

trade and the town council, have petitioned and sent resolutions and deputations to the minister, asking that the station be located at the intersection of Great George and Water streets, where the land is much higher and more available in the interests of Charlottetown than where the station is at present located. I understand that various offers have been made to the government of land, and that the prices are not unreasonable. But there are some political interests at work to have the railway down near the old station where it is at the present time, and the government are trying to keep the political strings dangling as long as possible before they decide where the depot shall be. Now I think there is only one possible place that will suit the people of Charlottetown and that will at the same time be advantageous to the interests of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

I think the minister should not hesitate to have the station built at this point. There has been some talk of engineering difficulties but I have found the consensus of opinion among engineers of repute who understand the situation thoroughly to be that there are no engineering difficulties in the way. Besides that the railway would have to be brought to this point in being extended along the water front and part of the increased cost of putting the station at George and Water streets would necessarily go to the extension of the line along the water front. Then too the Marine Department has purchased a wharf there for the improvement of the government property and of the facilities at this wharf it would be advisable to extend the line that far. From the estimates I find that the minister has added an amount for Kinkora station. I pressed this on the minister for a number of years and I was very glad to have him look into the matter with me last year in a very reasonable way and insert the item and I am glad to see that he has included an item for establishing a station at this point. I pressed on the minister at that time the necessity for having a booking station there. I trust that the additional $150 which I see in the estimates this year is for the establishment of a booking station at that point. Is that correct ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is $150 in the supplementaries for a station at Kinkora. The lowest tenders exceeded the estimate of the department and the appropriation so that we had to increase the amount. The question of a booking station at that point has been under the consideration of the department, but the business at that station as shown by the returns would hardly justify making it a booking station. When the trade and prospects of the place would justify it the department would hope to establish a booking station there.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I went fully into this question with the minister several months ago and I stated to him exactly the situation there. I think he was visibly impressed with the necessity of having a booking station at that point. The inconvenience to shippers at this point is so great that they are practically unable to carry on their commercial intercourse with the rest of the island unless they secure a booking station.

Mr. EMMERSON. When my hon. friend brought that matter to my attention and it was also pressed on me by other hon. members from the island I referred the matter to the officials of the government railways and their report was to the effect which I have just stated. I do not know anything about the matter personally ; I know that my hon. friend said that in his judgment there should be a booking station, but there are always these differences of opinion between outsiders and the officials. I must be guided in these matters by the judgment of the officials who are the ones who should know something about them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I must contend that it is not fair for the management to take into consideration only the monetary returns from a station in a case of this kind. They should take into account the inconvenience that is caused to the people by the lack of accommodation. I must insist that the case has not been fairly represented to the minister by the officers of his department or he would more favourably consider the claims of Kinkora to a booking station. I stated last year that these men have to go to Emerald to receive their goods and have to drive 12 or 15 miles or else waste a day on the train. Then these trains often arrive at midnight. A booking station would not cost the government much as they have to keep a man there now. At the same time I might just as well urge the necessity of having two trains daily on that branch. There is only one train a day now and for the convenience of the travelling public and of the commercial people down there. there should be two trains. I am glad to find that the minister has decided to grant a station at Kensington and an extension to their siding. Fredericton, Breadalbane and Alberton are also to have new stations. I understand that the Alberton station is to be a fine brick station according to the minister's statement last year. I would ask whether it is proposed to abolish the nuisance of the 'Y' that is used in order to get into Alberton station. This is a very inconvenient way of getting into the town, and for a reasonable expenditure it could be remedied. The abolition of the 'Y' is just as important to the operation of the railway as is the straightening of a good many of the curves.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given that matter considerable study personally ; I have also conferred with the officials, and I may say that this work would mean an expendi-

ture of probably $25,000. There is a similar 'Y' on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ottawa and they seem to get along very well notwithstanding. In my judgment, and in the judgment of the officials, the conditions prevailing at Alberton would not justify such a large expenditure simply to avoid some little inconvenience in backing the trains.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the distance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 3,000 feet. This matter has been pressed upon me by a great many friends but I could not concur in their conclusion. I hope to have the pleasure of visiting the island in the near future.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the minister would come over and see the place I have no doubt he would change his mind.

Mr. EMMERSON. Sherbrooke and Ottawa are in exactly the same position as respects the 'Y.'

Mr. LEFURGEY. That may be, but if Sherbrooke and Ottawa are content to remain in the slough, that is no reason why Prince Edward Island should not make progress. If the minister carried out these improvements on the island it would make him more popular.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then you would feel bad.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Not at all. I am afraid that the people of Alberton have very little to hope for from the minister. The minister talks about an expenditure of $25,000, but that is a paltry sum to this government with their surpluses rolling in. If the Minister of Railways would whisper to the Finance Minister, he would tell him to go ahead, that it was only a drop in the bucket.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then you would complain of the expenditure.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am told by my colleague (Mr. Hackett) that the new stations at Northam and Richmond are going to be erected at once and I now remark that it is about time they should be. I again call the attention of the minister to the fact that the station accommodation at Summerside is badly in need of improvement. The station is located just at the head of the railway wharf ; there is a considerable amount of traffic there every day, and serious accidents have occurred while others have been narrowly averted. This matter has been pressed upon the minister by the people of Summerside and by resolution of the Maritime Board of Trade, and I trust the hon. gentleman will give his attention to this matter immediately. I have many times brought to the attention of the House the construction of branch lines in Prince Edward Island, and I trust now to have the assistance of my hon. friend from King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Haszard) in urging on the minister the necessity for railway extension. In Prince Edward Island there is only room for one system of railway, so that unfortunately we are debarred from the benefits which railway competition would give us. That being so the government should endeavour to meet the deficiency by affording adequate railway accommodation to the people. These branch lines have been promised to us more than once and it is high time these promises were carried into effect. While the government has built the Murray Harbour branch for the people of that district, there are other localities on the island which are even more badly in need of railway communication. There is a branch badly needed from Westpoint to the main line. The facilities for shipping by water at West Point are not of the best, nor is it probable that a suitable harbour could be constructed there. The people have now no means of getting in their coal, and other supplies, or sending their products to the market. I hope the minister will see his way to construct this branch line immediately. I have also brought to the attention of the House on many occasions the necessity of a branch line between Crapaud and North Wiltshire, and while I do not wish to elaborate on the arguments I have advanced on other occasions in favour of this undertaking ; I nevertheless earnestly press it upon the favourable consideration of the minister. During the by-election in Queen's, which resulted in the return of Mr. Haszard, there were strong resolutions passed in favour of a branch line from New London to a point on the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

The necessity of a branch railway in that section of the island was very strongly urged, and I understand that the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Haszard) gave his promise that if he were returned to parliament that branch would certainly be constructed. I hope the minister will give us his assurance to-night that that will be done. In order to fully round out the Prince Edward Island Railway and to put it in closer touch with the main line of the Intercolonial Railway, I would urge on the government the necessity of taking over the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, and making it the connecting link between the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial. I believe the hon. Minister of Railways will see eye to eye with me as to the advantage this would be to both systems, and the added convenience it would be to the government in carrying out the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island by providing a suitable service both winter and summer. I will not enter into any argument on this question to-night, but I submit it to the hon. Minister of Railways and his colleagues for careful consideration, and I believe

it will meet with their approval. Another matter connected with the railways, and allied very closely to them, is that of express accommodation between the western provinces and the eastern provinces. I understand that the Canadian Express Company has almost exclusive rights to a great many points on the Intercolonial Railway, while the Dominion Express Company is debarred from having access to those points. I know that the fruit growers of the west and the shippers of perishable products such as fish and meats in the maritime provinces, especially down about Canso, Halifax and other points not touched by the Dominion Express Company, are under a very serious disadvantage in getting their products to market. In many cases it is not possible to do so without the payment of a double expressage. I have in my hand a letter from one of the shippers, which points out that resolutions were passed and forwarded to the Minister of Railways on this subject, and I would like to know from him later on in this debate what conclusion he has come to with regard to giving relief to the shippers in this matter. The following resolution was passed by the Board of Trade of Canso :

Whereas, the fish trade of Canso demands the very best transportation facilities possible, and whereas, the delays in the delivery of express shipments at present is one of the most serious obstacles to the building up of the business ; and whereas, wherever competition in express service exists a much better service is given ; therefore resolved, that we request the Minister of Railways to grant to the Dominion Express Company equal facilities and equal rights with the Canadian Express Company over all lines of the Intercolonial Railway.

This is a very serious matter, especially with regard to the shipment of fresh fish from the maritime provinces to western Canada ; and speaking from my own experience, I think every facility should be given to the people of the maritime provinces to put a good article on the market, because there are no fish up here worth eating. The Council of the Halifax Board of Trade also passed a very strong resolution to the following effect and forwarded it to the Minister of Railways :

Whereas, the Dominion Express Company operates an express service on Intercolonial trains between St. John and Halifax affording competition to stations between these points ; and whereas, between Halifax and Sydney, and Truro and Sydney, the express service is confined to the Canadian Express Company, affording no competition to and from points reached by the Dominion Express Company on other lines of railway without two express charges being enacted ; and whereas, it is understood that the Dominion Express Company are willing to extend their service on all passenger trains of the Intercolonial Railway on same terms as are now granted to the Canadian Express Company ; therefore resolved, that in the interest of importers and shippers the council of the Halifax Board of Trade urges upon the Minister of Railways the advisability of granting the same terms to the Dominion Express Company as granted by the government to the Canadian Express Company ; and further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Railways, Finance and to the members for city and county of Halifax at Ottawa.

I would like to know from the minister that this matter has received his attention, and that he has some definite line of policy to announce to the House in regard to it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Have you anything from Manitoba ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. gentleman is not possibly so much concerned for the interests of the maritime provinces as he might be. If we heard his voice a little oftener upon certain subjects, for instance, the Elmira branch and some other matters, which he was loudly advocating when looking for votes in King's county, he would be much more appreciated. As I told him on one occasion, I am not here simply to represent my own constituency ; I consider myself as representing the Dominion of Canada at large ; and while the hon. gentleman does not see fit to look after his own constituency, I will have to point out on the floor of this House certain needed improvements in that district. Coming back to the express companies, Prince Edward Island suffers from an added grievance in the fact that during the winter season all our express matter stops at Charlottetown, and we have to pay an extra amount to the Prince Edward Island Railway for its shipment to different parts of the island. That is certainly a great inconvenience to shippers.

Arrangements with the railway could readily be made to give Georgetown, Souris, Summerside, Tignish, and Alberton express accommodation, and I would strongly urge on the minister the necessity of giving this increased accommodation to the importers in Prince Edward Island. Without trenching upon the matter of the conduct of the mails from the mainland, on which I shall have something to say on another occasion, I believe that there were twenty-eight days on which the mails came over, that Summerside did not receive its foreign mail, and there were eighteen days on which these mails could have been forwarded to Summerside had the Department of Railways given the people a special train for their distribution, so that while the mails reached Charlottetown for distribution, they were held over there for many hours before they were forwarded to Summerside and points west, and on the other ten days the mails coming into the capes were sent to Charlottetown and brought back the following day. I have pointed out a great many of the grievances under which the people of Prince Edward Island are suffering in the matter of railway

and transportation facilities and also some on the mainland, and I think that if the hon. minister will take these seriously into his consideration, he will give better accommodation to the people of the different localities and the shippers and travelling public and wipe out a substantial part of the deficit which has been rolling up on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways during the past season.

Mr. HASZARD. It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) in the long and somewhat rambling speech he has just delivered. The only conclusion I can draw from it is that he has abandoned the county of Prince and intends seeking election in Queen's county.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have been offered the nomination down there.

Mr. HASZARD. No doubt he will find a few friends to encourage him, but if he accepts he will experience the same trouble there that he found himself in during the by-election as the electors did not pay much attention to him. The interests of the mussel mud diggers of his county are important, but had he stayed at home, when that industry was being carried on, in February last, and attended to the interests of his constituents, he might have met with more success. Instead of that he followed me through the riding of West Queen's and no doubt discovered that his chances for re-election in that part of the county were so slim that he is now looking for a nomination in Charlottetown. I do not believe in taking up the time of this House in airing our grievances and calling the attention of hon. gentlemen to them, who cannot be expected to be interested in these local matters. I appreciate the fact that much better and more effective work can be done by interviewing the proper ministers at the proper time, and I have no doubt that when the supplementary estimates are brought down I shall be able to convince the people of my riding that I have not been idle in attending to their requirements. The hon. gentleman also made some reference to the necessity of having a new station at Charlottetown—a question which has already been pretty fully threshed out. But his statement to-night does not agree at all with that of the hon. member for Lincoln, who only a night or two ago said that the people of Charlottetown had no right to have anything to say regarding where that station should be built. I claim that the people should be consulted, and the question I think is now being dealt with in the only way that will be satisfactory to them. I shall not take up further time in following the hon. gentleman, but simply want him to understand that the people of Charlottetown and West Queen's have placed their confidence and trust in me, and if the hon. gentleman has no grievance to urge on behalf of Prince county, that speaks very well for the government. They must certainly have been doing a good deal for that part of the island, since the hon. gentleman has confined his remarks almost altogether to the riding I have the honour to represent. No doubt, however, the speech which the hon. gentleman has delivered will be circulated broadcast throughout Canada, and possibly adorned by his photograph, as was the speech he made the other day.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has failed to appreciate the ideas advanced by this side. The proposition advanced by this side is not that the people of the locality shall not have a voice in determining where a station shall be located, but that the matter shall not be made a political engine by which to win votes. What we contend is that the administration ought to take the responsibility of coming to a decision and not leave these items in the estimates dangling before the public from year to year for election purposes. I want to ask the hon. minister whether there has been anything done with reference to the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway. That was discussed a good deal some time ago in the press. It was said that the government were negotiating for its purchase, and at the time when the minister was considerably engaged outside the House, it was supposed that he was engaged in these negotiations. It would be interesting to the public to know how far that matter has advanced.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think what is of more interest at this moment is the item before the House. My hon. friend heard the announcement of the Prime Minister with respect to that matter, and if he will only possess his soul in patience he may learn something more about it.

Mr. LENNOX.. I did not happen to hear the Prime Minister and I do not think it would be out of place for the hon. gentleman to inform the committee in what position that matter is now.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that my hon. friend is travelling outside the record. We are not dealing with the Canada Eastern but with the Prince Edward Island Railway. But as my hon. friend says he did not hear the Prime Minister, I shall be very happy to tell him what the Prime Minister said. The Prime Minister said that there would probably be legislation introduced in this parliament having reference to the Canada Eastern Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government purchased the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That my hon. friend will probably learn in time.

Mr. SPROULE. This would be a good time to give the information.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) seems to have

silently stolen away, but he made a number of statements and suggestions which call for some attention on my part. The first was as to the non-furnishing of sufficient cars on the Prince Edward Island Railway for the hauling of mussel mud. It was well known that the storms of last winter were very severe and impeded railway traffic in all parts of Canada. Prince Edward Island was no exception. For a time the railway was unable to carry on its traffic, and the shippers of mussel mud were not able to get cars as fast as they wished them or as fast as the railway would have liked to furnish them. But the difficulty was soon cleared away and the cars were supplied. He read a communication from the employees with reference to the pension scheme on the government railways. He received that communication in March last, and I am sorry he did not make it known to me. Almost all the members on this side received similar communications and they made the matter known to me, and we have conferred with respect to it. Complaint is made with regard to the Boston travel. My hon. friend must know that during the past two seasons a special train has run between Point du Chêne and Boston, connecting with the train on the Boston and Maine. Cars come through from Boston to Point du Chêne, many of them cars of the Boston and Maine line. They are the same cars that are used on that line and on the Maine Central system, and are quite up to the standard of that system. It seems to me they should be fairly capable of meeting the requirements of the Intercolonial. This is a special train, and makes very quick time between Point du Chêne and St. John and, in fact, right through to Boston.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it a mixed train ?

Mr. EMMERSON. An express train. It connects with the Prince Edward Island Steam Navigation Company's steamer on her arrival and departure. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the line of railway along the harbour front in Charlottetown, and complained of the delays on the part of this government and of the Intercolonial management. There is one very significant fact that he withheld from this committee. When he criticised this government and the present management of the Intercolonial on this point, he was certainly presenting a very severe indictment against my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). When my hon. friend from South Lanark was Minister of Railways in 1888, if he was minister at that time——

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then his predecessor in the Conservative government, which certainly was in power at that time—Mr. P. S. Archibald, then engineer of the Intercolonial, was sent to Charlottetown and made a survey for a railway along the harbour front of that city. The year 1888 passed, and 1889, and so on up to and including 1896, during all of which time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and yet nothing was done. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) made any complaints against the government of that day with respect to their delay. This matter has received the attention of this government, and progress has been made. The proper connections are being made, and in due time the terminals at Charlottetown will be completed. Provision has been made in the estimates in connection with the station and the yards, and that is certainly more than the previous government did, though they led the people to believe that it would be done when they made that survey. The booking station to which the hon. gentleman refers would be at a place where the total freight earnings in the yard would not be enough to pay the expenses of maintaining the station. It would cost $700 a year to conduct, and the general manager advises me that there would not be that much of freight receipts in a year. It will be seen, therefore, that the officials on the Intercolonial are justified in reporting against it. But if circumstances later on justify it, we will establish it as a booking station. One of the hon. members on the other side—I think it was my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster)—stated last night that we should rely upon the judgment of the officials of the road and not consult the wishes of the people. I had stated that the people of Charlottetown could not agree on a site for the station, and the hon. gentleman condemned me for consulting the people. That seems to be the new doctrine of hon. gentlemen opposite—or it may be their old doctrine. We are endeavouring to consult the wishes of the people and to meet their requirements in every possible way.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) was good enough to answer me with regard to the Canada Eastern. It would facilitate matters if he would state whether there is any foundation for the statement made in the newspapers the other day that the government was about to purchase the Canada Atlantic. Probably it would save time, and certainly would be more satisfactory to the committee in dealing with these estimates, if the hon. gentleman would tell us if that statement is well founded.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was asked that question by one of the reporters last night, and I gave the answer. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will look at the Toronto 'Globe' of this morning——

Mr. INGRAM. Never read it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I feared that. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will remain in a benighted condition as long as he does not read the

Toronto 'Globe.' I made the statement last night, and I do not propose to enter into a discussion of that matter now. It would be entirely out of order. But I wish to be courteous to my hon. friend, and I will tell him where he can find the information.

Mr. LENNOX. Then the statement in the 'Globe' is correct ?

Mr. HACKETT. Does the minister intend to take action this session with regard to a pension to the railway employees on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps my hon. friend did not hear me say that I hoped before the session was through to be able to introduce such a Bill. The premier stated from his place in the House the other day that such a Bill would probably be brought before parliament.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Haszard) stated that the supplementary estimates were going to show something good for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no doubt they will.

Mr. HACKETT. Would the minister state now what these supplementary estimates will contain ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no idea what is in the mind of my hon. friend who made that statement, therefore I cannot answer for him.

Mr. HACKETT. Well it is difficult to get information on these matters respecting Prince Edward Island. There are two of us here, my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) and myself, and we stand up for the rights of Prince Edward Island on every possible occasion where we think we can advance the interests of her people. Now the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) this evening made what I consider a very unkind and very ungrateful remark. When my hon. friend from East Prince was speaking on matters affecting Prince Edward Island, the hon. member for King's interrupted him with the remark, What about Manitoba ? Are you going to advocate matters in connection with Manitoba ? Sir, it is too small. We are here representing Prince Edward Island, we are advocating the rights of Prince Edward Island, and when one of her representatives stands up here and advocates the rights of Prince Edward Island, he is told that he should also advocate matters in connection with Manitoba. I say it is unkind and ungrateful on the part of that hon. gentleman. Sir, the opportunity has arrived for the people of Prince Edward Island to be represented in matters affecting their interest, we wish to see justice done to our people in connection with railway stations and branch lines. Now the minister said that the Murray Harbour branch would be opened shortly. How is that progressing ? Is it intended to open it shortly ? How is the Hillsboro bridge getting along ? Will the Murray Harbour branch be open before the Hillsboro bridge is built ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I want to say one word to my hon. friend who has referred to me. He says that I interrupted the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) with a very unkind remark. That is not quite correct. The hon. member for East Prince was wandering in his speech all over the Dominion of Canada ; he was referring to Sydney, to Halifax and pretending that he had received communications from those cities, that he had to discuss matters in relation to them. Certainly he was not then advocating the interests of Prince Edward Island, in fact, in my judgment, he was making himself—well, he was trying to spread out, and instead of advocating the interests of Prince Edward Island he was looking after other parts of Canada, and it was then that I interposed with the remark and asked if he had any communication from Manitoba.

Mr. HACKETT. After hearing the hon. member's explanation I repeat again that his interjection was unkind and ungrateful to the people of Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend from East Prince was advocating a better system on the Intercolonial, he was perfectly within his right in advocating an improvement of that system from Moncton to Halifax, he was justified in advocating that better accommodation should be given to the tourist travel over the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway during the summer season. He complained that a change had been made at Painsec Junction, and that passengers travelling over the line had to change cars, and to go out of what might be called a fairly good palace car into an old dilapidated car that had been used for twenty years. The Minister of Railways said that was not so. I travelled myself over that line a little more than a month ago. There is one car that goes to St. John, a Canadian Pacific Railway car I think it is.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it can't be that.

Mr. HACKETT. Then it must be a Boston and Maine car. There is only one car that goes through, and the passenger who has not been able to get a seat in that car must go out and hunt up another car to go down to Point du Chêne.

Mr. EMMERSON. When one car is filled up he has to get into another. Is that it ?

Mr. HACKETT. Yes. Now would you imagine in an up-to-date railway that all the travellers going down from Painsec Junction to Point du Chêne have to change cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They don't change at Painsec, the train goes right through.

Mr. HACKETT. Only one car goes through.

Mr. EMMERSON. But this season, during the summer travel, or the tourist travel as it is called, there is a special train known as the Boston train that goes right through from Boston to Point du Chêne to connect with the island steamers, and it returns from Point du Chêne right through to Boston. Some of the cars are Boston and Maine cars, others are Intercolonial cars. My hon. friend is certainly not well informed with respect to that matter, or he would not say that they have to change at Painsec. It is a through train, and is known as a special schedule train, it is on the time table of the Intercolonial and is known on the time table as the Boston train.

Mr. HACKETT. That change must have taken place very recently.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is only during the summer season when the tourist traffic is on.

Mr. HACKETT. I had to change cars on May 15th.

Mr. EMMERSON. Summer had not come then nor had the tourists.

Mr. HACKETT. It ought to be along on May 15th if we are to have any at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year there was the same improvement during the tourist season.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to resent the insult cast upon my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) when he was advocating something in the interests of Prince Edward Island by the hon. member for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes). The people of Prince Edward Island are all interested in having a large tourist travel and we want to have the best accommodation possible from Painsec Junction to Point du Chêne, because we have as good boats between Point du Chêne and Summerside as can be found in Canada or anywhere else, and therefore in order that we may keep up a good system of travel between the continent of America and Prince Edward Island it is necessary that we should have fairly good accommodation between Point du Chêne and Painsec Junction. In regard to the station at Kinkora, which is a good old Irish name, I may say that accommodation is required there for the factories, manufacturing all kinds of agricultural implements, and for the people of the surrounding district, which is one of the best farming portions of our island, inhabited by a thrifty, hardy, intelligent people. Does the minister not think it necessary to build a station there which would provide the accommodation of a booking station ? I would appeal to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who was in that province during a by-election some few years ago and who promised these people great things. He said : We are going to build a station ; you will have a booking station and all the facilities you require ; we will place you on the same footing as other parts of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hold him to it.

Mr. HACKETT. Will you do it now, may I ask the hon. Minister of Finance ?

Mr. FIELDING. All the promises I made, if I made any, to the people of Prince Edward Island have been fulfilled long ago. I do not wait until this time to fulfil them.

Mr. HACKETT. What about the station?

Mr. FIELDING. Never, never, never; it is a dream of my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett).

Mr. HACKETT. It is a dream now, it is a dream of the past. You have forgotten all about what you promised to the people of Emerald and Kinkora in this connection. I met the minister at some of those meetings and he promised everything a minister could promise to obtain votes to elect his candidate.

Mr. FIELDING. He got them, too.

Mr. LENNOX. As we are dealing with the total working expenses of the government railway system, it is perfectly right that the committee should be informed distinctly and explicitly as to whether the government proposes to purchase this Canada Eastern Railway, and the terms upon which the purchase is to be made. It would be only right and fair if he gave us full information in regard to the purchase of this railway, which I believe is owned by a gentleman in the House, a supporter of the present administration.

Mr. LOGAN. The statement was made by the Prime Minister that this purchase was under consideration, and that the probabilities were that legislation to that effect would be brought down this session. I do not think it is fair to press the minister any further, in reference to this matter. For my own part, I only hope it is true that we are going to buy the Canada Eastern and I hope that this is only the commencement of the policy of purchasing all the feeders of the Intercolonial in the maritime provinces. I am convinced that if the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway owned the Intercolonial, it would not be many months before they would acquire not only the Canada Eastern, but the other small railways, such as the Havelock Railway, the New Brunswick Railway previously spoken of, the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company, the lines of the Canada Coals and Railway Company and the other feeders to the Intercolonial Railway in the maritime provinces. I believe that this wise policy will be adopted in the future in reference

to these small railways in those provinces. Many of these railways are so conducted that the road-bed is not in proper shape, and many of the roads—although I do not now refer to the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company's lines—are not maintained in safe condition and accidents have happened which would not have happened if the government owned the railways and kept them up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway.

I am firmly convinced that this is the proper policy to adopt in reference to these feeders to the Intercolonial Railway. I did not intend to speak in the committee, but there seems to be a plan amongst hon. gentlemen on the other side to obstruct business, and I do not see why I should not have something to say as well as these gentlemen. We have had to-night a sample of the varied views of the opposition upon the question of railway operation. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) had the floor for more than an hour while he called upon the Minister of Railways to build in his district of Prince Edward Island, stations and sidings by the score, to make improvements without number, to run more trains, to build branch lines, and last but not least, to purchase the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway. I tried to figure what would be the probable cost of carrying out his requests, and I find that it would amount to between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) on the other hand, has referred to a large expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway as most reprehensible.

Mr. LENNOX. I have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. LOGAN. Well, it does not make much difference anyway what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) said in reference to the matter.

Mr. LENNOX. It makes some difference that the hon. gentleman should misrepresent me.

Mr. LOGAN. I will not hesitate for a moment to take the hon. gentleman's word, but I shall quote even a higher authority than he is on that question. I shall quote the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) who I have no doubt will be the Minister of Railways in the next Conservative government, whenever the time comes that a Conservative government is in power.

Mr. J. D. REID. Next election.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry to think that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will not live that long.

Mr. LOGAN. I regret that my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) whom we all respect so much and whose genial manner we appreciate is not a younger man; because gray as his hair is now, it will be whiter than the driven snow before he has a chance to be Minister of Railways again. However, he was Minister of Railways once upon a time, and a few evenings ago in discussing the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, with tears in his eyes almost, and with a tremor in his voice, he proclaimed:

> Has the Minister of Railways no pity for the poor ratepayers of Canada ? . . . . Is the House going to submit to this ? . . . . Is the country going to submit to it ? . . . . The building of deep water termini and such thongs are interminable and are not justified at all . . . . The Intercolonial Railway is a sink hole.

The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) denounced the building of sidings on the Intercolonial Railway, but now the member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) demands sidings and improvements on the Prince Edward Island Railway which would cost millions of dollars. How can the people of Canada take the opposition seriously ? They are as much divided on this question as they are on the question of government ownership. I have no doubt that the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) was not intended for this House but for his constituents, and I am convinced that that speech in pamphlet form will supply interesting reading by the firesides of East Prince in the cold winter evenings. Now, as to the request with reference to the express companies; I believe it is the general desire of the people living along the Intercolonial Railway that the Dominion Express Company should have the same privileges on that railway as are enjoyed by the Canadian Express Company. A number of us on this side of the House have recently waited upon the Minister of Railways in reference to this matter, and he has promised a sympathetic consideration, and expressed the hope that he will be able to look into the question within the next few weeks. I have no doubt the minister will come to the conclusion that the request of the Dominion Express Company should be granted. The hon. gentleman from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) complained that there was a lack of cars on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I am sorry to say that there is also a lack of cars on the Intercolonial Railway, as I know from experience because I have just been endeavouring to secure cars for certain excursions which would not be objected to by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) or my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). There is undoubtedly a lack of rolling stock on the government railways, but how are we going to remedy that deficiency if attention is paid to the argument of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who says that the Intercolonial Railway is a sink hole, and that such expenditure is unjustifiable ? We

need rolling stock, and a good deal of it, and I hope the Minister of Railways will make provision to supply such rolling stock as is required. We have on the Intercolonial Railway some magnificent trains ; we have the best road-bed in the Dominion of Canada, but we have not sufficient passenger or freight cars. There is complaint from the shippers of the maritime provinces that they cannot secure facilities for the shipment of lumber and hay and other products. My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) has referred to the tremendous crowds of people coming from Boston to Prince Edward Island. I am glad to know that the exodus from Prince Edward Island has ceased and that the people are returning to that fertile province in such prosperous circumstances that they can afford to travel in parlour cars. But what has the hon. member for East Prince to complain of ? During the ten months of the last fiscal year ending on the 1st of May, this government has spent the sum of $364,924.66 chargeable to capital account on the Prince Edward Island Railway. What more does my hon. friend want? This government has spent on the Prince Edward Island road within the last few years over $2,000,000 on capital account. It would seem to me as if the government was doing its duty to the Prince Edward Island Railway in this regard. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) will only be patient, he will find that the present government will amply supply the wants of the people of Prince Edward Island in the matter of railway accommodation.

Mr. J. D. REID. Whenever the Minister of Railways is asked an important question I notice that some of his supporters pop up and endeavour to evade the issue raised. The Minister of Railways apparently has not the confidence of his supporters to such an extent that they will allow him to answer a question.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. You were not present to hear the minister answer the question.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have been here all day trying to hear him answer.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Where were you yesterday and the day before ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I have been in this House as much as you have, and taken a greater part in the debates.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I can say that that statement is absolutely and unqualifiedly a false statement.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. gentleman had the manners of any decent man he would not make that statement. It is only a man of his reputation who would do so. There was a question asked from the Minister of Railways about the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway, and he has not answered it. There is a vote before this House for $7,000,000, and we are entitled to an answer as to the policy of the government on that matter before we pass this item.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. It is indeed refreshing to hear the voice of the hon. gentleman in this chamber once more. There is one thing about him, that when he does come in, which is a rare occurrence, he tries to make himself heard, and I congratulate him upon giving us his views on matters pertaining to the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. I desire, however, to point out that certain anomalies crop up from time to time in these discussions on the Intercolonial. I had intended to reply to certain matters brought up by the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), who addressed the House at great length this evening ; but the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) having replied, it is not necessary for me to do so again. It was my intention to remind him that a communication was received by him in March last in regard to a matter of extreme importance to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway. I intended to ask him before he concluded his observations what action he had taken in regard to that communication. Several members on this side of the House have received the same communication ; but they have not treated it as did the hon. member, who tonight professed such great anxiety for the interests of those people. They went to the minister in regard to the representations there made, they were received favourably by him, and I hope the impression they made on the minister will bear fruit that will be appreciated by the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway. If they had desired to use this matter for political purposes, it is probable that they would have kept these letters and resolutions in their pockets and waited three or four months to bring them up in the House and parade them before the people of this country to show that they were interested in those railway employees. They did not do that. They preferred to go about this matter in a businesslike way, and I have no doubt the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway will reap the benefits of the efforts those members on this side of the House have made in their interests. It is important that the people who have communicated with the hon. gentleman should know that the communication which they sent him in March last has remained in his pocket, and that he has not brought it to the attention of either the minister or the country until after the lapse of four months. They will hardly thank him for his conduct in this matter. They will realize that it is not so much the interests of the people employed on

the Intercolonial Railway or the Prince Edward Island Railway that he desires to promote as it is his own interests.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask the hon. gentleman how long it is since he waited on the minister with regard to the railway employees ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I want to say to my hon. friend and the committee that before this year, before that communication had been received, before the present Minister of Railways had assumed his present office, hon. members on this side of the House, together with myself, moved for a measure of this character, which I hope the Minister of Railways will submit to this House before the present session closes.

Mr. HACKETT. That is very unsatisfactory. My hon. friend from East Prince read a document here, signed in March last. Has the hon. gentleman waited on the hon. minister since ; and, if so, what effect has he had on the minister ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I certainly have. Immediately on receipt of that communication I brought its subject matter to the attention of the minister, not for the first time, and again urged upon him the desirability of passing such a measure in the interest of those people.

Mr. HACKETT. My hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), from purely patriotic motives, in the interest of the employees of the railway, brought this matter before the attention of this committee this evening. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Alex. Johnston) desires to reflect upon my hon. friend from East Prince, and to take the credit to himself. He said he had been working for a year or for two years. What success has he yet achieved in those two years ? The hon. member for East Prince had the manliness to come forward and present to this committee this document, signed by the different associations down there.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where has the document been in the meantime ?

Mr. HACKETT. The original was before the minister. This is a copy that was sent to the hon. member for East Prince, and the hon. minister must also have had it before him. Why did the hon. gentleman not bring this matter before this parliament before ? Why did he wait for two years to have it brought up ? While my hon. friend from East Prince has been working in the interest of the railway employees, the hon. gentleman has remained as dumb as an oyster. I want to say one word in reply to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who has also made an attack on the hon. member for East Prince. He says we require millions of dollars. We require no millions of dollars. This government undertook to build a branch line from Southport to Murray Harbour, which has cost $1,000,000 or $2,000,000. They also undertook to build a bridge. The accommodation required on the main line of the railway does not require millions. It would only take a few thousand dollars to grant this accommodation to the people. I made the remark a few minutes ago that when the Minister of Finance was down there he made great promises to the people of Prince Edward Island with regard to providing accommodation of this kind, but he has failed to carry out those promises. To come down to a later date, I find that the hon. gentleman last year made promises in parliament which he has not carried out. On an item for increased accommodation at Charlottetown, $87,000, we had the following discussion :

Mr. LEFURGEY. What work does this vote contemplate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are proposing to have a new station with covered platform, additional freight shed accommodation, additional land required for the purpose, re-arrangement of the yard, additional siding room, additional wharf accommodation, with dredging, and the usual allowance for engineering, inspection and advertising. The largest item is the new station and platform, $55,000 ; the next, the rearrangement of the yard, $11,000.

I ask the Minister of Finance, who was then administering the Railway Department, what has he done with regard to that Charlottetown station. Has he carried out that promise made last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has spoken of some promise. I do not know of any. We took an appropriation to provide Charlottetown with a new station and we mean to do it. It could not very well have been done after parliament prorogued last October. My hon. friend can make his mind easy, Charlottetown will have a new station.

Mr. HACKETT. The people of Charlottetown are supposed to wait until doomsday for the accomplishment of these promises. Year after year a certain amount has been appearing in the estimates for the purpose of building a railway station, and nothing is done. And the same statement which the Finance Minister made a moment ago is made every year. He was down there last autumn when it was supposed the elections were approaching. That was before the Grand Trunk Pacific difficulty. He must have looked over the site, and certainly can now whisper into the ear of his colleague that something should be done in connection with the building of this station.

Mr. FIELDING. I will whisper.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister going to answer the question I put regarding the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not think my hon. friend was serious. He knows that I am not privileged to declare the policy of the government. The Prime Minister is the one to make announcements of that kind. When the matter is in a condition to be brought before parliament, it will come up in the regular way.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not gifted with the power of humour which the hon. minister possesses.

Mr. EMMERSON. No one would charge you with humour.

Mr. LENNOX. But in all seriousness I consider that parliament has a right to the information I have asked. We have got two rival policies before us. We have the policy propounded by the government of building the Grand Trunk Pacific and crippling the Intercolonial. On the other hand, we have the proposition involved in the question of whether this additional feeder shall be purchased to increase the usefulness of the Intercolonial. The question before us now is whether we shall or not devote a matter of some $7,000,000 to the maintainance of these roads.

Mr. EMMERSON. $6,500,000, and we have passed that item. We are now over on the island and the Canada Eastern is not on the island.

Mr. LENNOX. We have not yet passed vote No. 250, which is one of $7,000,000, we are considering its various subdivisions. In considering the question whether we shall vote this money or not, we have the right to insist on being informed of the policy of the government. We have the right to know whether, notwithstanding the policy of building a transcontinental railway, which will necessarily cripple the Intercolonial, we shall adopt as a rival policy the extension of the principle of government ownership, by purchasing the Canada Eastern as a feeder for the Intercolonial. It is all important that we should know exactly where the government stand in this regard. We have the announcement of the First Minister that the principle of government ownership is to be extended by the purchase of this railway, because he informed us that there probably would be legislation brought down this year having reference to it. That could mean nothing else except legislation for the purpose of acquiring this road. Therefore the committee is entitled beyond question to this information at this time. We have to determine not only whether we shall devote $7,000,000 to the ordinary expenditure of the Intercolonial and the other road for the year ending 1905, but also that other question which is involved in it, and that is whether we shall connect the Intercolonial with this Canada Eastern, which it is said the government contemplate purchasing. The two things go together, and it is time the House knew exactly what the government propose doing.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the Prince Edward branch sufficient rolling stock to meet its requirements ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the general manager that it would be very desirable to have some more.

Mr. INGRAM. There is not much satisfaction in that answer. What class of cars is required ? What is the rolling stock that is deficient ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been enough to meet the requirements. Business is increasing and as it increases we shall need more.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the number of cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total number is 446.

Mr. INGRAM. And the number of box cars is 213 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. What portion of these are in active service ?

Mr. EMMERSON. All of them, except about five per cent that are usually undergoing repairs.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the failure in the train service on the Prince Edward Island Railway last winter was due to the snow blockade ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what I was informed at the time, and I so informed my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). On receiving the complaint, I communicated with the officials, and that is the answer I got.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman look over the train mileage of the road and tell us what was the mileage for August ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was 25,429.

Mr. INGRAM. And the snow blockade, I suppose, took place about January or February ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it was during March.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is the train mileage for March ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was 21,936.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, if business was the same, the falling off due to the snow blockade would be about as 25,000 to 21,000. Now, my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) stated that there was an insufficiency in the train service all winter.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the general manager that the road has a larger number of trains in summer than in winter.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, that explanation makes the position of my hon. friend from East Prince all the stronger. It would show that the snow blockade affected the train mileage very little or not at all. The minister has not thought this out. The excuse he makes is not in accordance with the figures he has given.

Mr. EMMERSON. The statement I made was that the management reported to me, in answer to the complaint put in, that it was because of the snow blockade they could not furnish the cars, and I gave that answer at the time. The delay was only for a short time as I understand it. Soon after he made the complaint my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) said that the matter was all right.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) made the statement that it was owing to the snow blockade.

Mr. EMMERSON. Because my officials told me so.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman is responsible for what his officials tell him

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly; I am taking the responsibility.

Mr. INGRAM. But surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) will see the point. My hon. friend from East Prince said that the necessary train accommodation had not been furnished during the winter. The minister puts forward the excuse of the snow blockade. Any gentleman looking over the railways and canals report can satisfy himself that there was more snow in 1903 than in 1902, because in 1902 the snow ploughs were used for 2,330 miles, while in 1903 they were used for 14,026 miles. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) will see that this additional mileage was in March. If that be true——

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram can save himself a great deal of energy if he will recall the fact that this was during the month of March, 1904, and he is quoting the month of March, 1903. My hon. friend is quoting figures from the month of March, 1903. He is only a year out of the way.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister may be perfectly right, I have no doubt he is.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman might save himself a good deal of fury.

Mr. INGRAM. How did it come to pass that the snow blockade in 1902 prevented the cars from being used in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was speaking of the snow blockade this last winter. The complaint was made with respect to cars during March and February of this past year. But my hon. friend is quoting figures and returns for the year previous.

Mr. INGRAM. Now the hon. gentleman's snow blockade took place in the month of March. He could only say that in the month of March a snow blockade interfered with the cars and the trains. Now he explains that it was in January, February and April.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not say there was a snow blockade only in the month of March. We know that in Ontario and New Brunswick, and other points there were snow blockades in February and January, and there may well have been in Prince Edward Island also.

Mr. INGRAM. If the snow blockade during the whole of the winter months prevented the train accommodation in Prince Edward Island being what the people required and desired——

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no complaint about the train accommodation of the island, or if there was a complaint, it came from a certain class of men who were hauling mussle mud to their farms. This last year they were a little late because of the deep snow, and they complained. But the general train service of the Island has not been complained of, that I have heard.

Mr. INGRAM. One of the representatives of Prince Edward Island has taken up nearly an hour in complaining of insufficient train service, and the hon. gentleman said that it was owing to the snow blockade.

Mr. EMMERSON. No. As I understood the complaint of the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), and as it was presented to me in communications which I received, and about which I telegraphed in March last to the officials, it was merely from the mussel mud men who could not get enough cars. They wanted twenty-seven a day, I think it was, and they did not get that number in a week. The reason they did not get them in that week was the snow blockade, at least that is the reason assigned by the officials, they could not furnish the cars. I telegraphed to them, and immediately after that blockade was removed these men got all the cars they wanted.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friends were complaining about insufficient cars, the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) also made a similar complaint. Let me mention that the revenue from the Prince Edward Island Railway for ten months was $189,894, and the expenditure during the same period was $255,056. The expenditure was more than $65,000 over the revenue. Now we find complaints about the insufficiency of cars, those who desired to ship could not secure cars in order to increase the revenue of that road. I tried to find out from the hon. gentleman if they had sufficient rolling stock to meet the requirements, and he has not explained to this House satisfactorily whether they have or not. He says they could put up with

more. Surely if the road is losing $65,000 in ten months owing to a shortage of cars, then it is necessary to have more cars to meet the requirements of trade. The hon. gentleman has not given us a satisfactory explanation with respect to that. Now the hon. member for Cumberland rose to answer some questions, and so did the hon. member for Cape Breton. I understand that some of these gentlemen, and this is not the first time, have interfered with that road. I understand some of these gentlemen go so far as to say that they must have trains to meet their convenience, and they simply give orders to the station agents : You must hold these trains till I am ready to go. I understand that has been done, and when one of the station agents refused to interfere with the progress of the trains, he was removed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will the hon. gentleman give the names ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, I will give the hon. gentleman a name privately, it is a member of this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like my hon. friend to be kind enough to give the name now.

Mr. INGRAM. I will give it privately.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not fair to hon. members of this House for the hon. gentleman to make that statement without giving names. The statement is made publicly, and it is but fair to give the name of the offender and of the official who was dismissed. I think it is due to the management that their names should be reported. I am sure that the hon. gentleman has been misinformed.

Mr. INGRAM. I hope so.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am satisfied that he has been, and I will make this statement, challenging successful contradiction, that there never has been an official dismissed from the railway because he refused to detain a train at the request of a member of parliament or of anybody else.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman go so far as to say that a station agent was not removed for refusing to comply with the request of a member of parliament ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will go so far as to deny that, if any request to detain a train was made by a member of parliament, the station agent was dismissed because he refused to detain the train. Now it is due to the department——

Mr. INGRAM. I did not say that, you are not going to put words down my throat.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend wishes to withdraw——

Mr. INGRAM. I withdraw nothing, I am not here to withdraw anything I have said. What I did say was that it was reported to me that a certain member of this House went to a station agent and asked him to detain a train to suit his convenience. The train was not detained by the agent and by reason of the train not being detained. the agent was removed from that station.

Mr. EMMERSON. I give that a most unqualified contradiction.

Mr. INGRAM. Very well ; I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing of the kind ever occurred. I think my hon. friend should in fairness to the hon. members from the maritime provinces give the name of his informant, the name of the member, the name of the station agent and the particular station. I think that information is due in all fairness.

Mr. INGRAM. I told the hon. gentleman that I would give him the name privately.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). We want it publicly.

Mr. INGRAM. I will do as I like about that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that in fairness the name should be given. A stigma is placed on some one member of this House. That member should be known and if the charge is not true he should have an opportunity of giving it a contradiction, otherwise all the members from the maritime provinces are under that stigma.

Mr. INGRAM. The member whose name I have is a good respectable member of this House, and I have no desire to do him injury. I will tell the minister the name privately, and if I do him any injury by this statement I am man enough to stand up in the House and say it is not true. Is that fair ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that in all fairness he should give the name.

Mr. INGRAM. I am the best judge of what I should do in this matter. I give you the complaint and if the complaint is not correct I will be as glad to hear it as the hon. minister, but if it is correct the sooner a matter of that kind is investigated and stopped the better.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the hon. gentleman will give the name an investigation will be held and the true facts elicited. I wish to say that no station agent has ever been dismissed on the Intercolonial Railway because——

Mr. COCHRANE. He did not say dismissed at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. Removed.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is from one station to another.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is charged that he was removed because he refused to detain

the train at the request of a member of parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. Does my hon. friend grasp the difference between removal from one station to another and dismissal ?—That is what I meant, and that is what I said.

Mr. FIELDING. It seems to be a rumour which we can get no one to father, and that is a poor rumour.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister approve of naming a member.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not approve of a gentleman taking an idle rumour of that character and flinging it before parliament when he has no authority and no one to back it up.

Mr. INGRAM. I have as good reason to state that as the hon. minister has to state what he said.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not stated anything.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be more becoming the hon. gentleman not to say anything. What are we here for ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is a question.

Mr. INGRAM. That is a question.

Mr. COCHRANE. To vote blindly.

Mr. INGRAM. If there is any statement in the public press of this country in connection with the management of any government institution and that comes under the eye of a member, parliament is the place where that member is supposed to state it, and if it is not correct it is neither belittling nor unbecoming to a minister to give an answer. The minister has given that answer, I have accepted his answer as correct. He has asked me the name and I have said I am willing to give the name privately. What more do you want ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Am I to understand then he declines to give the name of the one member ?

Mr. INGRAM. No you are not.

Mr. EMMERSON. Only in private.

Mr. INGRAM. I will give it in private.

Mr. EMMERSON. And may I make it public.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not care what you do then, you can father it. I will give it to the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to use it he can.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will he give the name of the informant privately ?

Mr. INGRAM. No, I shall not.

Mr. FIELDING. It has no father at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. An idle rumour which has been set afloat which the hon. gentleman cannot connect with anybody.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite, on the eve of a possible election, evidently do not want information as to the affairs of the country to be given to the people in answer to the questions which the people can only get through the opposition who are particularly charged with asking for information as to the administration of the country. I can quite understand that. They do not desire to have any clear announcement. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has pointed out very calmly and earnestly in the discharge of his duty the importance of knowing whether the Canada Eastern, running from Fredericton to Chatham, is to be acquired by the government and made part of the Intercolonial. We are asked to pass an estimate of $7,000,000 for the maintenance of this railway, and surely we are entitled to ask as to the acquisition of this Canada Eastern. The Minister of Railways perhaps does not know or care. He may be satisfied to get his estimates voted blindly, without giving any information on the subject whatever, and then use the estimate as he pleases—as he did with $4,000 which was voted for the acquisition of a station site. I understand that the Minister of Railways does not want to give us the information but we are obliged to tell him that we are entitled to it and that we must insist on having it.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is not justified in saying that I want to withhold the information. The question had reference to the policy of the government, and I said that the Prime Minister was the proper person to speak with regard to that. I do not feel that I would be at liberty to state what may be transpiring before council with respect to this or any other matter until it has reached a stage that it can be announced to parliament. The Prime Minister is the person to do that, or to delegate it especially to some of his colleagues. That is my position in the matter.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did it occur to the Minister of Railways that the Prime Minister should tell him not to try to get these estimates through until he was ready to give us information.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The only connection that question would have with the item under discussion is that should the government acquire this branch railway, it would involve further expenditure.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not the only one.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If it should happen before the session closes that the government would ask parliament to acquire the Canada Eastern, the government would also have to ask parliament to vote money to maintain the Canada Eastern, and then would be the proper time to discuss

the matter, and the committee would have ample opportunity for discussion. No one desires to be discourteous to the opposition, but it is unreasonable to take the attitude that no estimate will be voted until the committee is informed as to the policy of the government regarding the Canada Eastern.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not say that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That seems to me to be the attitude taken.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not my attitude.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Is it reasonable for the opposition to dwell further upon the refusal of the Minister of Railways to anticipate the Prime Minister's announcement, should the government decide that an announcement may be made with regard to this matter ? If the opposition were curtailed in their rights in any way I would be the first to resent it ; but they are not in the slightest degree prejudiced by postponing the discussion on a matter which is not before the House, and which may never occur ; it may and it may not occur.

Mr. MONK. Suppose the House was not disposed to vote this money for the Intercolonial Railway unless the Canada Eastern were acquired, would we not be entitled to get an answer from the minister ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the opposition choose to say that they are not going to allow these estimates to pass until the policy of the government respecting the Canada Eastern is announced, we come to a deadlock, and it becomes a question of physical endurance. Is that a desirable state of affairs ? It is quite as competent for the government to enter into a battle of that kind as it is for the opposition. I have been many years here and I have taken part in such contests, but I must say that I fail to discover wherein the public interest was advanced by any such method. I am sure that all will agree that nothing is to be gained to-night by the opposition adhering to the view that no progress will be made.

Mr. LENNOX. No one has suggested that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I gathered that from the language of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster). Is it fair to create an impasse because the Minister of Railways will not make an announcement that he is not at liberty to make ? If any announcement is to be made it will be made by the head of the government, or by some person properly authorized. There is no person authorized to make such an announcement to-night ; yet hon. gentlemen opposite, in anticipation of something that may or may not happen, make that a cause for obstructing the passage of these estimates. I do not think that is reasonable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Weeks ago it was announced in the government press that this railway is to be purchased and made a part of the Intercolonial Railway. The question was asked of the Minister of Railways an hour ago, who saw fit to treat it in a somewhat supercilious manner.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have our own opinion about that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not intend to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the hon. gentleman's manner is unfortunate The government could have done one of three things when the question was put ; they could say: No, it is not to be purchased ; or, yes, it is to be purchased ; or they could say that the matter is under consideration. Any of these three answers might be given without any detriment to any public interest, and any one of these answers would be absolutely satisfactory.

Mr. EMMERSON. If that is the question I can answer it at once.

Mr. LENNOX. That is practically the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question before the committee is a vote for the Prince Edward Island Railway, and a question entirely foreign to that is being discussed. Information is asked of the minister with regard to another railway which is not now under discussion. That is out of order, and I would not allow the minister to answer the question if he proposed to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—I move that the committee rise, and I ask whether or not there are any proposals under consideration, and whether or not the Canada Eastern Railway is to be purchased by the government ? I may say that I do not agree with the ruling of the chairman, but it is not worth while wasting time over that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When a motion is made that the committee rise the discussion must be confined to giving reasons why the committee should rise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question that is to be considered on a motion that the committee rise is that which is introduced by the person who makes the motion——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Not at all.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely you should let the hon. gentleman make his statement without rising up in the middle to interrupt him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I want to put myself right. The hon. gentleman has taken exception to my ruling, and it is my business to sustain my ruling. A motion that the committee rise is equivalent to a motion for the adjournment of the House. If such a motion is made during the dis-

cussion of a question, then the discussion must be confined to the question. But if a motion of adjournment is made in the House between the Orders of the Day, you can introduce any question you wish to discuss. The discussion on this motion must be confined to the question before the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say to the Minister of Railways, after this luminous exposition by the Chairman that I do not regard it as sufficient for him to say that the Prime Minister is not here. We know that he must necessarily be absent sometimes during the sittings of the House, and we are ready to make every reasonable allowance ; but that is no reason why an item should be passed in his absence. The proper course would be to postpone the consideration of the item until the Prime Minister finds it convenient to be present. If questions arise as to which he only can speak during the discussion of an item, then he should appoint some one to speak for him in his absence, or the consideration of the item should be postponed until he has an oportunity to be present. However, I understood the Minister of Railways to say that there is no difficulty in answering the question.

Mr. EMMERSON. The question first put to me was a comprehensive question, on which I was to give all the transaction, all that has transpired. If the question is as put by my hon. friend, whether the purchase of the Canada Eastern is under the consideration of the government, I would at once say yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was not just the way I put it. I said that a question had been put to which I thought there could be one of three proper answers which ought to be satisfactory to the opposition. Has the Canada Eastern been purchased or is it about to be purchased by the government ? I thought the government might very well say that it has been purchased, or that it is about to be purchased, or that it is not to be acquired, or that the matter is under consideration. Either of these answers would be fair.

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is to say it has not been decided.

Mr. LENNOX. As the minister says, the question. was somewhat comprehensive The first question I asked was : Has the railway been purchased ? I also asked : Is the government about to purchase it ? If so, we would like to have the particulars. The minister could have answered the question by saying that they had not purchased it, but that the matter was under consideration. I understand the minister to say that they are about to purchase it and that the matter is under consideration.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that the answer of the hon. minister ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does it not follow that when the minister says the matter is under consideration, it may be that negotiations with the idea of purchase have been undertaken ; but you could not say that the matter had been completed, that a bargain had been agreed to, unless the details had been agreed upon. When you say it is under consideration, that is I think as liberal a statement as an opposition might reasonably expect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we all understand the situation. The hon. Postmaster General is hedging a little for the benefit of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. J. D. REID. The answer, I understand, is that the railway has actually been purchased, but the Minister of Railways and Canals does not choose to make that declaration.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose that on your ruling, if the Minister of Railways had stated that the railway had been purchased, the question could not be considered at all under the item ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, he would not be at all in order in answering. It has nothing to do with the question under discussion.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to ask a few questions of the minister. According to his statement for the ten months ending the 30th of June last, there has been a deficit of about $65,000 in receipts as compared with the expenditure and working expenses. Is there any anticipation that that deficit will cease ? The expenditure on capital account for the same period he states to be $346,000 ; yet the hon. minister retains $650,000 to his credit. Does he expect to use up during the unexpired two months the difference between those two amounts ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $300,000 of that would be expended during the two months.

Mr. HAGGART. About $300,000 more than the $343,000. That would be $643,000 on capital account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would mean for the whole twelve months.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount contemplated to be expended on capital account, after the vote of this year, on the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Murray Harbour branch ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, and the other improvements. Does the vote of this year cover the whole expenditure contemplated on that branch ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I gave the explanation and the information will be found in 'Hansard.' I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BARKER. I understand that the hon. minister will have in the supplementary estimates an item for the completion of work on the double track between Windsor Junction and Halifax. Last year the Minister of Finance, as acting Minister of Railways, took an appropriation of $118,000, telling us at the time that that would not complete the work, and I understand that the minister will have to ask a further amount in the supplementaries. I presume that is so.

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be necessary to have a further vote.

Mr. BARKER. My object in asking that question now is this. When that item comes up on the supplementary estimates, I desire that the minister shall be ready to furnish us with all particulars about the work—the plans, profiles, specifications and contracts entered into, if any, and the tenders and everything concerning the work, so that we may be able to discuss it without asking further adjournment.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 8, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY—CORRESPONDENCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to lay on the table correspondence respecting the Alaskan boundary.

PAPERS *RE* COLONEL GREGORY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The papers relating to the extension of Colonel Gregory's term of command have not, I think, been brought down. The Minister of Militia stated that they would be here shortly.

SUPPLY—THE 12th OF JULY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, before that matter is taken up, I take the liberty of drawing the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that next Tuesday will be the 12th of July, which is a day honoured by a great many people of the Dominion of Canada, and a day on which a great many members of the House would like to get away to different parts of the country. I would, therefore, ask the Prime Minister if he would be good enough to take it into his consideration, and let the House have a holiday on the 12th of July ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no doubt that my hon. friend feels divided between his duties outside and his duties inside ; but there is no precedent in that respect that I know of.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The right hon. leader of the government can easily create a precedent. That is no trouble to him.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway, to strengthen bridges, $385,000.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was asked to give a statement as to the bridges that were to be strengthened after the appropriation of $385,000 is exhausted. This is exclusive of the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton railways. The bridges and estimates are : East River, $75,000 ; Shubenacadie, $24,000 ; Stewiacke, $16,000 ; Elmsdale, $25,000 ; Enfield, $14,500 ; Hall's Creek, $3,000 ; Hammond River, $32,000; Bic, $14,500; Isle Verte, $25,000; St. Henri, $46,000; Harris' mill stream, $4,000. There are also a number of small bridges on which it is estimated that we shall require plate girders to the amount of $11,500, and rolled beams to the amount of $18,000. The whole, after making an allowance for estimated credits, will amount to $280,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was a great deal more information promised by the hon. gentleman on some of these items.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not on this item.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some of the information required is set forth on page 6123 and following pages of the unrevised 'Hansard.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I propose to give that information in connection with each item.

To exchange drawbars of freight cars on Intercolonial Railway, $45,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was asked to furnish some information respecting the protection to Grand Narrows Bridge. I find that I was a little in error in giving the prices of timber. For two inch creosote sheathing the lowest tender, that of Wyckoff Creosote Co. of Stamford, Conn., at $45 per thousand feet board measure, was accepted. For ballast

poles, A. Mackenzie, of River John, was the successful tenderer at one and three-quarter cents per lineal foot. Hemlock logs, ten inches, was given to D. McLean, Orangedale, at six cents per lineal foot for a portion and another portion was let to R. McGregor & Sons, of New Glasgow, at seven and a half cents. Hemlock logs, twelve inches, was given to R. McGregor & Sons of New Glasgow at nine and three-quarter cents per lineal foot. Square timber was given the same firm at $10.50 per thousand feet board measure. I was asked by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) for the name of the party who got the contract for car couplers. It was given to Geo. McAvity, of St. John, and the Monarch Coupler Co., of Detroit. The price to McAvity is $17.50 delivered in Montreal, and to the Monarch Coupler Co. $17 delivered in Detroit. What page of 'Hansard' did my hon. friend refer to a few moments ago ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 6121 and the following. On 6121 there is a reference to a bridge. The hon. member for Hamilton said he wanted some information, and perhaps that is what the hon. minister has just given. The minister said then :

I will give a list of forty bridges for which the Dominion Bridge Company has a contract. I can give the names of the bridges but not the exact amount required for each bridge. I could probably furnish that later.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given that just now. On page 6124 I find that the hon. member for Hamilton asked me how many new freight cars have been furnished with the brake equipment, and also how many cars out of service have been rebuilt and equipped. In reply I would say that 207 new freight cars were purchased, equipped with Master Car Builders drawbars, and 388 have been rebuilt and equipped.

Mr. BARKER. In both cases have they been equipped with the drawbar and the air brakes ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There were 207 new freight cars purchased with air brake equipment, and 388 cars have been rebuilt and equipped with air brakes.

Mr. BARKER. I understand the minister to say that both the cars which have been purchased new and those that have been built in the shops have been equipped with the air brakes and the special draw bars.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is my information.

To strengthen bridges, Intercolonial Railway, $385,000.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman did not give us the other day the amount he was appropriating for each bridge. He mentioned the names of the bridges he proposed to strengthen, but did not say what amount he would spend on each.

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the names of the bridges : Chisholm's Bridge, $629.64 ; Riversdale, $3,169.42 ; Bible Hill, $723.49 ; McManus, Mill, $1,505.84 ; North River, $1,416.52 ; South Cocaigne, $723.81 ; Buctouche, River, $685.34; South Coal Branch, $3,084.54; Red Pine, $465.82; Little Elm Tree, $1,201.26; Fournier's, $616.31 ; Martin's Mill Race, $706.78 ; Charles River, South crossing, $2,971.42 ; Charles River, North crossing, $4,427.34 ; Gordon, $1,229.01; St. Alexis, $722.69; Tobogote, $690.99 ; West Tobogote, $488.11 ; Cedar Hall, $713.76 ; St. Moise, $461.74 ; St. Moise Tank, $1,068.71 ; Ste. Flavie, No. 1, $474.67; Ste. Flavie, No. 2, $469.96 ; St. Luce No. 1, $588.66 ; St. Luce, No. 2, $459.26 ; St. Luce, No. 3, $672.13; St. Anaclet, $440.01; Bic, $467.14 ; St. Fabien, No. 1, $369.01 ; St. Fabien, No. 2, $376.89 ; Trois Pistoles, $234.15 ; Isle Verte, $356.14 ; Halifax street crossing, $8,725.96 ; Beaver River, $905.73 ; Canal Bridge, $804.29 ; McDermid's, $272.14 ; Hildon Station, $375.29 ; Lydia Brook, $429.27 ; Torryburn, $1,589.35 ; Brookville, $2,800.12.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to state to the minister my reason for asking for these details. For two or three sessions I have complained of the manner in which the railway estimates are brought down. We find large items such as this $385,000 in a bulk appropriation covering a large number of works. There is no other department of the public service that treats the House in this way. If the minister will turn to pages 50 and 51 of the estimates he will find the appropriations of the Public Works Department. In these there are ten items of between $500 and $900 each. This form of estimate enables the Auditor General to carry on his work properly. But he cannot properly audit such an item as this of $350,000 covering thirty or forty works. The Auditor General has before him only an appropriation of $385,000 for strengthening bridges, and, so long as the department keep within the amount, they may expend the whole sum on only half the bridges and leave the other half to come up again next year, when another similar appropriation may be asked for. I am quite sure the officers of the railway understand that that is not the proper way to bring in appropriations. It is not the way the bridge department of a railway submit estimates to the general manager. In fact, as we have seen, the general manager of this railway submits to the minister, very properly, the details showing exactly, even down to a single cent, as the hon. gentleman has read, just what he proposes to do on each particular work. The very information the minister needed to enable him to deal with this subject is needed by the Auditor General as the work goes on to check the purposes to which the money is applied. I am glad to have in 'Hansard' the list of items the minister has given. But such a

list should be in the estimates. It would be much less expensive, for it would save the time of the House, and it would enable us to get the information more satisfactorily. We should be saved a great many questions which now must be asked. If the sum was divided into items as it should be, many of those items could be passed without any consideration to detail. I would suggest to the minister, therefore, that next year he should give the estimates in such detail that we may not be obliged to take the time of the House in making these inquiries.

Mr. EMMERSON. The course pursued this year is the same as that pursued for many years past—so I am informed by the general manager. But I will take a note of what my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) says of course, the change will mean very voluminous estimates where so many particulars are to be given. That, I think, would be the only objection. I think there is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman will see that last year we had votes of three and three quarter millions in a bare half page of the estimates. As I said before, there is not another department that gives so few items as the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to have been the custom.

Mr. BARKER. But that, perhaps, is the very best reason why it should not be done. I have called attention to the matter more than once, and I am glad that the hon. gentleman now says that he will give attention to it next year. No attention has been paid to the matter hitherto.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is not correct in saying that the same system is pursued this year as last year. For, last year the hon. member for Hamilton urged upon the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who then had charge of the railway estimates, what he has urged to-day and the Minister of Finance absolutely refused to give us certain information which was then asked for and which has been given this year. In that respect the Minister of Railways is to be congratulated upon having adopted a part of a system that was advocated by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) last year. Last year the hon. member for Hamilton insisted that when a certain sum was asked to pay for sidings along the line, a bulk sum of $100,000 or so, the committee should be told the particular places where this expenditure was proposed, with the amounts in each case. The Minister of Finance absolutely refused to give the amount of expenditure in each case, but he did in the end give the names of the places where the expenditure was proposed. He said it was not proper to give the amount. This year on the other hand we have the Minister of Railways giving us not only the proposed expenditure for sidings and increased accommodation along the line, but he is giving us in each case, at the request of the committee, the amount proposed to be expended in each case. Now, I think the minister, having started out so well, ought to consider, in case this administration should have another opportunity of presenting the estimates next year, which we hardly think they will have—the minister should consider the advisability of placing upon the estimates each sum and the place where it is proposed to expend it, along with the necessary particulars. That would greatly expedite the work of the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. I find that I did not give the information I should have given with respect to the other amounts, that together make this total $385,000. For instance, there is the conveyance or the transfer of these bridges, that is estimated to cost $8,000. To erect and double up certain bridges, $46,000. I can give the names of the bridges that it is proposed to double up. New Glasgow, Canal, Christie's brook, Beaver river, North Cocaigne, North Coal brook, Richibucto river, Nelson's, Dickie's, Benjamin river, Otterbrooke, Indian brook, One-half mile west of Sayabec, two miles west of Sayabec, one-half mile west of St. Anaclet, one-half mile west of Trois Pistoles, twenty-five or twenty-six bridges at these places.

Mr. BARKER. Can the hon. gentleman give the cost as he is reading off the names ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is one and a-half mile west of Trois Pistoles, three bridges at Benjamin river, three at Richibuctou river, three at North Coal Branch, two at Beaver river, two at canal, three at Indian brook ; these require to be doubled up, that is, to have two spans. The doubling up is estimated to cost $46,000. Then at Sackville we require $66,000 to replace a bridge. That is in Westmoreland county, New Brunswick. Then there is the Sackville bridge, $66,000 ; Laplanche, $11,000 ; Sutherland river, $25,000 ; Salmon river, $19,400. Then Nicolet river, bridge No. 1, $110,000 ; and bridge No. 2, $85,000. The whole of these items will total more than the $385,000, but a portion was paid out of last year's appropriation, and $385,000 will be sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman sees that under cover of this item he has sums of $85,000 and $110,000 for instance. He must see that it is not treating the committee properly to lump all these together. Surely the committee is entitled to discuss separately an appropriation of $100,000 for any work. Then I would ask the hon. gentleman what he means by the carriage of the material. Is that included in the charges for carriage upon the Intercolonial?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, these bridges are built at points beyond the Intercolonial, and this is for freight. The contracts are made for delivery of the work, and this is for the freight.

Mr. BARKER. Is it only for freight off the Intercolonial, or do you include any freight on the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Freights delivered at the bridge on the Intercolonial, and a portion of the freight would therefore be payable to the Intercolonial itself.

Mr. BARKER. So he is doing business for the country on revenue account, and charging for hauling the material upon this railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is proper, it is capital expenditure.

Mr. BELL. I observe the New Glasgow bridge is mentioned as being doubled up. My impression is that that bridge was doubled in some way a few years ago. Is it proposed to repeat the operation, or what is meant by doubling up ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Doubling up is putting two girders together. The work that was done a few years ago was simply to strengthen it a little.

Mr. BELL. This does not mean putting two spans side by side, each of them to be used for going one way ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is doubling up and strengthening. Instead of having the strength of one girder you have the united strength of two girders.

Mr. BELL. Will there be new work, or are the spans taken from some other points?

Mr. EMMERSON. That means taking up some of these. This is new work.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has given us a statement of the total amount to be spent on bridges. He has also stated that he could not give us the specific amount for each bridge. May I ask how he makes up the sum total ? Are we to understand that the engineer in charge of that work gives a general estimate of the total amount to be expended on the different bridges, or does he not give the department a specific amount or an estimate of the amounts required on each bridge ? If he does not, how is it possible to make up the sum total without just simply guessing at it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given to the committee the information in respect to the individual bridges, but there is an item of $46,000 for doubling up certain small bridges. I have given the names——

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman misunderstands my question.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given the names of these twenty-five bridges that it is proposed to double up and I have stated that we have not the specific items in respect to each one of the number. But, the engineers have made an estimate as to the total cost of them and their estimate is $46,000. That is included in the $385,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the engineers estimate not be for each separate bridge rather than for the total amount ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount is not given for each separate bridge.

Mr. BLAIN. It makes it rather difficult for the committee to understand where this amount is to be expended and it gives a great deal of liberty to the minister in the expenditure of it. Would it not be better, when the engineer inspects a bridge and finds that a certain improvement has to be made upon it, that he should report to the department that it will cost a certain specific amount? It would be better that he should report the amount required for each specific bridge and then we could tell if the money was expended for the purpose for which it had been voted.

Mr. EMMERSON. The twenty-five bridges which I have named are to be doubled up and that $46,000 can only be applied to these twenty-five.

Mr. BLAIN. Could it not be expended on five instead of twenty-five?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. This is for paying for the whole work. We say that we are going to do that work. We must necessarily do it, and we say that $46,000 is all that we require for that purpose.

Mr. BLAIN. How are we to hold down the minister to the expenditure which he tells us he is going to make ? He says that it will take $46,000 to do the work. Now the hon. minister could expend that $46,000 on half the number of bridges proposed to be strengthened and he could still be within the vote. My hon. friend shakes his head; I cannot understand it in any other way. If the hon. gentleman will say that he is asking for $3,000 to be expended on a specific bridge when he brings in his report showing how the money has been expended we can tell whether the money has been expended for the purpose for which it was voted.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not see it in that light. If the engineer reported to me that twenty-five bridges which he named required to be doubled up and that it was going to cost $46,000, and if he was only able with the $46,000 to dispose of half of them, it would strike me very forcibly that he should be condemned and I think he would place the minister and the department in a

very false position. We state that we propose to apply that $46,000 to the doubling up of all these bridges. If we were to come back next year and say that we used the $46,000 and that only half a dozen or fifteen of that number were dealt with and there still remained ten more it would be a matter which might be very severely criticised.

Mr. BARKER. I think it would too.

Mr. LANCASTER. In one case the opposition and the country would have to content themselves with criticism and in the other case they would have the prevention. Prevention is a good deal better than criticism with this government. In the one case they would not be able to spend the money improperly, because the Auditor General would say, you cannot do this because you announced when you submitted your estimate to parliament that you were going to expend so much on each bridge, and that is the statute. The government might, in the other cases, if they chose strengthen one or two of the bridges, say that they were not going to do any of the rest and still be within the item. Then, the hon. minister says that we may criticise them. What good would that do the people of this country after the money had been spent in an improper way? Suppose the hon. minister gets the item through upon the understanding that he is going to make this expenditure on twenty bridges and he only spends the money on two bridges and does not spend anything on the eighteen remaining ones, and suppose the Auditor General under the item has not the power of preventing the expenditure, you will have to be satisfied with simply finding fault. The country has had some experience in that regard with this government. The people are rather tired of finding fault with the government for not doing what they say they will do. It is better to have the purpose of the vote stated in the statute so that the Auditor General will be able to say, if the money is diverted to any other purpose, that this is not a proper expenditure and that the money must be expended under the terms of the vote. The hon. minister says that this amount is required for the strengthening of so many bridges. Let us take the hon. minister at his word and at the same time put it in the statute. In my opininon, the criticisim of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) is quite right.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is asking to do something that no minister has previously asked. Last year we had the same nature of discussion up and the item under discussion which evoked a reference to this matter was an item of $63.500 for additional sidings along the line of the Intercolonial Railway. What the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) then claimed was that it was right enough to have these bulk items where no large expenditure was proposed in reference to any one item. He said that if the total expenditure on any one item was a matter of $2,000 or $3,000 or $4,000 each, the government need not bring each specific item and need not tie themselves to the same extent as if it were a large expenditure, the declaration that the hon. minister made being to the effect that if he proposed a number of these expenditures it gave the same safeguard which would ordinarily attach to a specific item, with a specific sum of money attached to it. It is impossible for the committee or this House afterwards to trace the expenditures of the administration if this system is pursued. Here we have exceedingly large amounts proposed to be spent upon a group of bridges with no particular amount attached to any one of them. The hon. minister of Finance pointed out at that time that the expenditure on sidings as contemplated under the item was $63,500 in all, being made up of small sums of money and that it would be unreasonable to tie the government down to a specific expenditure in reference to each of them. He said:

> The engineer's estimates for sidings vary from $2,000 up to $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000; there is one estimate of $10,000 for a siding at Campbellton; but with that exception all the sums are comparatively small, none of them more than about $6,000.

Then he gives a list of the places at which these expenditures are to be made and he says further in illustration of what he means:

> The vote for the double track which my hon. friend refers to can only be applied to that purpose. I can give the names of the places where we contemplate building sidings; but I do not think it would be wise to confine us to a particular amount for a particular siding. Suppose, for instance, that one siding is estimated to cost $2,000 and another $3,000, and suppose it is found that they cost about $2,500 each; I do not think it would be wrong to apply the $5,000 for the two sidings in that way.

And so it is that last year the Minister of Finance, having claimed the right to simply give us the names of the different places at which the expenditure was to be made, aggregating in all $63,500, a sum of comparative insignificance as compared with the $385,000 proposed to be expended in this way this year, pointed out that the only latitude he required was in the case of small expenditures running from $2,000 to $6,000, but now the minister insists on having this large discretion and says that we can criticise the expenditure next year. I submit that is not a fair method of dealing with the matter.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that this $385,000 will complete the works for which it is voted or is this expenditure on account of new works?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will complete the work. That is the estimated cost.

Mr. BARKER. Are any of these bridge items renewals, replacing worn-out bridges by new bridges simply ?

Mr. EMMERSON. None whatever.

Mr. BARKER. Are you proposing to replace any old bridges with new ones at the expense of capital this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that is not proposed.

Mr. BARKER. You are not replacing one bridge at the cost of revenue ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there are none in contemplation now.

Mr. BARKER. Did you last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The engineer says not.

Mr. BARKER. Not one last year, not one in the current year. Everything is done at the expense of capital.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend ask whether some of those charged against capital account have been renewed ?

Mr. BARKER. You are charging now $385,000 to capital. I asked you what you are doing as to the bridges that have become worn out in the ordinary course of their lives and have to be replaced without regard to strengthening. Are you renewing any one bridge or did you renew one last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Wherever that is done, it is done out of revenue not out of capital expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. Were there any ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The engineer says he cannot recall that there were.

Mr. BARKER. Supposing the minister did not increase the strength of one of these bridges, but had to renew the bridge. What branch would bear the cost, revenue or capital ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not prepared to answer that question. I think that the repairs to bridges, where a bridge is worn out, would probably be a revenue item.

Mr. BARKER. Are not these new bridges replacing old or partly worn out bridges ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, these bridges would all be suitable for the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway had we not increased the size of the engines.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. minister mean to assert that all his bridges are brand new bridges, and that he is not making money for revenue by charging the whole of this to capital ? Are not some of these bridges, if not wholly, at least partly worn out ? Why should revenue get the benefit of a new bridge erected at the cost of capital ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume they are all somewhat worn, but I do not think any of them are worn out.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. gentleman charged anything to revenue, in these cases against the liabilities which it ought to bear ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman not think he ought to do so. How can he show a truthful statement of his net revenue if he does not charge maintenance with its fair share of the cost of replacing every bridge whether it is only in the fifth year of its life or in its fiftieth year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I question the position taken by my hon. friend.

Mr. BARKER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman's explanation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly would not be willing to go to the extent my hon. friend does.

Mr. BARKER. I can only tell my hon. friend it is always done. Any corporate company would take care that the maintenance account was charged with a fair proportion of the cost of replacing a bridge so that capital would not be unnecessarily burdened. The hon. gentleman is never going to charge anything to maintenance as long as he can get the country to provide sufficient capital for him.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have often wondered how we can get a clear and distinct idea of how much this railway is making which we cannot do now owing to the way in which the books are kept. Of course you can have a surplus, or a deficit, according to the way you keep the books. It appears to me that if a railway company like the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, that was making their road pay and that did not have the people of Canada at its back were doing work of this kind, it would not charge all this to capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. We might of course do as the Canadian Pacific Railway do, issue debenture bonds, come to parliament and get power to do that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do they do that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, they came last year.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is no use of the hon. minister saying they do certain things unless they do them. I quite understand that the Grand Trunk when they want to double track their line would issue bonds, but if I understand rightly, on the Intercolonial they build bridges out of capital over the same

rivers or ravines that bridges are now built over. It appears to me that when revenue account has benefited by the use of these bridges in the past, it should bear the cost of their renewal.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister said the large expenditure was on the extension of sidings and the strengthening of bridges in order to accommodate heavier and longer trains. How much has been expended up to date and how much more is estimated to be required to put the road into the requisite condition ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have asked for votes to carry out all that is contemplated at present. Whether there shall arise in the future conditions which will necessitate future expenditures we at present do not know. The sidings for which we are providing it is thought will be sufficient for some time to come. It may be that there will be such a growth of business in connection with the construction of the new transcontinental line as to warrant the Intercolonial being placed in a very much better condition even than it is. We expect to get a large traffic over the Intercolonial in connection with the construction of that line.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister must have had an estimate of the amount required for the purpose of improving the gradients, strengthening the bridges and lengthening the sidings, in order to accomplish the object in view.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given that in respect to the bridges.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, I understand that all that is required to accomplish that is being voted this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, exclusive of the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton railways. I stated that after the appropriation of $385,000 was exhausted, the amount necessary to strengthen the bridges was estimated at $280,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I know, notwithstanding the statement made by the Minister of Finance last year that the amount voted then would virtually finish the work. But what I want to get at is this. The minister must have had an estimate from the department as to the total amount required for repairs, easing of gradients, extensions of sidings, strengthening of bridges, and all other work necessary to the object in view. What is the total amount, exclusive of the New Glasgow and Cape Breton roads ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that we shall not require under present conditions to strengthen the bridges on the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton sections. We have not gone into that, and have no estimate of the cost, because at present the larger engines are not required there. There has been no estimate made as to the improvement of the curves and gradients of the road, but I have given the information with respect to the bridges, and all other information, I am sure, that would enable my hon. friend to form his own judgment.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I am to understand that for the gradients and curvatures and strengthening of the bridges, except on the New Glasgow and Cape Breton sections —concerning which he has no estimate at present as he is not using heavy engines on those sections and there is no necessity for an estimate—we have the whole amount required to be voted this year on capital account, which he requires for strengthening the bridges. That of course does not include the $280,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not want to be misunderstood. There has been no total estimate of the amount required, but there are two or three items under consideration now and the finality will be reached with respect to them very shortly. These items have to do with lengthening some curves that may be necessary on the main line of the Intercolonial, especially on the Drummond County portion.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister tell us where they are ? Surely he can get from his engineers an estimate of the probable cost. I do not want a close estimate.

Mr. EMMERSON. Until the department has determined what shall be done, I could not very well bring it now to the notice of the committee. At St. Cyril and Carmel and St. Leonard Junction, there are three very unfortunate curves.

Mr. HAGGART. On what road is that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Drummond end of the Intercolonial.

Mr. HAGGART. Why, we were told that was a perfect road when we purchased it.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is the bridge at Folleigh river to be strengthened, and to what extent ? The people believe it to be dangerous.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was doubled up about two years ago.

Mr. GOURLEY. What do you mean by doubling up ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Putting in double girders. That would be two girders on each side.

Mr. LOGAN. Last evening while I happened to be in room 16 for a few moments, I find that in my absence the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made reference to a certain member as having had an agent removed from office because he had refused to interfere with the progress of the trains. On being asked to give the name, he de-

clined to do so on the ground that he had no desire to do the gentleman in question, who was a good respectable member of this House, an injury, and he went on to say :

I will tell the minister the name privately, and if I do him any injury by this statement, I am man enough to stand up in the House and say it is not true.

I beg to thank the hon. gentleman for those words. I took the first opportunity of asking him to whom he referred, and on ascertaining that he referred to myself, I gave the rumour then, as I do now, my most unqualified denial. There has been no agent in the county of Cumberland removed or interfered with by me because he refused to interfere with the progress of the trains, and I cannot understand how the rumour could have arisen. There have been only two agents in that county removed, and they were removed for cause, after a most thorough investigation, and that was away back in 1896. Since then I cannot remember of any agent being removed. I am certain that none has been at my request or because he refused to interfere with the progress of the trains.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the names of those who were removed ?

Mr. LOGAN. Jos. McKeown, of Oxford Junction, and Jos. Clarke, of Pugwash.

Mr. SPROULE. The member for East Grey never referred to any such rumour at all.

Mr. LOGAN. I meant to say the member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). This is only another case of how a man may use one word for another and say 'foreigner' instead of 'stranger.'

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad the hon. gentleman has made this statement for he it is to whom the rumour referred. I said last night that I would be very glad if he denied it, and as he has done so I am glad to hear his denial. I have nothing to withdraw because I simply stated a rumour, and now that that rumour has been contradicted, I am very much pleased to learn that the charge was not true.

Mr. LOGAN. It is absolutely untrue and I beg to thank the hon. gentleman for withdrawing the statement.

Mr. BLAIN. How much will it take to complete the strengthening of the bridges which it is contemplated to strengthen or double up ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have repeated that about ten times, but do not object to repeating it again. $188,000 is the estimate for this year. I have given the names of the bridges and the amounts required for each. This is of course exclusive of the Cape Breton line and the New Oxford and New Glasgow short line.

Mr. BLAIN. There is just the difficulty. When this question of strengthening bridges was up a year ago, the item was $165,000, as will be seen on reference to page 8269 of 'Hansard.' The hon. member for South Lanark asked for the details and the hon. Minister of Finance replied :

I understand the hon. gentleman wished to have a statement in detail as to the bridges to be strengthened. Of this sum $77,000 is a revote standing over from last year.

Then Mr. Haggart asked :

What is the total amount expended up to date and the probable amount required to finish this work of strengthening ?

Now, there is a perfectly honest question asked by my hon. friend from Lanark and to that question the Finance Minister replies :

My deputy informs me that he thinks this will finish the work of strengthening these bridges.

There was a straight statement from the Minister of Finance, who was acting Minister of Railways. And now my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) comes forward and says a still larger amount will be required. And the committee are asking, year after year, when the hon. gentleman names a certain number of bridges to be improved, that he shall set opposite each name the amount he intends to spend, so that we may know where the money goes. I would be glad if the minister would make a definite statement of how much it will cost to complete the strengthening and doubling up of these bridges. I further wish to draw his attention to the fact that the Minister of Finance differs from him as to what doubling up bridges is. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) says it it is putting two girders together. But the Minister of Finance says :

Doubling up, of course, means the taking of two bridges and putting them together.

It is not for me to say which of these is the proper definition. However, I cannot understand how it is possible for the hon. minister to bring down a statement of the total amount required to strengthen a number of bridges unless the department has given him specifically the amount required for each bridge. I cannot understand how, without these details, the hon. gentleman can make up a sum total.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has this same complaint with regard to every item—that he cannot understand. Now, it seems to me this item was quite clear.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, if the minister will explain I will make a desperate effort to understand it.

Mr. EMMERSON. If I can find my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) actuated by a desire to

understand I shall be well satisfied. There is a statement in 'Hansard' of last year, made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) as acting Minister of Railways, referring to certain bridges, concerning which he says that the deputy informs him that he thinks the amount then asked for will finish the work of strengthening these bridges;—not all the bridges on the Intercolonial but only those that then required strengthening. If it was supposed that the hon. gentleman referred to all the bridges, there must certainly have been some misunderstanding, as shown by the fact that $385,000 is asked for the same purpose this year.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speaks in another place of this completing the work of strengthening.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not for the work in the future, and not for all the bridges on the Intercolonial, but only for a certain number. There was a list of bridges to be improved then, just as there is a list to be improved now. However, it is hardly worth while for us to have these post mortem examinations of what was understood in the committee last year. I have made a statement as to the bridges for which expenditures are required now, and the question is whether that statement is satisfactory.

Mr. LENNOX. Surely the hon. minister, in speaking of post mortem examinations, does not mean to suggest that we are not to look back and see what promises were made last year. The committee's investigation and the statements of the minister become merely idle if we are not to look back and see how the statements of last year have been lived up to. The hon. minister has taken a very wide departure——

Mr. EMMERSON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) allow me to explain? What I said was that there must have been a misunderstanding if it was supposed that the minister last year in referring to an item of $87,000 said that this would complete all the bridges on the Intercolonial. He could not have had that in mind, because $385,000 is asked for this year.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. minister (Mr. Emmerson) will look further on in the debate he will see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) spoke of all the bridges.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is, all the bridges in the list.

Mr. HAGGART. All that required repair.

Mr. BLAIN. May I have the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals while I read a part of the debate of last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The list I have read only refers to the bridges which it is expected to deal with during the present season and the money has not been expended yet.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any estimate as to the probable cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in the case of each separate bridge. The estimate is general.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is a total amount required for strengthening these bridges of over $600,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $451,000 up to the end of January.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And $165,000.

If there is a misunderstanding—I am sure there is not on this side of the House—the responsibility rests either with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) or his predecessor. The hon. gentleman says he has been making this matter quite plain, but I regret to say it does not seem very plain to me. I would like it very much if he would make a statement of the amount spent in strengthening bridges, and also what it will cost to compete the work of strengthening the bridges on the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given that.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, what is the amount?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is $385,000 this year for the bridges I have named, and the amount required hereafter for strengthening the bridges I have named about $280,000.

Mr. BLAIN. We understand that this will double up or strengthen every bridge that it is necessary to double up or strengthen on the Intercolonial?

Mr. EMMERSON. This $280,000 together with the $385,000 voted this year. I have given the names of the bridges, and have stated that these are all that require to be strengthened according to the judgment of the engineers of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. For how long?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will mean that every bridge on the Intercolonial requiring to be strengthened will be strengthened. How long they will last, when strengthened, I cannot say. When this work is done, we shall have improved all the bridges except on the Cape Breton Railway and on the line between Oxford and New Glasgow.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman's statement, then is that $665,000 will meet this proposed expenditure. Will he state to us how he has arrived at that in view of the fact that he has made the statement that he has not set down the specific amount required for each bridge?

Mr. EMMERSON. I read off the expenditure for each bridge included in the $385,000, with the expenditure on 25 small bridges where the girders are to be doubled up, totalling $46,000. My hon. friend remembers my making that statement, and therefore, without giving the detailed items with respect to these 25 bridges the engineers give a total of $46,000, and these 25

bridges can be doubled up for that sum of money.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister give us the total estimate of his engineer for strengthening this work, from beginning to end.

Mr. EMMERSON. $1,759,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister should realize how necessary it is to have accurate information. A while ago I was particular to inquire from the Minister of Finance, not only in reference to this, but the total amount required for strengthening the bridges altogether, according to his engineer's estimate. Here is the statement he made to me in last year's 'Hansard,' at page 8279 :

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know the total amount expended for the strength ening of bridges and putting in new bridges on account of these new locomotives. Th total amounts expended on the Restigouche and the Miramichi bridges are two independent items. Add the two together, and the amount expended on the other, and I think it must be over $1,000,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not the figures to the close of the fiscal year. Leaving out the bridges at Miramichi and at Restigouche, the amount is $461,680.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what the hon. gentleman said before. Then there is the vote of $165,000 to be added to that, and the hon. gentleman says that will complete the repairs on those bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I stated that this appropriation for the year will probably finish the work, but the general manager says it will take another year. There will be something further to be done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You do not know what the amount is ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE I have not the estimates at hand.

Mr. INGRAM. For the total repairs of the bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For strengthening the bridges.

Mr. INGRAM. I have always understood that the department makes an estimate of the probable cost of strengthening bridges on the Intercolonial Railway. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is the estimate cost of strengthening these bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was an estimate made by the general manager, and the recollection of my deputy is that it was about a million and a quarter dollars.

He was only $500,000 astray.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely there must be some mistake. That includes the bridges at Restigouche and Miramichi.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate is substantially correct—over a million dollars, including the large bridges as well as the process of doubling up. It would be subject to some deception if bridges were sold off the road, but that has not yet been done, most of them being used in doubling up.

So you see that last year we had this estimate as a million and a quarter, and to-day it amounts to $1,700,000. While I am on my feet—to what account are these bridges credited ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I notice that on page 8279 of 'Hansard' the Finance Minister in giving the total of about a million dollars excluded the Restigouche and the Miramichi bridges. Later on, exclusive of these bridges, the amount appears to have been stated at a million and a quarter dollars. Now either these bridges were excluded, or the minister meant to say a million and three quarters as a total estimate. One can well understand how an error of that kind would occur, because the estimate given by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) shows that he had in his mind over a million dollars exclusive of the Restigouche and the Miramichi bridges. There is no objection taken to the statement of a million dollars by the Minister of Finance, that sum being exclusive of the Miramichi and Restigouche. Then if you add those, the total would be upwards of a million and three quarters. The error must have occurred in some way like that, because these figures I am sure would not have been deliberately stated erroneously, it would be folly for a minister to make such a statement. The facts are all there.

Mr. HAGGART. It does seem to be folly. But if the minister will look further on in the discussion he will find that the minister fully understood the facts. How was it then that the minister stated last year that the total expenditure would be only about $600,000 ? Three years ago it was $600,000, last year it was $1,250,000, and now it amounts to $1,750,000. That is the kind of information we get from the Department of the Minister of Railways. Something is wrong. The minister should have accurate information in reference to the cost of these improvements, and it is impossible, with such mistakes and blunders as have been made from year to year by the minister, to ascertain the cost of these works. The engineering department that would furnish information that certain repairs required for the purpose of bringing up the standard of this road in the form of strengthening the bridges would only cost $600,000, then comes to the minister next year and says that it will cost $1,250,000 and then this year informs the minister that $1,750,000 will be required, ought not to be kept a day in the employ of any institution, government or anything else.

Mr. EMMERSON. Evidently the reference to the $650,000 is to the Restigouche and Miramichi bridges. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), at page 8276 of 'Hansard,' gives the whole case away. He says :

The expenditure for the purpose of strengthening and renewing the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway within the last few years has been over $1,000,000, besides an expenditure for repairs on the different bridges of nearly $700,000.

Now, there is $1,700,000, and he must have got his information from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. That $1,700,000 conforms to the statement made by the general manager last year, that the total expenditure is $1,750,000. Surely we are making a mountain out of a molehill in endeavouring to show there is some discrepancy in the statement. When this committee is considering these questions, and when interjections are being made by hon. members, the reporters cannot always get the exact figures, and no minister is able to go over the report and correct his proof. The figure as it appears must go on record as it is stated, or as it is understood to be stated, and it is very possible for hon. members to misunderstand. Somebody will say a million and three-quarters across the floor and it will be understood as a million and a quarter. These things will occur, but that there was no misunderstanding in this case is clearly proved by the fact that my hon. friend from South Lanark, at page 8276 of 'Hansard,' last year referred to $1,700,000 as being expended and required to be expended for repairs on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister not know the distinction between his statement and the statement I made? I was speaking of the $1,000,000 which was required for strengthening and renewing bridges.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the same thing.

Mr. HAGGART. Besides that there was expended for repairs $700,000. That $700,000 does not come into consideration at all. They are two distinct and separate items. We were dealing with the question of the strengthening and renewal of bridges on the Intercolonial Railway. The question of repairs does not come into it at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to the statement made by his predecessor (Mr. Blair). At page 3809 of 'Hansard,' 1902, appears the following:

Strengthening bridges, $175,000.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister explain what this is for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The extreme pressure under which the bridge companies were working last year made it impossible for them to supply what we required within the fiscal year, and so $75,000 of this has to be revoted. We started out with the idea that by spending $100,000 a year, we would in five or six years sufficiently strengthen our bridges to bear the heavy locomotives.

What would the hon. minister think from that?

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. BARKER. Is this taking the place of old work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The bridges that were built on the Intercolonial Railway were nearly all built after one pattern, and if they were not called upon to carry heavier trains than prior to 1898, they would last for many years to come. We have been obliged to increase their carrying capacity, and what we do is to take one span out and add it to the existing span of another bridge, then replacing the one which we have removed by a new span.

Mr. MONK. Is the work progressing from Montreal to Halifax or from Halifax to Montreal?

Then passing on:

Mr. MONK. Is there an estimate of what the total cost of this work will be?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have only expended $225,000 out of the $600,000 which it was originally estimated we would require.

Mr. HAGGART. Exactly. That was what was stated.

Mr. BLAIN. That seems to be plain. That shows the lack of information afforded by the hon. gentleman and his predecessor to the committee from year to year. I think that if the hon. gentleman would state the number of bridges on the Intercolonial Railway, and if his engineer would bring in a report showing that so much money would be required to repair and strengthen each of these bridges and that the total sum would be a certain amount, the committee would readily understand it; but, as my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has pointed out, his estimate was $600,000 in plain Anglo-Saxon words. That was the total amount required to strengthen these bridges, and now it has been brought up to the enormous sum of $1,750,000. Surely the hon. gentleman sees that there is something misleading in that. It cannot be the fault of members of the opposition, because they are not in possession of the information required. It must be the fault of the department. I have no censure to pass upon any official of the department. I know nothing about it, but I cannot understand it, and I do not think any hon. member of this House can understand how it is possible for my hon. friend now to state the total amount required until he makes an estimate of how much is required for each bridge along the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. The total now is $1,759,000. That will include the $385,000 that the hon. gentleman is asking for now. Am I correct in that?

Mr. EMMERSON. And the $280,000 which is contemplated later on.

Mr. INGRAM. That includes the $280,000?

Mr. EMMERSON. That includes the $385,000 which is now being voted, and, as I

understand it, the $280,000 which I gave as necessary for the year 1894-5.

Mr. INGRAM. So that we have it now that the total cost is actually to be $1,759,000, which includes the item which you or somebody else expect to ask for next year of $280,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. $1,759,000.

Mr. INGRAM. That is to be the total actual cost of strengthening the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Exclusive of the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton railways.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what the bridges on these two railways will cost in addition to the figures he has already given ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In respect to these two railways I have stated that we have no estimate for them. The strengthening of the bridges on these lines does not seem to be necessary, and it has not been estimated. The larger classes of engine will not probably for a long time to come be used on those lines. We have not had an estimate made, because the bridges are quite strong enough for the present traffic and rolling stock.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Additional sidings along line, $118,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish this item to stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will have an opportunity to discuss the whole matter later on.

Mr. HAGGART. I want an opportunity on Monday.

Mr. EMMERSON. On Monday, unfortunately, I shall be obliged to be absent.

Mr. HAGGART. All I want is an item left for the purpose of discussing the whole matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is an item of $70,000 lower down which will stand.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend the minister might give us the particulars as to the expenditure of this $63,500 last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. The amounts expended up to May 31st were :

Iona siding	$2,402 52
Belledune	535 17
Clark's Brook	2,272 92
Cedar Hall	967 41
Chatham Junction	4,170 28
Between Beaver Brook and Bartibogue	4,667 51
Between Red Pine and Bartibogue	4,627 59
St. Moise	845 40
Jacquet River	59 40
Between Assametquaghan and Mill Stream	$5,700 08
Ste. Anne	1,086 57
Milford	778 31
Windsor Junction	661 42
Pomquette	67 10
Campbellton	533 91
Engineering, &c.	100 80
	$29,476 39

Mr. LENNOX. Did the minister mention Mill Stream ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Then at Campbellton it is contemplated to spend $10,000 on that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $533.91 of additional expenditure. The arrangement is to pay $8,000 for the Richard land, and $2,700 for the Duncan land. We will require a supplemental vote to complete the whole expenditure. Expropriation proceedings were commenced to acquire these lands, but instead of taking the matter to the Exchequer Court we put two valuators on the property and an arrangement was made with the parties by which we agreed to pay them so much.

Mr. LENNOX. Expenditure seems to have been made at all of the places where the minister said it was intended to expend additional money on sidings.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. Of course this does not include them all, because this was only the expenditure up to May 31st ; some of the others may have been attended to in June.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the minister has no idea of the amount of the capital revenue and expenditure for June ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to have some information about the Cleveland patent cylinder which has been applied to some of the Intercolonial locomotives and which has been in operation there for some two or three years. I understand that this is a device to decrease the consumption of fuel. Perhaps at the same time the minister could tell us whether the Chapman ball-bearings are to be applied to any other cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. My impression is that they have not used the Chapman ball-bearings. I think there was some talk of it but the matter has not come under my observation since I have been in the department. Several engines have the Cleveland cylinder. There is quite a difference of opinion among experts as to the value of that cylinder. Some engineers are very strongly in favour of it and others are opposed to it. I know of two or three engines myself which have that appliance and from what I could gather they have been quite success-

ful, but the Cleveland patent is not now being used on any additional engines.

Mr. GOURLEY. In making these sidings does the minister keep in view the double-tracking of the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax? There is a strong and growing feeling in Nova Scotia, in favour of having the Intercolonial Railway double-tracked within a year from Moncton to Halifax. I have received a letter to-day from a lumberman complaining that he is being charged large demurrage at Halifax owing to the great press of business on the Intercolonial Railway. He does not blame the minister, but simply the fact that the business is greater than the railway, with its present equipment, can handle. It is felt in Nova Scotia that the Intercolonial Railway must be double tracked both for safety and to properly handle the business of the country. The lumbering industry in that province, has grown to enormous proportions, and will undoubtedly increase, owing to the fact that the forests in Nova Scotia reproduce themselves every ten or twelve years. I am instructed by the lumbermen of my county to ask two things, that the Intercolonial Railway shall be double-tracked and that far more sidings shall be constructed.

At Brookfield, which is growing into a large community, which is eight miles nearer to Halifax than Truro, people are kept for days loading their lumber, because the short sidings will not permit more than one firm to load at a time. The result is, that the whole profit of the winter's transactions is eaten up by the delays. These are crying evils in Nova Scotia which I am sure the good people of Ontario know nothing about. In Ontario they have been provided with railway facilities in every direction, and they deserve them; they have been bold enough to ask for them. We in Nova Scotia have been timidly standing on the brink, not daring to ask what we are entitled to, while our friends in Ontario have been bold in asking for and getting everything that is good in Canada. I want to say with regard to the lumbermen, that though they are divided in politics, they are all united in this, that they want longer sidings. I am bound to say that a great deal has been accomplished in the last two or three years in that direction, but a great deal more remains to be done. I want the manager of the Intercolonial to be impressed with the fact that the desire of the whole country is that the government should assist the business interests of the country by giving them increased railway facilities. I will support the government in double tracking the Intercolonial at once from Moncton to Halifax, and in providing miles of sidings instead of the short sidings which we have now.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. There seems to be a difference amongst the leaders on that side of the House.

Mr. GOURLEY. Not a bit of difference. We represent the progressive side of politics. There is no need of discussing that, because it was settled years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. You will have to square that with the hon. member for South Lanark.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not wish to have any party bickering on this matter. This is for the development of the country. While hon. gentlemen opposite have opposed all development in the past, they can make amends for their past by doing better in the future. I have it also in charge from the great lumber interests of Colchester county to ask the hon. minister to take steps at once to have the lumber cars equipped with some kind of stake. There is the Miller stake, which is well known in various parts of the country. It is an excellent patent, and can be applied to any car at a cost of about $2.50; and when the car is not used for lumber it can be used for any other purpose. At present the Intercolonial Railway hires to a lumberman a car at a high rate; but before he can use it, he has to spend $2 or $3 in staking it. One of two things should prevail—either a very low rate for lumber, or the cars should be equipped for the purpose for which the lumbermen hire them. Mr. Alfred Dickie, of the firm of Alfred Dickie & Co., is determined to have fair-play; there is also a lumbermen's association formed in Nova Scotia, and if you do not do something for them, the good Liberals will no longer vote for you. Mr. Dickie's firm is a most enterprising firm. He started twenty years ago with scarcely a dollar, and to-day is worth $1,000,000 or $1,500,000. His only drawback is that he is a Liberal; but I am bound to say that if you do not stake these cars for him, he will not be a Liberal much longer.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. How did the late government treat Alfred Dickie?

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not think the late government did right. I am told that they did not equip the Intercolonial Railway thoroughly because in front of them sat an opposition, that was reviling the Intercolonial, from morning till night, until the government supporters were absolutely frightened to do justice to the railway; and Sir Richard Cartwright was one of the chiefest sinners. To-day we have this difficulty, that numbers of gentlemen from the province of Ontario believe that we have plenty of railways in Nova Scotia, while we have none at all. We have just a skeleton system of railways. When I place the map of Nova Scotia beside that of Ontario, the members from On-

tario feel ashamed to see that we have no railways in Nova Scotia. Sir Richard Cartwright and the Hon. Edward Blake went through the province of Ontario reviling the Conservative party and Sir Charles Tupper for building railways in Nova Scotia. I can admire the clear, incisive, strong language of the hon. member for South Oxford, even when he advocates errors. If he ever undertook to advocate the truth, he would be supreme and masterly. That hon. gentleman, assisted by the Hon. Edward Blake, a man infinitely inferior to himself intellectually but still a man of some parts, went through Ontario trying to convince the people that Sir Charles Tupper had built many railways in the province of Nova Scotia, whereas as a matter of fact, we have no railways, and to-day we want 2,000 miles of railway before we can be said to be properly civilized; because the railway, to-day, is the great civilizer of the world. Now, I ask the Minister of Railways if he is prepared to adopt the Miller stake or some other stake to help the lumber trade of Nova Scotia? The lumbermen have to split up a lot of their marketable deals in order to stake the trains at a cost of from $1.50 to $3 a car. It is a shame for the government, or for any other common carrier, to hold out that they supply cars for the carriage of lumber, when they are not fittted for the purpose, and the person who hires them has afterwards to equip them at his own expense. The lumber business is a great and splendid industry, which is going to be permanent in this country. Some people, a few years ago, thought that our forests would soon be destroyed; but we find that after the trees have been cut down to eight inches, the forest will recover in twelve years. The maritime provinces have been regarded as inferior in financial standing since our shipbuilding has gone to pieces; yet I can assure you that the great fishing industry, for which my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has done so much, and the great lumber industry, are only beginning to develop in the maritime provinces that immense wealth which we hope in a few years will put us in such a position that we shall not ask for government favours, because we shall be able to provide everything we want at our own expense.

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter has already been looked into.

Mr. BELL. A day or two ago I asked about the proposed extension of the railway yards at New Glasgow. I understood the hon. minister to say—though perhaps not very definitely—that some provision was to be made for that in this year's estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter is having attention.

Mr. BELL. Will there be any provision made for it in the estimates this year?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to make a definite promise.

Mr. BELL. The impression I got was that there was to be some provision in this year's estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in the regular estimates. I was going to suggest that we pass resolution 89 and leave 92 for consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I think that would be convenient, and on that item it is understood we can continue the discussion on the general subject of the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. Very well.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has said that the department have been looking into the question of the Miller stake. Perhaps he could tell us what prospect there is of that or some other stake being adopted.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am waiting a report from the mechanical department as to the value of that plan, and I cannot say more at present. We are anxious to have the cars equipped with modern equipment and appliances, but every change is not an advantage, and this may not prove to be one.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Truro would not ask that it be adopted if it is of no advantage.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure he would not if he did not think it would be an advantage.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not wedded to any particular stake, but the lumbermen are anxious that a stake of some kind should be provided.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Colchester wanted some information as to the possibility of getting the Intercolonial double-tracked from Moncton to Halifax. I am afraid the hon. minister is trying to sidetrack that question.

Mr. EMMERSON. Parliament has made provision for double-tracking a portion of the road between Windsor Junction and Halifax and the work is under construction.

Mr. GOURLEY. Only thirteen miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. Everything must have the first thirteen miles.

Mr. GOURLEY. Are we to understand that the policy of the government is to extend that double track up to Moncton?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not answer that question. I can only call attention to the fact that contracts have been entered into for double-tracking a portion of the Intercolonial. The future will have to develop itself.

National Transcontinental Railway, surveys and other expenses, $500,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is simply a revote.

Mr. CLARKE. We want elaborate particulars. We want to know what has been done, what the policy is, how many parties are to be sent out, and whether they are to be composed of aliens or British subjects ?

Mr. SPROULE. By the way these estimates are got up, it is impossible to tell when there is a revote or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have had occasion to complain of that already. That mistake has occurred in a number of instances. It is not the fault of the department, because it appears in the original here.

Mr. LENNOX. We have revotes marked down at three-quarters of a million, but as a matter of fact they are more than one and a half million.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the minister's contention that it is not the fault of the department——

Mr. EMMERSON. If it is any satisfaction to the hon. gentleman, I will take the blame.

Mr. SPROULE. The department ought to have some person to read the proofs after the items are printed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be the duty of the Department of Finance.

Mr. WILSON. How could any other department check the items, unless it had the original documents ? It seems to me that it is the business of each department to see that its own estimates are properly printed. It is rather curious that any department should allow its estimates to go to the Printing Bureau and then see no more of them until they are presented to the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. If this item is going to take up time in its discussion, I would suggest that we pass on to some other item.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask if the hon. minister will have the evidence taken by Judge Winchester up to the present time printed and distributed ? Some of it is most extraordinary in its character, and we are entitled before voting this $500,000, to get the fullest information as to the discoveries which Judge Winchester has made. We desire to know also what surveys have been completed and the facts concerning them ?

Mr. LENNOX. Last session the Minister of Finance told us that, with the money then voted, and as soon as the session was over, surveying parties would be put in the field and the work of those already in the field under instructions from the Grand Trunk Pacific, so far as it was valuable, would be taken over, they would be settled and we would have whatever information they had collected. We want to know not only what surveys have been made by these parties, but how the people have been settled with and what they have been paid, if anything. We would like to know also if surveying parties have been put in the field as promised last session by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CLARKE. In the meantime, the item should stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the matter is to be gone into at length, it is better to let the item stand.

Mr. CLARKE. And, of course, the hon. gentleman will have the information we ask for before he brings the item up again. That is only reasonable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before we leave this item, I would call the attention of the government to some evidence given by Mr. Charles M. Hays before Judge Winchester. The report is as follows :

> Mr. Charles M. Hays, second vice-president and general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway system, examined by Mr. Mowat, testified that on June 16, 1903, he wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, informing him that the Grand Trunk Pacific had nine surveying parties in the field, and of nine locating engineers, four were Canadians, three Americans, one was a German and one an Englishman.

I do not know whether there is any mistake in the date—16th June, 1903. I have not observed that that letter has been brought down. Further he says :

> When witness, in reply to a communication from Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, wrote that of the thirteen engineers employed on the work, but three were Americans, the other being British subjects, he relied upon Mr. Stephens for the information.

Possibly that letter may have been brought down. I have sent for a copy of the correspondence, which I have not yet had an opportunity of examining very carefully. There is no date given, and one would have to look over the entire correspondence to see if this letter is included. But if these letters or any others relating to the matter have not been brought down, I think they should be brought down a once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) give me the dates ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, and I will also give the reference to the report. The date given by Mr. Hays for the letter he wrote to the Prime Minister is 16th June, 1903. The date of the letter to Mr. Fielding is not given. The report from which I quote is that contained in the Montreal 'Gazette' of July 5th.

Mr. BOYD. There is another matter in connection with these surveys. I would like, as far as possible, to have what information the government may have in re-

gard to the grades and curvatures on the surveys that have already been made. The House will remember that last session a gentleman very close to the government made the statement to the House that the surveys between Winnipeg and Lake Nipigon had shown that they were able to get grades and curvatures such as they stated would be essential for the road as they propose to build it—grades of some twenty feet to the mile and curvatures of some three or four degrees. I would be glad if the minister would prepare to tell us something in regard to that matter, because it is very important to the people of the district from which I come.

Railways and canals—chargeable to capital —canals—Cornwall canal, enlargement, $26,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to continue certain work that was commenced in 1902. Of this amount $8,450 is a revote. The amounts to be expended are as follows:—Repairs and enlargement of regulating weir at old lock 17, $15,500——

Mr. HAGGART. Is that at the head of the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At the lower end of the canal. Protection to north bank, $3,000; Sheik's Island dam, final estimate, $8,000, total, $26,500. The total expenditure on this work up to the 1st May, 1904, was $7,016,328.33.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is upon this item that we propose to have the discussion of the so-called Davis contract and the report of the Auditor General. I was informed by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) privately on Wednesday last that he did not desire us to take up this matter in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is prepared to go on, of course it does not make any difference to us.

Mr. EMMERSON. If this is the particular item on which the discussion is to take place and the discussion has been arranged for. It was understood on this side that the discussion would take place next Wednesday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, I suppose it would be better to let the item stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, if this is the item to which that matter relates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is. But there is no objection to going into the item so far as other matters are concerned, so long as we have an understanding that the other discussion will not be closed out.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that the arrangement was made that the discussion of that subject will take place next Wednesday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is as I understood it, but I wanted to let the hon. minister know that we were ready to go on if the arrangement is varied.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. minister (Mr. Emmerson) to say that on Wednesday next we would take up the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is for Wednesday afternoon, but this other question will come up on Wednesday morning.

Mr. HAGGART. You cannot get through in a morning.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will try. Perhaps we can, if the hon. gentlemen do not make very long speeches.

Mr. HAGGART. There may be half a dozen who will want to make long speeches.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then we will have to adjourn the debate.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps you had better make no arrangement about the Intercolonial. If you are going to take the M. P. Davis matter up on Wednesday for lighting the Cornwall canal, that will likely take most of the day.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said Wednesday, because I expect to be away on Tuesday evening.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice is here, perhaps he could take up the Davis matter now.

Mr. EMMERSON. No. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side came to me yesterday and wanted a day fixed after Tuesday. The Minister of Justice says he is ready to go on, but some hon. gentlemen opposite who wanted to go away, asked that the matter be not taken up during their absence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is all right.

Galops canal—enlargement, $204,300.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the minister kindly explain the item ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This estimate is made up as follows : Under contract : the Iroquois section, $6,300 ; Cornwall section, $88,000 ; Upper entrance, $100,000 ; Iroquois section at Presqu'Ile, $10,000. The above amounts will complete the three sections. For construction purposes, the canal was divided into four sections.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any new work going on now or is this work merely to settle up the whole matter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a little work going one, but this is the final estimate for that section.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood last year that the work was all completed, and that only the final estimates remained to be

made up. Since that time there has been no appearance of much work going on. What are they doing now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is very little work going on, and there is but little work to be done. This amount is to meet the final estimates. The engineers are preparing the final estimates, and this is to pay the contractors.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many employees are there now on the engineering staff ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Four or five.

Mr. J. D. REID. The work was done a year ago, and the minister says there is no work going on now.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are engaged in making up the final estimates.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know the number of men that are employed on the engineering staff. They have been doing nothing for the last year, but merely drawing their pay.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend wants that information, I will send over to the department and get it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Exactly, and we will know who the men are, because, as I understand, they are there, and there is nothing whatever for them to do. Moreover, during the whole of the winter months these men are kept on the pay-list, while in years gone by, when winter came on and work closed on these contracts, all these men that were employed at that work were let go. But since the hon. gentleman has been carrying on this work these men have been kept on during the whole winter, not only during the whole winter but since the work has been completed. I would like to know how much longer they are going to be kept there.

Mr. EMMERSON. During the winter months, as I understand from the deputy, they were all off excepting the engineers, and subsequently two men were employed doing certain work with the engineers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then they were off during the winter. I find in the Auditor General's Report, one man, Wm. Matthews, timber inspector, 12 months, $960.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is referring to 1903 is he not ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I know this man was on part of this last winter at all events.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said a part of the winter.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know the names of the men that are on now, and in the meantime we could let the item stand till we get that information.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will get the information, but I do not think that we should let the item stand.

Mr. J. D. REID. It has been understood that the work has been completed for over a year. You have the staff there permanently the whole year round. The inspector of masonry is now on the work drawing his salary notwithstanding the fact that the work has been done for two years.

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount expended on the Cardinal section since the 1st of July last year and up to the first of May of the present year is $19,060.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. gentleman could give the names of the men who are employed, I would be able to judge what it is costing to keep these men there when there is no work going on.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman states there is no work going on. The deputy tells me there has been work going on. The work has been continued. There is still some work to do and in so far as the engineers are concerned they are still at work in connection with the final estimate.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no question about the engineers being employed as yet. There should be work for them to do in getting up the final estimate, but the masonry has been done for two years and I understand the inspector of masonry Mr. Connley, who is down in the Auditor General's Report for his pay for 12 months up to the 1st July last year is still on. After the work has been completed why is it this inspector is being kept on ? A few days after I brought this matter up last year they let these men go, but a meeting was held and it was decided to put them all on again after the House had risen. They were immediately put on and they are still on. I would like to know what they are doing ?

Mr. LENNOX. You are asking for $204,300. Does that complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that completes the three sections.

Mr. LENNOX. These are not the same sections for which this $25,000 was voted last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, these are the same sections.

Mr. LENNOX. In 1903-4 we had in the estimates $253,000. That was for a specific section. In the same column this year we are asked for $204,300. I would assume that $204,300 is for the same work that we voted the $253,000 for last year ? Is that right ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The $204,300 is to cover three sections, the Iroquois, Cardinal and upper entrance and some new work on the Iroquois section consisting of cribwork at Presqu'Ile. That $253,000 voted last year was very largely for the upper entrance.

Mr. LENNOX. As far as I can make out the $253,000 voted last year was to complete

the whole work. Now we are asked for $204,300 for the Galops canal enlargement. Last year the vote was :

Galops canal—enlargement, $125,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to pay the final estimate of Messrs. Larkin & Sangster on their contract for the Iroquois section. The work is completed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How much has been voted this session for this canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was in the main estimates for the Galops canal an item of $128,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that include the Iroquois canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. That item we have now is for the Iroquois canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There have been items voted for the Cardinal section. Does this finish the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I am advised that the estimates of the current year are expected to cover the whole expense.

I am not very familiar with the matter but it appears to me that that covers the whole work we are discussing now.

Mr. J. D. REID. When I asked that question last year the minister then in charge informed the committee that the work was completed, that that was the final estimate and that the item of $128,000 was for the whole work on the Cardinal section. Notwithstanding that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that there is $88,000 in this estimate which is now before the committee for this same work.

Mr. EMMERSON. In settling up the final estimate it was found that this $88,000 is necessary to meet the cost of construction.

Mr. J. D. REID. But, the hon. minister will see the question of last year. I will read it again.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There have been items voted for the Cardinal section. Does this finish the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I am advised that the estimates of the current year are expected to cover the whole expense.

So that you will see that that was the final estimate. That was the amount that was put into the estimates prepared by the department and which was intended to wind up the whole work. Now the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals brings down an estimate for $88,000 and makes the same statement that this is expected to complete the work. This is a part I cannot understand and one in regard to which I would like to have a little further information.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was estimated last year that the sum asked for would pay the whole cost, but the work exceeded the estimate and it has been determined by the final estimate that $88,000 more will be required.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the work was all completed then.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was not finally settled. It is of course carried out upon schedule rates. There was a difference as to the quantities and it turns out that $88,000 is still required to settle up what was finally determined as the amount.

Mr. J. D. REID. The estimates are made up monthly.

Mr. EMMERSON. The progress estimates are but the final settlement of the matter is not.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then the minister says that a mistake of $88,000 was made by the engineers in preparing the estimate last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not state that. I stated that they found they still required the $88,000. At that time they were not in a position to definitely settle upon the amount and since that they have engaged in the work of making up these final estimates and have reached that view with respect to them.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister does not seem to realize the situation. Surely when there is a mistake of $88,000 there is at least the duty upon the minister and the department to inform parliament of the state of things at the earliest possible moment and too explicitly call the attention of parliament to the mistake. That is not the attitude the minister has taken and he would have allowed this item to go through without giving any information. We should have all the information that was before the department last year and all the information that was collected since then in reference to this matter in order that we may have an opportunity of criticising this carefully to see that there has been no unlawful leakage and no improper diversion of money. We have had it stated by a member who knows the situation that there does appear to have been a substantial leakage by the engagement of men who should not have been engaged and the retention of men whose services should not have been retained. He should allow this item to stand in order that he may bring a full statement in writing of the basis upon which the estimate was made last year, and the data collected since then showing how it is and where it is that this discrepancy of $88,000 has arisen.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be very difficult to get the evidence of the gentleman who made the estimate. These estimates are furnished in this way. The resident engineer, the superintending engineer, sends in to the department his estimate. That gentleman was Mr. Rubidge.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was not Mr. Rubidge who made up the estimate ; it was the engineer in charge of the work at Cardinal.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was the superintending engineer of all these works and it was he who sent to the department as his own estimate the progress estimates of the contractors at the different points.

Mr. J. D. REID. These estimates have been prepared for some time; they have been before this House for some months. The minister knows well of course that the late Mr. Rubidge only died about two weeks ago and up to within a week before his death he was as active as he ever was. He therefore sent in his estimate and you have all the papers of Mr. Rubidge in connection with this.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have all his estimates; we have the estimate wherein it was shown that $128,000 or whatever was asked last year was sufficient to complete the work. We also have the further estimate from Mr. Rubidge which appears in these estimates stating that it would require $88,000 more. That was received before March last because at that time these estimates were made out.

Mr. J. D. REID. The work is practically done; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can neither deny nor confirm that statement, but the deputy of the department tells me that the work is not done. The trimming up work of the canal is not yet done.

Mr. J. D. REID. The trimming up work?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a very important feature.

Mr. J. D. REID. When does the minister expect the work will be finally completed?

Mr. EMMERSON. The deputy is hurrying up the officials in every possible way, urging them to have the work completed. The department is doing their very best in that direction and are anxious to have the final estimates as to the work.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was reported to me a few days ago that there had been another slide of the stone work with which the banks of the canal are faced. What is the position in relation to that?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing of that kind has been reported to the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have not been there for the last few days. Last year there were three large slides. I would ask the minister if this damage has been repaired and I would also ask if the government did it at their expensive or were the contractors compelled to do that at their own expense?

Mr. EMMERSON. The contractors did it; they are supposed to do it at their own expense.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there anything in this $88,000 for that or will they be paid for that?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the deputy says that is not included in this.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell us when he got the final estimate for this work?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the final estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. I mean of the contractors work for the completion of this canal. Have they not the final estimates yet?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of the Iroquois section they have not.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood that the final estimate was included in this $88,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have not the final estimate but the deputy says that this amount will certainly cover the item.

Mr. J. D. REID. The whole work.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what the deputy assures me.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then you are giving me the same answer as I received last year which was:

> Yes, I am advised the estimates of the current year are expected to cover the whole expenditure.

And this is the same answer this year. What will the answer be next year? What is the total amount that has been expended on this up to date.

Mr. EMMERSON. The total expended on section 1, that is from Iroquois to Presqu'Isle, up to the 30th of June, 1902, was $1,277,770; from the 30th June, 1902 to the 30th of June, 1903, $12,418.20; total expended up to the 30th of June, 1903, $1,290,188.20; total expended up to the 1st of May, 1904, $1,366,856.40. Larkin & Sangster are the contractors. On section No. 2, from Presqu'Isle to Gates Point, known as the Cardinal section, on which William Davis & Sons had the contract, the total amount expended to May 1st was $4,108,920. On section 3, from Gates Point to Upper Entrance, known as the Upper Entrance section, on which the contractors are Murray & Cleveland, the total expenditure to the 1st of May was $1,866,998.15. Section 4, outside Upper Entrance, W. A. Allan, contractor, was completed some years ago. The total expenditure to the 1st of May, 1904, was $5,439,238.24.

Mr. HAGGART. Was the payment to Mr. Allan on account of the Galops canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. He had section 4 of the Galops canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister done anything about arranging to have the bridge at Cardinal swung by some other means than hand power?

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter is receiving the attention of the department now.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was receiving it a year ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had the papers under consideration this morning, and some instructions were given with a view to having that work done at once, so that the bridge will be swung by electric power.

Mr. J. D. REID. If you put on electric power, will the same staff be kept on, or will the number be decreased ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think we shall probably not require more than one man in the day and one at night.

Mr. HAGGART. This work was finished a couple of years ago. How is it you have not a final estimate, but that you are keeping on a staff of engineers, who have nothing to do but prepare a final estimate ? It is a most extraordinary state of affairs.

Mr. EMMERSON. The real fact is that such details are required by the Auditor General with respect to the matter that it is impossible to get all these gathered. I presume the late superintending engineer was in the confidence of my hon. friend, and he would not say that he was purposely delaying the work. He was in his lifetime urged to have the work completed, and the department is very anxious indeed to have it completed ; but it has seemed to be impossible to get it done.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I am to understand from the hon. gentleman that the staff of the Galops canal is kept on for two years after the work is done for the purpose of furnishing details to the Auditor General ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman must not understand that, because that is not what I said.

Mr. HAGGART. Those were the exact words the hon. gentleman used.

Mr. EMMERSON. Excuse me, I did not. My hon. friend said the work was completed two years ago. I stated, on the authority of the deputy minister, that the work is not yet finally completed.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister knows that the contractors have left, they have taken their dredges and tugs away, sold their steam shovels, and taken all their plant.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is speaking from personal knowledge.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know that their plant is all gone. When the minister says the work is not yet completed, I cannot understand what these people are working at. For instance, why do you require an inspector of masonry, drawing $1,200 a year, when there is not a solitary mason working on the premises ? Surely there must be something wrong in this.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend must surely be labouring under some mistake. I understand he is speaking of the Iroquois section ?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, the Cardinal section.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is some work going on there, the engineer states. There are five men employed, namely, two chainmen, the engineer, the assistant engineer, and the masonry inspector ; but on the Iroquois section there are only the clerks, the engineer and the assistant clerk.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am speaking particularly of the Cardinal section. Will the hon. gentleman tell me why chainmen are required there when there is no engineer to do the work other than make up the final estimates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. But there is some work on the Cardinal section which the deputy says is going on. My hon. friend says it is not, and of course I could not act as arbitrator between the two.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any masonry going on ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My deputy says that work must be going on or the services of the men would not be required.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there anything going on in the winter time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We employ by the year. It is often cheaper to do that than employ a man only a few months. We want a man to commence as inspector and continue the work, and do not want to be changing every month.

Mr. J. D. REID. If there is any work going on.

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall go down there myself and make sure.

Mr. J. D. REID. I wish the hon. minister would. I am quite satisfied that there are two or three men there who have nothing to do but draw their pay. I would like to know the names of the men of whom the hon. minister has a list, who are employed on the Cardinal section.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are C. D. Sargent, F. B. Patterson, M. L. O'Connell, E. Cook and A. Cameron.

Mr. J. D. REID. The last two are the chainmen and the inspector of masonry, who certainly have nothing to do.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister said a while ago that the contracts were not finished. Will he be kind enough to inform me what amount he has paid to either of the

contractors, W. Davis & Co. or Larkin, to the end of July, 1904.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was expended from the 30th of June 1903 to the 1st of May, 1904, $170,000, of which $19,000 was spent on the Cardinal section up to the 1st of May, 1904.

Mr. HAGGART. To whom was that paid ?

Mr. EMMERSON. To W. Davis & Son.

Mr. HAGGART. Was that for work done during the year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw the minister's attention to what was said two years ago by the then Minister of Railways with respect to this work. When the item for the Galops canal enlargement $293,000, of which $55,000 was a revote, was up, the then Minister of Railways said :

> I do not propose to ask parliament for any money beyond this, part of which is needed to pay the drawbacks. There is an amount of drawbacks which we have to pay out of that $50,000. I do not propose to ask parliament for any more money.

Then he said :

> There is nothing in the estimate inserted with any intention of continuing the expenditure on this work. I have concluded not to go on with the work any further.

It must have been a surprise to the minister himself, in view of this statement, to find that large amounts have been expended since then, and the committee will expect that the hon. gentleman will now be able to say when the work will be completed and how much more money will have to be voted for its completion.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that the hon. minister hardly understood what I referred to a little while ago. I do not want this item to stand over if that possibly can be avoided, but I hope he will see the justice of placing before the committee later on the estimates upon which the amount of $250,000 last year was based and the supplementary estimates that have since come in. Although the minister says that there is some work still being done, neither he nor his deputy can tell the committee actually what is being done, and the conclusion is irresistible that whether there may be something in the nature of trimming still going on, the contractors are not any longer engaged on the work and that substantially the work was completed more than a year ago. I would call the minister's attention to the undesirability of having this kind of thing prevail. In one aspect of the case it occurs very frequently, and that is, whenever a delay occurs, from whatever cause, it seems to me, looking over the public accounts, the public treasury has to bear the interest for the time of the delay. And if it takes nearly two years to complete these final estimates, the result will be that the contractors will be paid not only the amount of the original estimates, but, probably interest as well. That is not fair to the country. I ask the minister particularly to say that he will, at all events, place the papers before the committee at some future time.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman, if I understand him, asks for the reports from the chief engineer with respect to these payments——

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, on which they base their estimates. I ask that these be laid on the table. Am I to undestand that that will be done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, we will furnish that.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister stated that $19,000 had been paid to W. Davis on the contract for the year ending 30th June, 1904. Was any portion of that paid for the three slides that took place on their work, or was it independent of that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is on their contract, not on the slides.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the hon. minister is assured by his department that none of the money paid was paid on the slides that occurred on his work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what the deputy informs me—that it is simply paid on the work done under contract.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not an exact answer. I want to know whether any of the money was paid on the slide, and was that included in the contract—was that considered part of the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have told my hon. friend distinctly that nothing was paid on the slides ; it was paid on account of the work under the contract, and the slides did not form part of the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the minister now distinctly.

Mr. SPROULE. There is the strangest kind of work in connection with this whole matter. I have listened to explanations of ministers for three years in succession. Practically the minister said three years ago : Give me so much money and we will finish the work, we will discharge the hands and the expenditure will stop. And when we came back two years ago he asked an additional amount. What for ? To finish the same work which he had declared the other vote would finish. And still the same men are kept on the work, though, apparently, they have nothing to do except draw their salaries. The minister tells us : My engineer tells me this ; or : My engineer tells me that. The only conclusion that one

can come to is either that the minister, the engineer, and all the rest of them, are in league to take the money from the country, or else that they do not know what they are doing. Though we have been assured so often that the work would be paid for and completed, here again we have $204,300 asked for the same purpose, of which $88,000 is for the contract. What work is being done ? Who is the contractor ? Is the work going on now ? Has there been a new contract since last year ? These are things we ought to know. We are voting money belonging to the people, and we ought to have information that will be reliable, that we may judge when we reach finality in this affair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not carried by any means. We want information from the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the same old contract, anyhow. The work has been done under the original contract by the contractors, whose names I have given.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the contract given ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1897.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not carried, Mr. Chairman ; and you need not be in such a hurry. It will not be carried until we get the information we ask for.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) need not lose his temper.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not losing my temper over the minister, but over the chairman calling 'carried' even when the minister is on his feet and speaking.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not allow himself to be disturbed even by you, Mr. Chairman. We do so much better when we are all amiable and good-natured.

Mr. SPROULE. This is too much of a farce to be good-natured over.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now I am sorry I spoke ; I am afraid I make my hon. friend angry. I am anxious to give all the information possible.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I ask the hon. minister if he will be good enough to give us the information we ask for : Who is the contractor ? Has any new contract been let since last year ? What is the nature of the work being done ? When is it expected that it will be finished ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Wm. Davis & Sons have the contract for the Cardinal section of this work. Of course, there are several sections.

Mr. SPROULE. We are speaking of the Cardinal section.

Mr. EMMERSON. The contract was entered into in 1897. There has been no new contract, and all payments from 1897 down to the present time in connection with the work were paid under that contract ; and the Auditor General, in his approval of the payments, calculated with regard to the original contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What work is being done at the present time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed that the trimming up work is being done.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. minister mean by 'trimming up' ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a technical term with which I am not familiar.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman will become familiar with it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose I shall. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) seems disposed to trim me, and I suppose I shall have to get used to it. The chief engineer and deputy minister tell me that the work now being done on the Cardinal section is the final work, that of trimming up the canal—in other words, putting on the finishing touches.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has the engineer at his side, cannot he ask him what 'trimming up' means ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It means trimming up the slopes and giving the canal the finishing touches.

Mr. J. D. REID. I may say that was done a year ago. The work was nicely levelled off and sodded, and the sides of the bank are covered with stonework. The minister says now that $88,000 is not sufficient, and that there will be more money asked for next year because the final estimates have not been made up.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think I said that. I said this work is practically completed except some finishing work, which is not a serious matter. But the final estimate has not been made up. After consulting with my deputy, I am getting new light. One of these reports which I will bring down will show that in addition to this $88,000, the judgment of the late engineer was that we would require $30,000 more to pay final estimates.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then I must tell the people there that in addition to this $88,000, at least $30,000 will be required before this matter is finally settled up.

Mr. EMMERSON. With sorrow I admit it.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this contract let on schedule prices, or was it a lump sum?

Mr. EMMERSON. Schedule prices.

Mr. SPROULE. Then are there any extras being allowed on this contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this is an extra. How many years will it be before we may expect these extras will be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is always a question as to what is extras. By the term extras, I do not understand those items that are within the bounds of the contract. A man does certain work, and more than was contemplated, but which is provided for under the contract. While it adds to the first estimate of the work, it is not essentially an extra.

Mr. LENNOX. Are the contractors doing this trimming ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, Davis and Sons, on the Cardinal section.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is another matter I wish to bring up. The effect of placing the canal where the government placed it was virtually to make an island of the village of Cardinal. A bridge had to be put across to allow the people to get into the village, and the effect on the whole, was to injure the property of a great many people in the village on account of the main road being cut off. One of these gentlemen was the Rev. George McArthur, whose property was seriously damaged. This gentleman appealed to the government to pay him damages, or to appoint valuators to examine his property and award him some damages. The government refused to send their valuator, and he then employed counsel and asked permission to go before the Exchequer Court. The government granted him that privilege. The case came before the Exchequer Court, and I think it was tried by Mr. Justice Burbidge, who awarded Mr. McArthur $1,200 damages. The government refused to pay, and appealed to the Supreme Court, and I am told by Mr. McArthur's solicitor that the Supreme Court decided against Mr. McArthur, merely on a technical point, but on account of the injury that was done him they believed that morally his case was good. Still they had to decide against him merely on this technical point, and so this gentleman finds himself without redress. The Supreme Court felt that he was entitled to some redress because they decided that the government should pay all the costs that he had incurred up to and including the Supreme Court. I do not know whether the government have decided to pay the costs. At the same time, there are some other persons whose property has been seriously injured in consequence of the canal being placed where it is. I think the government should settle this claim with the Rev. Mr. McArthur and also with others who may apper before the Exchequer Court. I now appeal to the government to settle this claim and give others a chance to appear before the Exchequer Court, who consider that they have been injured. Therefore I would like to ask the hon. minister what his opinion is in so far as this case in concerned ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had the circumstances of this case brought recently to my notice. While it excites my sympathy and personal inclination I do not see any reason or any justification for my recommending that the reverend gentleman should be paid. His case does excite my political sympathy, because he is a supporter of a party with which I have been for a lifetime allied, and I would liked to have seen him paid.

Mr. SPROULE. You are not as liberal with him as you are with many others.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, if my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) were in a situation like that I would like to see him paid and that desire would be intensified if his politics were right. The facts of this case, however, are that in the construction of the canal that gentleman and some others were put to some inconvenience. Their lands were not taken from them, their property was not invaded but they were put to some inconvenience, a very remote injury, too remote in the judgment of the Supreme Court to warrant them in having a legal claim. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), who is a very watch dog of the treasury, would become indignant, if not cross, if we were to pay any claims of that kind. If you pay one you open the door for all similar claims. Any one who thinks he has been injured or put to an inconvenience by a great public work would have a similar claim. The construction of the canal in that place must have been an advantage to the people of that section.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was a great disadvantage to place the canal where they did in so far as the inhabitants of that village were concerned.

Mr. EMMERSON. But they would rather have it there than not have the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, they had the canal before. It ran around the front end of the village where it did not injure the village at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be a greater advantage to them to have it larger.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, but it has injured this gentleman's property.

Mr. EMMERSON. It has not injured his property. It may be a little inconvenient for him and he may have to drive around a little farther. We are all subject to some inconvenience in respect to public utilities. There is hardly a man in Canada but can figure up to some degree an inconvenience that he could value in dollars and cents, but

it is more or less remote. In this case it was very remote.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister what the judge of the Exchequer Court thought of it when he gave judgment in favour of this gentleman.

Mr. EMMERSON. Other judges seemed to think the judgment of the Exchequer Court was not correct. It is one man against many.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another question I would like to ask my hon. friend. He says the reverend gentleman has his sympathy. I would like to know how long he considers he can live on sympathy.

Mr. EMMERSON. If you will let me have your's for a little while I will tell you how long I can live on it.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he will agree to this ? The clergyman whose property has been injured or who has gone through with this case is certainly not in a position financially to appeal it. His property has been very seriously injured. He could not get to-day one-half for it what he could have obtained had the canal been left where it was originally and as his property is encumbered he is not able to appeal the case. The first court decided that he was right, the next that he was wrong. There is yet one final court of appeal and that is the Privy Council in England or parliament here. If parliament will settle the case by giving him a grant, of course that will end it. But if they intend to refuse, now that the Supreme Court have recommended the government to pay the expenses so far, will the government agree to allow this appeal to go to the Privy Council and pay the expenses that may be connected with it ? In case the decision is not in favour of the Reverend Geo. McArthur I am sure he will be satisfied that he probably is not entitled to anything and will abide by the consequences as of course he will be obliged to do.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have enough difficulty in connection with my own department without invading the jurisdiction of another. When the case went to the Supreme Court it was placed under the control of the Department of Justice. I would not wish to interfere as to that and could not answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. J. D. REID. We have the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) here. It is really a very great hardship for this gentleman and the amount of expense incurred by the appeal would be very small. I ask the Prime Minister as a favour to this particular gentleman that he will give him this right to have this case go to the Privy Council and that the government shall assume the expense in connection with it. I venture to say there is not one hon. gentleman on this side of the House who will object to the cost that may be incurred in taking that case to the Privy Council, and I believe that every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will take the same view of it. I will not ask that this shall be a precedent in connection with any other claims which shall be brought up. In case there are other claims tried the claimants will have to assume the responsibility of going to the Privy Council themselves, but in this case I ask the right hon. Prime Minister to grant the request.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not giving an opinion in regard to this case but if we are not to adopt the judgment I would rather give it to the reverend clergyman than to the lawyers. It would be less expensive, I am sure.

Mr. J. D. REID. The right hon. Prime Minister has power to grant that request. If the Prime Minister will stand up and say he will allow it to go he will only be doing justice to this gentleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will ask my colleague the Minister of Justice to look at the claim. Perhaps there may be a moral foundation to the claim, but apparently there is no legal foundation.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. Minister of Justice is here and understands the case thoroughly. I think he can explain anything necessary in connection with it so that this matter can be settled now and this claim can be allowed to go to the Supreme Court.

Mr. GOURLEY. The hon. Minister of Justice ought to take the view of the Prime Minister that he is entitled to benefit of clergy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Gourley), although a lawyer, is not aware that benefit of clergy was abolished centuries ago. This case is one of harship undoubtedly but I cannot understand on what principle the government should settle with this reverend gentleman unless we are disposed to settle a multitude of other cases which arise under similar circumstances. This gentleman's property with the property of about twenty others was affected as the result of the construction of this canal. I think it was the right of access to these properties that was injured as a result of the construction of this work. He acted for himself and others.

Mr. J. D. REID. For himself only.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not sure about that. I have not the facts quite clear in my mind but I think that others were con-

nected with the suit. However, that is not important. A man I think named Kief was also connected with this case. It was decided that if the suppliants succeeded in this case the government would pay all parties interested, and if they failed the result in this case would apply to all. The claim was made against the Railways and Canals Department, it was referred to my department, and I thought it my duty to advise that there was no legal claim. It occurred to me that the case was not one in which there was property damage within the meaning of the Act, and I had to advise the department that I did not think they could entertain the claim. Then the matter came up by way of petition of right. The reverend gentleman applied for a petition of right to have his position settled by judgment of the court. I immediately acquiesced in that and a petition of right was granted. The judgment of the Exchequer Court was in his favour. The judge of the Exchequer Court held that the man's property had been injuriously affected and its value decreased and that as a result the government should pay for the damage. He fixed the amount at $1,200. I remained still of the opinion—being perhaps obdurate in this matter—that the judgment of the Exchequer Court was wrong and I advised an appeal to the Supreme Court. When the case came before the Supreme Court they concurred in my view, namely, that while the right of access had been interfered with, the man's property had not been injuriously affected so as to give him a claim for damages. I have no recollection of having seen any recommendation in the judgment that we should pay the costs of the appeal to the Supreme Court. If my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) is satisfied from his own personal knowledge that this recommendation is contained in the judgment I shall have it looked up and certainly such a recommendation as that should receive and would receive the sympathetic consideration of the government. If they recommend that in this case the suppliant should have his costs paid, I do not think the government would hesitate a moment to adopt such a suggestion. My hon. friend says that, the Supreme Court having decided that this gentleman is not entitled to consideration, in the way of remuneration for the damage he has suffered, that we should appeal that question to the Privy Council. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that we cannot take the appeal.

Mr. J. D. REID. He will take it if you pay the costs.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If he takes the appeal we will give him every possible facility. He cannot appeal except on application for leave. If he applies for leave I shall agree that leave be granted, but when he comes and asks us that we should assume the burden of taking an appeal and assume all the costs the question arises what principle we are to lay down. The hon. gentleman says that he will not consider it a precedent but while he does not and will not, other gentlemen in the same position may do so, and may come to us and say : Treat us in the same way ; appeal to the Privy Council at your expense and for our benefit. I do not see what answer we could make in such a case, nor do I see how the government could justify any suggestion to take the case to the Privy Council by way of paying the costs. There is no principle at stake ; it is one of those cases that come before the court every day, a question of whether the damage to a man's property is such as would entitle him to recover damages. I do not see why we should distinguish between this minister's case and other cases. I can understand my hon. friend's sympathy for his constituent, and I quite appreciate his desire to secure relief for him. He says that this case is one of hardship. I admit that it is a hard case but so far as I am concerned I can only apply the law. I could not pay damages in such a case nor could I advise the government to do so. My hon. friend says that there is a recommendation in the judgment as to costs. I repeat that if there is such a recommendation as to costs I shall consider it and have it complied with. Of course I have not looked at the judgment recently.

Mr. J. D. REID. At the time the judgment was given I just noticed a paragraph that appeared in the newspaper, probably three or four lines, in the way they generally report these cases, and I should judge from the wording of that paragraph that the judgment contained some recommendation that the government should pay the costs. I am only speaking of what I saw in the newspaper.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course I am now speaking only from my impression. It is some weeks since I read the judgment. My impression was that the court held that the suppliant would not be obliged to pay the costs of the Crown on the appeal, that each party would have to pay his own costs.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am not sure, but, on rendering it, I came to the conclusion that the court suggested that the government should pay the costs. The minister has just stated that on this case several others depended, and that others were pushing this case through. I may say to the minister that there was no one connected with this gentleman at all ; he has paid his own costs and I do not think there is a single solitary person who has put up one dollar for him. He has had to pay all his costs in connection with the case so far, but is unable to proceed as he has not the means to do so, and therefore he has to suffer this hardship. I venture to say that I can

say for the whole village—and at all events I would do so before I would ask the government to allow the case to go to appeal—that they would pledge themselves that they would not regard this as a precedent. But of course if judgment were given in favour of the reverend gentleman, then they could have their own cases tried and if necessary could take them to the Privy Council. Of course there is no question that there are quite a few others who would be in a similar position, and there is no doubt that there would be others who would have to be paid if the government settled this one claim. This gentleman, in the eyes of the public in the locality, is entitled to damages, and in view of the fact that he got judgment from the court that is supposed to settle these cases and that it was only on a technical point that the Supreme Court decided against him, I feel now that the least the government could do would be to make a grant of a few hundred dollars in order that justice might be done this gentleman and others. There is no question about it in my own opinion—and I believe in the opinion of the public in that locality,—that this gentleman has been most unfairly dealt with in so far as his property is concerned. That is the reason that I make this appeal, which I suppose is the last appeal I can make. I have appealed to the Minister of Railways, and the Minister of Justice. I appeal to the Prime Minister, and I am very sorry they cannot grant that request and allow this reverend gentleman to get the amount to which he is entitled. I believe the least they could do would be to pay him the $1,200 to which he is entitled, without making it a precedent. The government could buy his property for a few hundred dollars more than the damages, and could use it for some of the lockmen or for some other purpose. There is a way of getting over it I am sure. It would be as easy to get over that as to get over the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. I think it would not be much trouble and I am now making this last appeal to the Prime Minister, to the Minister of Justice and to the Minister of Railways to see if they cannot find some means of doing something by which he will get the justice to which I believe he is entitled.

Mr. SPROULE. I suggest that they take for this purpose a portion of the money they are paying out for trimmings, that do not require to be done. I would ask the minister if he can tell us how much of this money which we are voting is to be used for paying what is already earned, by work having been done and how much is yet to be earned and the kind of work that is to be done to earn it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is practically all earned.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be so then the work must be completed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have explained to my hon. friend that we are just doing the finishing up work. When I say it is practically all earned I do not mean to say that every dollar is earned.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that it will take about $15,000 more to complete this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $30,000, according to the last report we have from the engineer, who has died since. That was made out about three weeks ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I suppose the whole staff of engineers will be kept on until that is spent.

Mr. EMMERSON. As soon as the work is through, the staff will be reduced.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that as soon as the elections come on this man should put in his claim, provided the others do the same.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the hon. Minister of Justice remember if the Supreme Court were unanimous in that case?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not remember. I will look into the case, because it is important to know whether there was such a recommendation as has been suggested by my hon. friend.

North channel—forming channel and dam, $150,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This amount is to continue and complete the forming of a channel above the Galops canal. This channel is 2½ miles long, 300 feet wide and 16 feet deep. It is also for the building of a dam between Galops and Adams Islands. By building this dam a dangerous bar is removed, making the navigation more safe. To complete the work under contract, including the dam, requires $150,000. The total amount expended on the work to the 1st of May, 1904, is $1,314,000.42.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the estimated cost of it, and what will be the total amount expended when it is completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total cost will be $1,464,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the estimated cost of the channel and the dam separately by the department when the first vote was taken ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The original estimate of making a 200 foot channel was three quarters of a million dollars. The estimated cost of the dam was in the vicinity of $60,000. But the channel was increased to 300 feet in width, and therefore the cost has been very largely increased.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that after the contract was let ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but the work was at schedule prices.

Mr. SPROULE. Who had the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. M. A. Cleveland.

Mr. SPROULE. You spent last year $85,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was paid to the contractors on account of the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the dam is now completed, what has it cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not finally completed.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much has been spent on the dam ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the information as to the dam separately. The deputy thinks the estimate has been exceeded.

Mr. J. D. REID. And yet the work is not finished. I think this item should not pass until we get that information. I am not objecting to the building of this dam. It was built last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are 300 feet of it in which the cribs have not yet been sunk. The progress estimates as they are received are in one amount for both the channel and the dam.

Mr. HAGGART. You do not separate the estimates between the channel and the dam.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, because it is all one contract.

Mr. HAGGART. They are a mile apart.

Mr. EMMERSON. They might be two miles apart. They are all one contract at schedule prices, and the progress estimates are sent in on the work without regard to whether it is the dam or the channel.

Mr. HAGGART. If it is on progress estimates and the minister took an amount last year to complete the whole, why is he coming now and asking for $150,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to complete the work under the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the hon. minister tell us that this dam is part of the original contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely not. It was not contemplated then.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am bound by the information which I get from my officials.

Mr. J. D. REID. This contract was let some seven or eight years ago. Are we to understand that at that time this dam was contemplated and made part of this contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; there has been no other contract.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. HAGGART. This is done on American soil. Have you got the consent of the Americans to the building of it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. I may say to the hon. minister that so far as this dam is concerned, I never heard of it and it was not talked of nor contemplated when this contract was let.

Mr. EMMERSON. It might have been contemplated without the hon. gentleman hearing of it.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the contract there is nothing specified about building a dam. If there was to be a dam, would it not be specified in the contract? The contract is very plain, and it only provides for dredging and some piering at the west end of the channel. I know the contractor well, and you could not get a better one. I am not finding fault with this contractor or his work. The only question I have asked is how much has been spent on this dam. The minister tells us that the prices allowed the contractor are just the same as on the other dredging work. I suppose that means the cribwork is so much per foot and the dredging or filling in so much per yard, the same as the original contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, under the original contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. I mean that for the work done at the head of the channel, the same prices are paid as across this dam ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what my deputy tells me.

Mr. J. D. REID. And the two are not kept separate ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; the vote is asked for the channel and the dam. It was that way last year.

Mr. J. D. REID. This was all done last fall. The Auditor General's Report could not show whether they were separate or not, because all this work has been done since July 1st of last year as far as this dam is concerned. That is why we are entitled to some information now.

Mr. EMMERSON. My deputy tells me that he could get the information by figuring it out.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we are on the supplementaries, will the minister be in a position to state how much has been paid on the dam so far and how much he expects it will cost to complete ? I may say that I believe this dam across the island has had the effect of turning the water back and throwing it around the head of the island, by which I believe it will do some good in so far as the entrance into the head of the canal is concerned. It has increased the water so that boats can enter the head of

the canal more easily. I know it was a difficult work, and the contractor has done it well. Still I think we are entitled to know exactly what it cost.

Mr. HAGGART. Have there been any complaints from overflow from this dam ?

Mr. EMMERSON. None.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister did not answer my question. Last year there was a vote of $60,000. He says that the dam and the north channel were both included in the contract. $60,000 was voted last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was $100,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Any way, it was to finish the work. How is it that $100,000 more is asked this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nearly $150,000 more. There must be some mistake if such a statement was made.

Mr. HAGGART. Here it is in 'Hansard' :

To complete the north channel (revote), $20,000.

You say that that was part and parcel of the whole contract, that the dam was made a portion of it. Then the discussion went on :

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that complete the work ?
The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. I wish to amend that item by adding the words 'and dam between Galops and Adam's island.'
Mr. REID (Grenville). Will this complete the Cleveland work on the north channel ?
The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the report of the engineers.
Mr. REID (Grenville). And the dam, too ?
The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, we are so advised.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is pretty explicit.

Mr. HAGGART. What has the department to say ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will have to take back what was said last year.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister not see that if we cannot secure exact information about these things it is a perfect farce our asking for information ?

Mr. J. D. REID. The Finance Minister was acting Minister of Railways last year. Let me read again the question asked him :

To complete north channel (revote), $20,000.
Mr. REID (GRENVILLE). Does that complete the work ?
The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. I wish to amend that item by adding the words 'and dam between Galops and Adam's island.'
Mr. REID (Grenville). Will this complete the Cleveland work on the north channel ?
The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the report of the engineers.
Mr. REID (Grenville). And the dam, too ?
The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, we are so advised.

Yet now we are asked to vote another $150,000, and the Minister of Railways says that the work on the dam is not half through, and that the work on the channel is likely to continue for some time yet. What has the Minister of Finance to say regarding that statement which he made last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. I can only say that at that time, as the information the hon. gentleman has read shows, I stated that we were so advised by the engineer, and I am quite sure that I had the engineer's opinion to that effect or I would not have made the statement. I am told by the Minister of Railways that Mr. Rubidge did make such a recommendation at that time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He's dead.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, we cannot extend the lives even of worthy men for ever. I take it for granted that the minister to-day is asking for this sum on the report of the engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister bring down that report ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will.

Mr. J. D. REID. Only $20,000 was asked a year ago to complete this work, and now $150,000 is asked to complete it. Perhaps we could get an estimate of what it will really take to complete the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a growing time.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister had a special engineer's report on this work—any engineer other than one in his own department?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it was under the control of Mr. Rubidge, who was the superintending engineer——

Mr. HAGGART. That is no answer to give to the committee. The department is answerable for the expenditure so long as they retain the parties on whose advice they act.

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly—no one man denies that. But I was asked whether any special engineer was asked to make a report on the matter, and I am endeavouring to enlighten my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) on that particular point. I was endeavouring to say that there was no special engineer, that the only engineer who made a report was Mr. Rubidge, the chief superintending engineer.

Mr. BLAIN. I would draw the hon. minister's attention to this statement at page 4034 of 'Hansard' of 1902. This was in the discussion on the item 'North channel, forming dam $56,250.' My hon. friend from

Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) made the statement that this was useless expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. So it is—altogether.

Mr. BLAIN. And my hon. friend the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) repeats that statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand my hon. friend from Grenville to have changed his opinion with respect to it and to say now that it is a work of value.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have not changed my mind on anything. I am under the impression that my hon friend (Mr. Blain) is referring to a matter that comes up on the next item relating to Galops Rapids. So far as this channel is concerned, I believe it is absolutely necessary and that it is a good work. Mr. M. A. Cleveland, who has been working on it, I believe is a first-class contractor and has done his work well. I do not believe there is a better contractor on the canal than Mr. Cleveland. But I recall the fact that, last year, when the question was asked if the $20,000 then voted would finish up the work, we were told that it would. Yet, this year the minister comes down and asks for $150,000, and this we are asked to vote without any explanation whatever, except a statement by the Minister of Railways and Canals which virtually means that there will be more money required. That is the position we are in to-day. The minister cannot tell us whether this ends the contract, or whether the work will finish this year, next year or five years hence. Personally, I feel that we have not received the information that would justify even a lot of school boys in approving this expenditure, much less the House of Commons of Canada which has the interest of the whole people in its charge.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) says that this is an excellent work and that the contractor has done good work. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says that the expenditure upon it is a waste of money.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is referring to the Galops Rapids.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I am referring to the north channel. I stated it before in the House, and I feel justified in repeating it, for the work came under my observation.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, which is right—my hon. friend from South Lanark or my hon. friend from Grenville? How can I tell?

Mr. J. D. REID. I may say that the hon. member for South Lanark will explain that. From the head of the canal at Cardinal to Prescott, according to the old channel where the boats have run for the last thirty or forty years there were spots in it where there was only eight or nine feet of water, and the question was whether it was better to make a new channel where it is now or dredge the old channel to the necessary depth. My opinion of the matter as expressed, was that the work as now done when completed was a work of actual necessity, or else the old channel had to be dredged. There may be difference of opinion as to which was the best route to take. I am not discussing that point and I do not know whether I could form an opinion upon it. But deeper water was necessary in order to accommodate the boats drawing 16 or 17 feet of water coming from Montreal. And, that depth having been secured I say the work is a good work so far as the interest of navigation is concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose I too must keep myself right in this matter. I made the statement a moment ago that my hon. friend from Grenville condemned the expenditure, and I suppose I must give the evidence. At page 4034 of 'Hansard' of 1902, in the course of the discussion on the item 'North Channel, forming dam, $56,250; the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) said:

> It is simply throwing this away. Better throw the money into the canal than throw a dam across there.

I understand the hon. gentleman now to say that he was directing attention to another matter, and so I will not debate that.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a difference between the hon. gentlemen themselves and I am quite willing to let them settle it.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) has explained that his remarks referred to something else, and of course, I accept his statement, as the minister is bound also to do. A little while ago I asked if any engineer outside of the department had made a report on this work and his answer was in the negative. I wish to draw his attention to what his predecessor, Hon. Mr. Blair says. Speaking in answer to a question as to the expenditure, he said:

> I will tell the hon. gentleman what I will do. I will undertake that the money will not be expended until I have the subject thoroughly investigated, and until I have had the opinion of other engineers. Not being an engineer myself, I cannot form a judgment upon a question of this kind. I can, however, probably decide not to spend, and I will not do so until I ascertain from independent engineers that it would be a proper expenditure to make.

There is a clear and distinct statement by Mr. Blair when he was asking for this vote of $56,250. It was questioned by this side of the House, and the minister pledged his word to the committee that not one cent of increased expenditure would be made until he had consulted another and outside independent engineer. The committee accepted his word and let the item go through. The

money was expended, and now my hon. friend comes forward and asks us for $150,000. He also makes the further statement that that sum will not complete the work.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I stated that I was advised that this $150,000 will complete the work.

Mr. BLAIN. The dam as well as the channel ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Both.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister stated that a short while ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that it would take $30,000 to complete the previous work.

Mr. BLAIN. Upon that statement in 1902 by the minister who had charge of the department, the money was voted and expended. Now coming to last year, in addition to what the member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) has read, on the same item 'North channel—forming channel and dam,' the Minister of Finance said that the total cost of that work when completed would be $1,354,410 including the dam. Now we have already expended $110,000 more than that. Then the Minister of Finance went on to say that there was a further appropriation of $18,000, and that these two items would complete the work. These are the promises that we get. This thing is of a daily and hourly occurrence in this House. The government come forward with an estimate, the minister stands behind the engineer and pledges his word that the sum asked for will complete the work. I do not think any member on this side of the House would expect that an engineer could make an exact estimate of what a work of that kind would cost, I do not think that is possible. But when the government come forward and state that an estimate is based upon an engineer's opinion, one whose duty it is to make a report upon that work, and then, year after year, they come before this committee and ask for increased amounts with the statement that the sum previously voted will not complete the work, then I say that the committee have a right to complain of the government. The difficulty rests somewhere with the government. On this side of the House we have nothing to do with the officers of the government ; the people and the opposition have no one to hold responsible except the ministers. It is time the ministers became more careful in the statements they make. It is the wish of the opposition to deal fairly with the government. I must say that we expect the Minister of the Department of Railways, who is new in his department, to do better than his predecessor. I am sorry to see, however, that he is not starting in very well. I would ask him to be more careful in the statements and promises he makes to the committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. In addition to what the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has read from the statements of the minister in 1902, I will read what I said in 1903 :

Before the committee rises, I wish to say that I shall have some remarks to make on items No. 91 and No. 92, referring to the forming of a dam in the north channel on the Galops rapids. The minister is aware that I took exception to the building of the dam, because it was part and parcel of that new channel. In discussing the matter with the marine men since, they state that they believe that the building of that dam will overcome the great damage that has been done to the water-way by the deepening of that channel, thus causing the lowering of the water above the island. They think that this wrong which I claim has been done for a great many years, would be really overcome by the building of this dam. I do not intend now to object to the building of that dam. I believe it will probably raise the water again to its normal level as it was previous to this work being done.

That shows that I did make these remarks in 1902, and in 1903 I corrected them. So there is no dispute.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Northern Bank.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Ingram.

NEW BRUNSWICK SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 143) respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Gibson.

On section 3,

Mr. HAGGART. Might I ask the Chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Hyman) whether this confirms any powers granted in the charter of the New Brunswick legislature which are inconsistent with the ordinary Acts which we grant to railway companies?

Mr. HYMAN. By this clause we do not confirm any of the powers. As the clause now reads it is :

The Railway Act, 1903, shall hereafter apply to the works instead of the New Brunswick Railway Act and to the exclusion of any provisions of the Acts mentioned in the preamble inconsistent with the Railway Act, 1903 ; but nothing herein shall affect or invalidate any action heretofore taken by the company pursuant to powers contained in the Acts mentioned in the preamble.

It simply confirms anything they may have done under the local Acts, but it makes the Railway Act of 1903 take precedence for the future.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this clause give to this corporation the ordinary powers granted under the Railway Act ?

Mr. HYMAN. I so understand, Mr. Chairman.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. At six o'clock we were discussing item 95, $150,000 for the north channel.

Mr. HAGGART. As was stated in the House when this item was under discussion there was an item of $20,000 in the supplementaries last year in addition to $80,000 in the main estimates, making $100,000 in all. The Minister of Finance stated that this $20,000 would complete the whole work on that north channel. He justified himself by having an estimate from the chief engineer on that particular work. This chief engineer subsequently sent a report to the department in which he stated that it would require $150,000 additional. As I understand from the minister now this $150,000 is intended to complete the whole of that north channel and that dam, and the report of the department is to that effect. The department obtained a certificate from the chief engineer or the engineer who was directly in charge of that work—and this was communicated to this House by the minister in charge of the estimates—that this would complete the work ; the engineer subsequently gave a certificate that it would require $150,000 more. The minister made some criticism of my statement that the north channel was an entirely useless one and compared it with the statement of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid). When that item was first brought up it was brought before me as Minister of Railways and I refused absolutely to support the contention of the engineer as to the necessity of that work. I say that it is an absolutely useless expenditure of money. My contention at the time was that by deepening what is called Pier Island shoal you could have got a proper entrance into the Galops canal, for one half of the amount that is being expended now for an entrance. The objection taken by the minister at that time was that we would have to use the American channel. The American channel from the Pier Island shoal up to Prescott has a depth of thirty feet. Past Pier Island shoal, there was no necessity of deepening the river at all. He said you would be getting into American waters. My answer was that under the Treaty of Washington, we have as much right to utilize and navigate the American portion of the St. Lawrence as the Americans have themselves, and they have an equal right to utilize and navigate our portion. My contention was that there was no need at all of the expenditure, which is in the neighbourhood of $1,400,000 ; and now it is proposed to expend $150,000 more, a total expenditure of about $1,600,000 to do what I contend could have been accomplished by an expenditure at the utmost of $100,000. From that time to the present I have never changed my opinion that this expenditure for the purpose of building the north channel is entirely useless. It was contended that perhaps the water passing over the Galops rapids would prevent barges or ships coming down from making the entrance to the Galops canals. But you must remember that you have erected a dam between two islands, where I suggested that the shoal should be deepened, and the canal, which did away altogether with that danger. But what I want to draw the minister's particular attention to is the former part of my statement. After having a certificate from the engineer in charge of the work that $20,000 would complete it, he receives a subsequent one that it will require $150.000 more. Have the officers of the department communicated with the engineer in charge of the work and got from him a reason for his change of opinion ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The late engineer, Mr. Rubidge, in his lifetime was asked that question by the department. His explanation was not in writing, and my attention was not called to it. I cannot give any personal explanation ; but I will take the earliest opportunity to examine the situation and learn exactly where the difficulty lies and where the fault is if there has been fault. That is the only thing that I can do at this time, and I shall endeavour to get that information from sources that will not be considered as in any way prejudiced.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not say the minister ought to have done it, but the department ought to have done it. The department had a report from Mr. Rubidge that $20,000 would finish the work and it put that statement in the mouth of the minister in charge of the department at that time. Then a subsequent report came in that $150,000 more would be required. The minister's attention ought to have been called to that. The department ought to have got the information without the minister inquiring into the matter at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the hon. member for South Lanark was Minister of Railways and Canals, if my memory serves me rightly, the government of that day were asking for tenders for enlarging the Cardinal canal and also for a channel from the head of the

canal to Prescott. The intention of the minister was to have the rock excavated at Pier Island shoal and at the same time to run the canal through the village of Cardinal much further south than where it is and where it would not have injured the village and would have been a straight canal. The intention was to run the canal straight from what is known as the upper lock almost to Iroquois. If that had been done, the canal would have been straight, and it would have cost only about one-half of what it has cost as located. But just at that time the government changed, and the Hon. Mr. Blair became Minister of Railways and Canals. Without ever appearing on the scene he changed the route of the canal and located it where it now is. I was informed at the time that the late Mr. Rubidge strongly urged the southern route. If the minister asks the deputy minister, I believe he will agree with me that the canal where it passes through the village of Cardinal, and where it was intended to be made straight, is about as crooked as the old original canal. If the minister visits it he will see that the canal there has a large curve; but it has been made much wider and deeper, so that boats can navigate it more easily than they could the old canal. But, as the hon. member for South Lanark states, west of the canal there was only a small shoal to be removed to make a channel twenty or thirty feet in depth from the head of the canal to Prescott, and the work could have been done for perhaps $100,000 or $150,000.

But, of course, in doing this the vessel would have had to go some 500 or 600 feet in American waters. None of the excavating work, however, would have had to be done in American waters. That canal had been used for forty years, and a vessel could have entered it easily, because it could have got around this island half a mile above the entrance and have plenty of opportunity to go into the canal. But for the same reason, this route was changed and was made to cut right through the island. They had to remove half the island. The water was only five or six feet deep in most of the channel, and as this channel had to be dredged, there is no question but that it could not be done without an enormous expenditure, as has been proved by the expenditure from that time to this. Of course, either one route or the other had to be made. The government were compelled to either remove the shoal near the island or do what they have done now. What has been done makes a splendid channel, but in doing this the government have squandered at least a million dollars, which it would not have been necessary to spend had they gone through the old channel and allowed the vessels to navigate its waters as they had been doing for so many years. Therefore, the ex-Minister of Railways is perfectly right in what he says regarding this expenditure. Another matter I wish to mention is this. These canals are now completed. At any rate, they are all in working order. Take the Cardinal canal. In that there is one lock less, and as it is just new and complete, it should be operated for much less than during the Conservative regime or up to the time the present government took power in 1896. Well, what do we find? I find that previous to the year 1896 it cost to manage those canals as follows: Take the Williamsburg canal, it cost for the permanent staff, $9,567.09; and for the actual repairs to keep it in working order, $7,123.97. That included Farran's Point, Morrisburg and Cardinal canals. In 1903, although the canals were new, just handed over by the contractor and in splendid working order, and when it might be supposed that they could not require repairs to anything like the amount they did in 1896, I find that the expenditure of the staff increased from $9,567 in 1895 to $15,246.91. And for the repairs to those canals it cost $7,123.97 to keep them in repair in 1895, and in 1903 it cost $20,092.79. From the first day the Liberals came into office the expenditure on those canals has increased, so that there is not one year which does not show an increase over the previous year. Take the Cornwall canal, in 1896 it cost $15,114.56 for what is known as the staff, but last year it cost $70,129.29, or an increase from $15,000 per annum to $70,000. Of course, in that latter amount is included lighting, $48,000, which I am not going to discuss now, because that will come up on a special item later, but in the year 1895 that was also included in the $15,400. Compare that with last year, and you will find that, leaving the lighting out of last year's expenditure, the cost of operating the canal was $22,129.29, as compared with $15,400 in 1895, and that latter amount included the lighting. The repairs on these new canals cost $19,235 last year, while in 1895 they only cost $13,053.53. Then take the Lachine canal, which, in 1895, was an old canal. In that year the staff cost $56,185.44, whereas in 1903 it cost $69,534.56. And for the repairs on this old canal, in 1895 it cost $24,924.89, whereas in 1903, on the new canal, the repairs cost $53,054.20, or more than double. Take the Sault Ste. Marie canal. In 1895 that canal cost $3,432.03 for staff. It is only a short canal with one lock, yet in 1903 it cost for the staff to manage that lock $16,017.22. And for the repairs on that little piece of canal it cost in 1903 $10,855.70, so that in 1903 it took $27,000 to run one lock on the Sault canal, while in 1895 the extravagant Conservative government managed to run it for $3,432. Take the Welland canal. In 1895 the staff of that canal cost $89,065.27, while in 1903 it cost $90,290.65. And the repairs on the whole length of the Welland canal in 1895 cost $40,270.94, as compared with $72,004.59 in 1903. You can take every canal throughout this Dominion and you will find that the cost of management and repairs has increased almost two-

fold under the present government. Take the canal that I know well, the one in my own county ; I cannot see any necessity for employing more men to keep it in repair at present than under the late government. Why, on the contrary, there should be only one-half of the repairs required to-day, and yet the minister, if he will take up his pay-list, will find that he has three times as many employees looking after the repairs, and if the Auditor General's Report were ready we would find that there are men employed on that canal the whole year who, I believe, did not work one day.

And I see item after item charged to these canals representing expenditure for which I can see no justification whatever. Take this Cardinal canal from Iroquois to the head of the rapids, it had only been handed over by the contractor and not a dollar had to be spent, so far as I can see for repairs. There should have been no charge for repairs for three years, because the contractors had full charge of the banks and were emptying upon them the material that they excavated. I cannot see why there should be such a great expense in managing this canal as in former years. If you go over the expenditure on these canals for thirty years, whether the Liberals were in power or whether the Conservatives were in power, you will find that it remained about the same year after year—only a few hundred dollars difference either way. But on this canal it is increasing year by year the same on the Weland canal, the same on the Lachine canal, the same on the Cornwall canal and the Soulanges and Beauharnois canals as well. Is this increase to go on every year ? Every time the Liberal committee meets in Iroquois or Cardinal and sends a recommendation for two more men or four more men to be put on the canal, or for certain supplies to be bought from certain men, must the minister load this expenditure upon the country regardless of the public interest ? These men are put there and they cannot be dismissed, and the government will take no action in the matter. We had an example this afternoon when the minister admitted to me that he had men employed on the engineering staff that, to my knowledge, have had nothing to do but draw their salaries. Then there is the collector of canal tolls at Cardinal. Not a dollar of canal tolls was collected last year, yet the collector was paid for a full twelve months $1,000. Not only that, but he was paid $1 per day for driving from the village up to the locks to his office, where he had not anything to do. And in addition to that, he was paid office rent down at his own house. In addition to that, he was paid for fuel. And, in addition to all, he was paid 20 cents an hour for extra work on Sundays, though the canal was closed from twelve o'clock on Saturday night to twelve o'clock on Sunday night. The Auditor General's Report shows this, and it seems all the more noteworthy because the collectors on the other canals have not received anything for extra work. Will the minister explain why this extravagance exists, why these officials are kept, why horse-hire is paid, and rent and fuel and all these other things? And, so far as this collector of whom I have spoken is concerned, he has just one thing to do in connection with his position and that is to go to the post office at the end of the month and get his cheque.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have heard my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) deliver this speech more than once. It seems to grow in intensity as the figures increase year by year. I fancy that after a while, he will begin to think there really is something in it. He forgets, of course, that, in the days of progress in Canada, when trade is, figuratively speaking, doubling year by year, necessarily the canals get a share of the increased traffic, and this, of course, involves additional expense in operation. These canals have been enlarged. He refers to a section of the Cornwall canal and says that the expense is nearly double what it was. I am informed that, in the meantime the number of locks has been doubled, and, of course, that involves greater expense.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know who gave that information to the hon. minister. I do not think any officer of the department will say that the number of locks has been increased.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the deputy minister that the number has been doubled.

Mr. J. D. REID. On what canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Cornwall canal, the one to which my hon. friend refers. Turning to the records, I find that, at page 12 of the report of the Department of Railways and Canals of last year, that the cost of staff on the Cornwall canal for 1895, was $15,414.56, and for repairs, $13,000 odd, while, for 1902—that is previous to the lighting, which is another question—the cost for staff was only $17,896.58, a very small increase over 1895, while for repairs only $15,000, again a very small increase, especially when you take into consideration the enlargement of the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. Compare the Williamsburg canal. The Cornwall canal happens to be one of the smallest increased.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am taking one that the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) started with.

Mr. J. D. REID. No. I started with the Williamsburg.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the hon. gentleman made reference to the Cornwall canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister states that there are more locks on the Cornwall canal with the new canal than with the old canal in 1896. I challenge that statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. The statement I made was that there were a great many more now than before the enlargement was made. The enlargement was only completed two or three years ago. My hon. friend has called attention to the Williamsburg canal and has shown that there is an increase. But taking into consideration the large increase of business, the enlargement of the canal and the increased cost of management, also taking into consideration that the present government pay living wages, whereas under the former regime people received starvation wages—I say that taking all these things into consideration, the additional work that is being done, the increased traffic that is attended to, we must expect an increase in the cost of operation. My hon. friend went on to speak about the locks in the canal. I was a little shocked at his contending that it would be in the interest of Canada to have a canal in American territory. If that proposition were to come from this side of the House it would be denounced as traitorous, as disloyal, and I am a little surprised at my hon. friend even making that suggestion. If it came from any other quarter he would be horrified, but in order to make a point against the government he now advocates that we should have a portion of this canal in American territory instead of having it all upon Canadian soil. Personally I know nothing of the locality, and am not in a position to form a judgment upon it, except from the facts recited by my hon. friend. From what I can gather from the member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) the differences between the hon. gentlemen have been adjusted.

Mr. HAGGART. Did I state that a part of it was on American soil ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Some of the boats going through there would have to go through American territory as I understand it. But I did not charge the hon. member for South Lanark with saying that.

Mr. J. D. REID. I said a boat coming from the head of the canal would have to go through American waters. If the minister is so loyal, how is it that a vessel cannot go between Prescott and Kingston without going through American waters ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend should not be so impetuous. I am pointing out that evidently since recess the little differences that existed between my hon. friends have been amicably adjusted, and they seem to harmonize once more regarding the Cornwall canal.

Mr. HAGGART. Remember Shakespeare's motto about brevity. For goodness' sake, be short.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am perhaps imitating my hon. friends.

Mr. CLARKE. A good dinner is supposed to lubricate business.

Mr. EMMERSON. I should take occasion to inquire into the figures presented by my hon. friend and may have occasion to refer to them.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister says that he would be accused of disloyalty if he advocated the proposition of the ex-Minister of Railways. I drew the attention of this government year after year to the fact that if they went on with the work at the Galops Rapids, it would have to be all done in American territory. Notwithstanding that fact, they are now paying money for dredging that is all done in American territory. The next item that follows this asks for money to be spent in dredging a channel through American territory. Any boat that ever entered that channel must necessarily go through American territory, either going down or coming up the river. In this case his loyalty is not so great as it is in the other, where the expenditure has already been made. Now the minister says that the increased cost of operation is owing to the increase of business and the employment of a larger staff. I make this statement, that there are no more locks on the Cardinal canal or on the Williamsburg canal than there were in 1895. On the Farran's Point canal there was one lock in 1896, and there is only one to-day, the only difference is that it has been enlarged.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are two locks on the Farran's Point canal, the old one and the new one.

Mr. J. D. REID. The old one was taken away, no boat goes through that.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then it is a question of veracity between my hon. friend and the superintendent of the canal and the deputy minister. I assume that my hon. friend is labouring under some misapprehension.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is news to me. I have gone up and down the canal very often. Then there were two locks on the Williamsburg canal in 1896 and there are two locks to-day. Is that right ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right. You have struck it for once.

Mr. J. D. REID. On the Cardinal canal there were three locks in 1896, and there are two now. Am I right in that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Three on the Galops.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the Cardinal canal was built there was only one lock at Iroquois, one at Cardinal and one at the head of the

canal. The new lock at Iroquois was built much higher so that they could do away with the lock at Cardinal and there was this new lock built at the head of the canal. The level between Iroquois and the head of the canal is now the same and there is one lock less. The old lock around by the other way has been abandoned, there is no reason why an official of any kind should be employed on that lock, so that when the hon. minister speaks of that as one lock, he refers to a lock at which there is not one dollar expended and at which there is not an official. I would like to know where the other lock is on the Iroquois canal if there are three.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the chief engineer's report the mileage of the Galops canal is given as 7½ miles and the number of locks as three. That does not include this old lock to which my hon. friend refers. There is one at Iroquois, the large lock which is mentioned, and at the head, or the entrance, there are two locks.

Mr. J. D. REID. There are two locks together but the same crew manage them.

Mr. EMMERSON. That makes three locks.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, there are two together.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not a question as to the number of men. I was speaking as to the number of locks.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is another lock on the outside. I did not get that far.

Mr. EMMERSON. You were right before but you seem to have missed that one.

Mr. J. D. REID. I said there were two locks at the head of the canal going west. There are only two there, one less than there was before. Then, there is another lock going down on the outside of the river. That makes three.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then there is the old lock.

Mr. J. D. REID. The old lock is not used, so that there are no more locks on the Williamsburg canal. It is true there are two on the Farran's Point canal. If there are two there that will make one lock more. With practically the same number of locks or with just one more why should it cost the department $15,246 to run them when they were formerly operated for $9,567? The hon. minister states that the reason is that there is more traffic. In 1896 I venture to say that the number of boats, and that means traffic for the employees, passing up and down these old canals was three times more than it was last year. The reason of that is that the canals were so much smaller that a boat drawing eight or nine feet was all that could go through them. A boat carrying 20,000 bushels was all that could go up or down these canals while to-day the boats that go up and down these canals carry from 60,000 to 70,000 bushels and the result is that one large boat handles as much traffic now as three smaller ones did in 1896. On the St. Lawrence to-day there does not appear to be nearly as many boats and I am sure that there are not so many boats passing up and down as in 1896. At that time there were a great many barges going up and down the river but to-day there are hardly any barges whatever. The result is that the actual work on these canals involved in the opening and shutting of locks is not half as much as it was in 1896. Therefore, there is no reason why the increase should take place in the operating expenses of these canals which we find at the present time. I claim that it is merely extravagance on the part of the government to increase the staff in the way that is has been increased from 1896 to the present time. I want the hon. minister to state whether it is his intention to keep in his position the collector of canal tolls at Cardinal when no canal tolls are collected. Not one dollar did the collector at Cardinal collect, but he received last year twelve months salary amounting to $699.99. He received for Sundays 24 hours at 15 cents and 429 hours at 20 cents, postage, and post office orders $5.96, rent of post office box 50 cents, office cleaning, $2.90, coal, $13.50, horse-hire, travel, &c., $2.15; sundries $1.24, making a total of $1,028.49. At Port Colborne we do not see any Sunday labour; at Port Dalhousie they have a little Sunday work, and at Cornwall, the collector has no Sunday work. The canals are closed up on Sunday and how is it that this officer has Sunday work? He has no tolls to collect, but his salary is paid.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the first place it is necessary to continue the collectors at these points in order that a record may be kept.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of what?

Mr. EMMERSON. The making of the canals free to the people for a period of years is an experiment so that it may be tested. In the meantime it is necessary to have a record and these men are employed. They have to give their time in the same way even though the government do not collect tolls. I think an answer to all that has been said by my hon. friend can be found in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals for 1903, part II, page 25. The hon. gentleman refers to the Sault Ste. Marie canal. I find that in 1895 there was a payment of $3,432.73 for staff. The canal had only been opened for a month or so during the year so that that is not for a year's operation. In 1896 it cost $16,074.70 for staff. In 1903 at the same place it cost $16,077.22 for staff. There is an increase of $2.30.

Mr. J. D. REID. You have struck it right this time.

Mr. EMMERSON. I strike it right every time when it comes to figures.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, you do not.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend knows that under the system in vogue along the canals the operators get an increased wage over that paid by the former government and they also get a free house or house rental allowed. These increased wages must necessarily be taken into consideration.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did they not get house rent before ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed not.

Mr. J. D. REID. They always got a government house on the other canals free before.

Mr. EMMERSON. Only a very few.

Mr. J. D. REID. On the Williamsburg canal they always have had government houses free of rent.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed that some of them received that, but that it was not general. Since this government came into power it has been made general, and therefore the cost to the country has increased. The cost of material for repairs has been increased. Wherever lumber has to be used the expense is much greater. Generally labour for repairs is much more expensive now than it was, so that there is very little in what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know for a fact that prior to 1896 every lockmaster and lock labourer on the Williamsburg canal either had a free house or was allowed, I think, $50 per annum to pay for a rented house. That was the case all along the Williamsburg canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said there were some instances, but that that system did not prevail on the canals generally. My hon. friend was making a charge as to the increased expense all along the canal system.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like the minister to make his statement definite, in order that I may make inquiries so that we can discuss it next session.

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall have a complete list prepared.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman has stated that there has been an increased traffic on these canals. Would he give us a statement of the number of vessels that passed through during the season of navigation of 1903 and the season of 1896 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was rather assuming that the traffic would be greater in these years than before. I do not think that that argument is very material when I come to reflect on it, because the men have to be there, night and day, whether one vessel or twenty pass through the canal during the twenty-four hours. It may be that while the number of boats has not increased, owing to the fact that larger boats are used, a great deal more freight is carried through the canals, as one boat now will carry as much as half a dozen would in years gone by. The canals have been deepened in many instances, and therefore can accommodate a larger class of boats ; but, after all, so far as the staff is concerned, the number of boats is not material.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like the minister to bring down with the other statement a list showing the number of boats passing through the canals in 1896 and 1903.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will get one for all of the seasons ; it would be an interesting record.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that the government have arranged to open and close the gates on the Cornwall canal by electricity.

Mr. EMMERSON. They propose to.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are they doing it now ? Yet the staff has been increased ; there are more men on the locks than in 1896, when they had to open the gates by hand power.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that is the case, but I will get the statistics for my own satisfaction. I think they are taking into consideration the question of the advisability of reducing the number of hands in view of the use of electrical power.

Mr. J. D. REID. In 1896 on the Cornwall canal they had a lockmaster and four men on account of boats running both ways up and down. Now they have the electrical power, and, as I understand, one man is supposed to manage the whole affair, because there is nothing to do, and yet there are more men on each lock than there were in 1896 when the men had to open the locks with a windlass. I understand that the number of employees has been increased.

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall obtain that information.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is apparent that the government have increased the cost of opening and shutting the gates in the Cornwall canal very materially since 1896. I would ask the minister when the supplementaries come up for discussion to bring down these statements for which we have asked, so that we can go into this matter again.

Galops rapids—to complete channel, $40,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote of $40,000, the unexpended portion of $75,000 which was appropriated last year. This is to complete the formation of the channel in the Galops rapids. A large amount of drilling and blasting has been done, but the material has not been excavated. The work is being done by the Gilbert Company. The channel is 3,000 feet long, 200 feet wide and

17 feet deep. The amount expended up to the 1st of May, 1904, was, $878,441.85. The estimated cost of completing the channel, including this $40,000, is $75,000, that is, assuming that an estimate made in February last that $35,000 of the $75,000 would be expended before the 30th of June, 1904, turns out to have been correct.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have been in this House now some thirteen years, and each and every year the minister gets up and makes the same statement, that it will take some $40,000 or $50,000 to complete this channel, and that it will be completed within the next year, when the fact is that this is just being carried on in the interest of the contractors. Does the minister know when this work was started ? It was started by the Mackenzie government in 1878, to make a new channel to allow large vessels to go through, and it is not ready yet. If we are to wait until these contractors will have it ready, the minister can make up his mind to wait for another quarter of a century.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was the contract entered into in 1878 ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I think that was the year in which it was started, and they have been working at it ever since with the exception of two or three years. I would like to ask the minister what arrangement has been made with the contractors for carrying on the work. The original contract specified that they were to be paid so much per yard for excavating the rock.

Mr. EMMERSON. They get $8.40 per yard for excavating and removing the rock.

Mr. J. D. REID. I thought the channel had been completed, and that they were simply removing the loose rock.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are paid $8.40 a yard, which includes blasting, lifting and carrying away the rock.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. minister looks up the records he will see that their original contract was to make that channel 14 feet deep. They were paid some $170,000 for going below grade in order to make it 14 feet deep. They have been paid in full for that ; but during the past two or three years the government have claimed that owing to the swift water running down between the islands, the loose rock would be carried into this channel, and that it was this loose rock which this firm were dredging. But no loose rock can be carried in there, because the dam has been built above and there is still water at that point, so that there is nothing to wash down. If it was worth $8.40 a yard to blast and excavate the rock, why is it worth $8.40 a yard to take out the loose rock ? I doubt if there is any. Last year the government had a very nice deal with this firm to pay them $425 per day for the use of the dredge ; but if they are getting $8.40 a yard for removing loose rock, they are doing still better. I venture to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals dare not leave that contract open to competition. If he does, he will get that loose rock excavated for less than $2 a yard. What did the government pay for blasting and dredging rock under the contract of W. A. Allan ? $4.25 a yard. The dam has been placed across the islands, so that there is no current there now.

Mr. EMMERSON. The dam is not completed.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is completed. It was completed last year, so far as not allowing that water to go through is concerned. I walked across that dam last year from one side to the other, and I venture to say that the deputy minister will not say that there is any swift water there. Surely the minister will not offer that as an excuse for paying $8.40 a yard now. If these gentlemen were paid in full for blasting and dredging this out to 17 feet, why are they paid again for the same work ? Why is that necessary ? Their engineer certified to it and they got paid in cash for it.

Mr. EMMERSON. When were they paid?

Mr. J. D. REID. They were paid year after year for any work they did of this kind. The certificates of the department show it.

Mr. EMMERSON. During all the years since 1878 ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, and I will tell you what happened. When the Cornwall canal enlargement came on, these same men took a contract on the canal and got a certificate from the engineers in charge that this channel was perfect, and the government took it off their hands and notified steamboat men that boats drawing 14 feet of water could go safely through, but it turned out that they had not dredged it all out. There were spots where there was only ten feet of water, but they knew the channel would never be used for the reason that years ago the ex-Minister of Railways decided to have this outside lock, of which we were speaking a few minutes ago, put right at the rapids, so that vessels could lock there and avoid these dangerous rapids. Therefore this dangerous canal was never used. Steamboat men and insurance men knew that this canal was useless and that they could not use it, even if there were seventeen feet of water in it. But they offered, if the government would experiment by running a steamboat down the channel, drawing fourteen feet of water, and drawing a tow, to run vessels down. But the government would not assume the responsibility. After my explaining the

matter in the House, I remember well when the steam barge 'Niagara' went down loaded with lumber, and was turned in the channel and went down backwards, and from that day to this there has never been a steamboat run down that channel except some small propeller drawing only a few feet of water. After I showed the House that there was only ten feet of water in the channel and demanded an investigation, the government appointed Mr. Kennedy, engineer of Montreal harbour, to investigate, and he proved that the statement I made in this House was exactly true. He proved that there was only ten feet of water in the channel and in quite a number of spots only nine feet and ten feet, although the contractors had been paid in full for dredging it out to fourteen feet. So we are today paying these contractors for excavating in what is practically still water $8.40 a yard, and we are paying them that price for blasting and excavating work which had already been paid for. Is it the present minister who made this agreement, because I cannot believe that any sane man would ever make such a contract, and surely there must be something wrong if he ever did make an agreement of that kind? Did he really make that agreement himself?

Mr. EMMERSON. The work had been going on under agreement before I took charge of the department. Of course I am not shirking any responsibility, but simply answering the question of my hon. friend. The work has been carried on under an agreement made and acted upon during the years he has spoken of.

Mr. HAGGART. When was the agreement made?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was a new agreement made in 1899 or about that time.

Mr. J. D. REID. It has been made since last session. They were not at work last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. They did not work last year, but that did not cancel the agreement.

Mr. J. D. REID. That agreement of $8.40 per yard was completed, and they were working at $425 a day two years ago. Now they have got back to the old agreement of $8.40 per yard.

Mr. EMMERSON. The only time $425 per day was paid was when they were surveying.

Mr. J. D. REID. I can prove by the Auditor General's Report that they were paid $425 per day for two or three seasons, and they did not get $425 per day when surveying. I can prove that if necessary. That is a statement reflecting on the ex-Minister of Railways, namely, that they got $425 per day when they were surveying. That is not the fact. They were paid something like $60 or $70 a day. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals knows that.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is not the Kennedy matter, as I am informed by my deputy.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you mean to say that they received $425 per day for surveying?

Mr. EMMERSON. And for removing some loose materials.

Mr. J. D. REID. Season after season they were paid $425 per day.

Mr. EMMERSON. The arrangement now is $8.40 per yard. That would be a reasonable price. I know that after competition very recently in Halifax, we awarded a contract at over $9 in that harbour.

Mr. J. D. REID. What depth of water—about forty or fifty feet?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 25 feet.

Mr. J. D. REID. And this is about ten or eleven feet.

Mr. EMMERSON. The price was $9 right in the harbour of Halifax where they could have no current and not very much tide, and whatever tide they would have would be an advantage.

Mr. J. D. REID. There must have been an estimate made of the quantity of rock to be excavated before this was let at $8.40 per yard.

Mr. HAGGART. There was no rock to be excavated. The work was done and paid for.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know what the estimate was based on. There must have been some estimate before this work was ready. What was there to be excavated and how many yards?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister states that this is for blasting and excavating. But long ago that contract was performed. The prism quantities were paid for, and the contractor was paid for taking out this excavation and an extra foot paid for besides. Sometimes he necessarily had to go two or three feet below the prism, but he was paid in full for all the quantities that were in the prism and outside of it. What is it he is excavating now that he is being paid for?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the actual excavation to bring it to a proper depth. The work is carried on, as I am advised, under the strict supervision of the officers of the department. Measurements are accurately taken and the payments are made on those measurements at $8.40. It strikes me that $8.40 is reasonable enough. The whole trend of discussion on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite has been to demonstrate that this work has been unnecessary.

Mr. HAGGART. It has nothing to do with the necessity of it, but it is a question of work actually done.

Mr. EMMERSON. But that is the trend of the argument—that it is unnecessary. Here is a work that was determined upon away back about the seventies, or before that, for all I know, and, for year after year, under succeeding governments, it has been carried on to the stage where $75,000 will complete the excavation. It is a question whether it will be advisable to complete the work or whether you will throw away $878,000, which Canada has spent upon it, and not attempt to use the channel. It seems to me the part of wisdom to expend the sum I have named to complete the work and utilize the channel.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister avoids the question I have put to him. Here is a contract entered into for the purpose of deepening the canal to 14 feet with a certain width. The government paid the full amount for that contract. It was extended to a further depth of one foot. The government paid the full amount for that. Has the depth or the width been increased, and has a new contract been made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is 300 feet wide.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the original width ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was originally 200 feet wide.

Mr. HAGGART. And it was made deeper. But has not that all been paid for according to the quantities long before this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HAGGART. When was the new contract entered into ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As near as I can discover, it was in 1899 that it was determined to widen it, and the contract was renewed with that view.

Mr. HAGGART. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. minister's predecessor in the House, that he would do nothing of the kind—that he would not enter into any new contracts and that he would see to it that expenditure ceased altogether on this work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is assuming——

Mr. HAGGART. No, I heard the statement, and I will quote it from 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPROULE. The question arose as to the 14-foot channel, and the minister said they had the depth and the width that was required. I read the item from the paper showing that some one disputed that, and he asserted most emphatically that the measurements had been carried out and all they were doing was sweeping the bottom of the channel so as to take away the pieces of rock or other material that had been carried down by the current in the spring. He said that the width and depth had been gained, and he announced to the world that any vessel not drawing more than 14 feet could pass through that channel.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister will find the passage at page 4301 of 'Hansard' of 1902 :

> Mr. SPROULE. Somebody must have done it. Surely it was done under the instructions of the engineer.
>
> The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I want to be understood explicitely by the committee. I stated at the last meeting of the committee when this item was referred to, that the contractor was notified that we were not going to continue the work.

Mr. EMMERSON. This vote last year was secured with a view to going on. It was a vote of $75,000, $35,000 of which was estimated to have been expended up to June 30th. To complete the work, as I am informed, clean up the channel and remove all possible obstructions will cost the $40,000 which we are asking for now and $35,000 additional.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister confine himself to the question I asked ? When was the contract entered into for the purpose of widening this channel ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As I am advised, the original contract was entered into years ago, and under that contract work has been done year by year, and when the work was not performed, of course, the contract was not in operation, but it was not cancelled. Then, when the work was authorized by a vote of parliament last session, the department went on under that original contract.

Mr. HAGGART. Then there was no new contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the minister was misinformed ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it not a fact that for a couple of seasons after the contract had been taken off the hands of the government, after the work had been completed and the $8.40 a yard contract was finished, the government made another contract with these gentlemen to clear out this channel and paid them by the day ? Instead of paying them $8.40 per yard, they paid them $425 a day, and in that way they paid them $70,000, $80,000 or $100,000 for work of this kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would not like to say what was done. I can furnish a copy of the contract. My hon. friend is asking me whether there was such a contract. I will get that information. I do not want to make statements that are not in accordance with the very letter of the contract. Therefore, instead of answering my hon.

friend, I will furnish a copy of the contract before the supplementaries are considered.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not believe that the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals would ever make that contract on his own responsibility. It may be all right for the minister to put it on the deputy minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not put it on the deputy. My hon. friend should not make that statement. I have no such thought in my mind. The deputy is not in a position to give me information definitely, and therefore I do not care to make any statements that are not in accord with the very letter of the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. This original contract for $8.40 a yard was not made by the deputy minister, it was made by the late Mr. Page.

Mr. EMMERSON. No contract can be made by the minister without the authority of Council, and the deputy minister would have no power to make one.

Mr. J. D. REID. I assume that. I do not believe the deputy minister would ever recommend either the $8.40 or the $425 arrangement. If he has done it, it was to satisfy the minister; because in my opinion this matter is not continued from year to year unless there is some deal in the matter. It is very strange that this was allowed to stand for a couple of years, until last fall when an election was supposed to be coming on, and then this old contract springs up again, and is continued, and will be continued I suppose, until this country does something to stop it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose my hon. friend's suspicions arise from his familiarity with the Conservative regime during all these years that his friends were in power.

Mr. J. D. REID. This contract was originally let by the Mackenzie government.

Mr. EMMERSON. But it was continued by the succeeding government.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was carried on through the Conservative regime because there had to be a channel cut through those rapids, or else some other means would have had to be adopted by which vessels could pass through. I have asked the minister what is the estimated quantity of excavation for this work under the contract, and what the total cost is to be, and unless we get that information, I shall ask the minister to allow this item to stand until we do get it, otherwise we will have to discuss the matter until he consents to produce it.

Mr. SPROULE. Two years ago the minister said this contract was closed and that they would notify the contractor to that effect. I assume that was done. Now if that was all settled, how could it be opend up again at the pleasure of one side or the other? The contract was closed. Anything done after that must have been done by some new agreement.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister says this is going on under a contract made in 1878, that this is an extension of the contract for the widening of the prism. But he must remember that the contract was virtually terminated by myself. A commissioner, Mr. Kennedy, was appointed for the purpose of finding out whether the contractor had performed the terms of the contract, and he found that the proper quantities had not been taken out. Then the contractor went on and took out the proper quantities. After that contract was finished, the contractor went on for a couple of seasons, not under the original contract at all, but was paid at so much a day for the work that was done. Then the minister comes in and says: I will inquire whether the facts you state are correct or not. Finally he tells the House: I will tell the contractor that his contract is finished and that he will get no more money upon it. In face of that statement the contract is renewed, the old contract of 1878, without tenders, after its expiry. We do not know what the new contract is. The minister says it is an extension of the contract of 1878, but we do not know how the prism is enlarged, or its depth. We want the actual quantities. He comes here without any information and asks the House for a vote of money for a wholly useless undertaking. The money that is spent upon this job is uselessly spent. The utility of it was done away with when I put a lock into the rapids for the purpose of enabling vessels to go in and pass the rapids. They use the lock entirely and yet this expenditure goes on from day to day. These men are paid the enormous sum of nearly $500 per day and then they get a contract at $8.60 per yard. Does the hon. minister say upon the advice of the deputy minister that the contract is enlarged? I understood him to say that the prism is being widened or deepened. If it is so let us get at the exact facts. How much is the prism widened or deepened and what is the new contract? We should know this before a dollar of the vote goes through.

Mr. EMMERSON. The information which is asked for is such as I have stated, I did not anticipate it would be required. I have stated the price and the quantities I will give to my hon. friend again.

Mr. HAGGART. Go on to another item if you cannot give us this information. We want this information before this item passes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think my hon. friends will be unreasonable.

Mr. SPROULE. This is getting to be pretty much of a burlesque on parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. This contract was entered into many years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. And closed many years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. Apparently it was not closed. It was not a contract of which time appeared to be the essence.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's predecessor said it was closed two years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, as read by the hon. member who read it from the record of the House, the Minister of Railways and Canals of that day did not make that statement. I did not understand that to be the meaning.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he not make the statement that he would notify the contractor that the contract was closed, and that he would spend no more money on it? Was not that the statement that was read here? That is the statement, as I understood it.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the statement, and I will read it again for the hon. minister:

> No, I want to be understood explicitly by the committee. I stated at the last meeting of the committee when this item was referred to, that the contractor was notified that we were not going to continue the work.

Mr. INGRAM. What date is that?

Mr. HAGGART. May 6, 1902.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is estimated that there are about 9,000 cubic yards of material to be removed from there, and that under the contract under which they are operating we have paid out during the fiscal year ending 30th June the sum of $35,000.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if that has been paid out on the basis of the old contract or of the new?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that the estimated payment up to June 30th is $35,000. The work has been going on during the month of June and parliament has provided the money for it. I do not want items to be forced through this committee. I want to furnish all possible information, but I think we should make some progress, and I think I can furnish my hon. friend with copies of the contract itself. When I can tell the committee what the contract is, what the arrangement is under which they are working and for which the department is liable, and for which purpose we are voting the money, it seems to me that I am meeting all the expectations that can be formed of a minister placed in a like situation. I have endeavoured to give that information fully. To me it seems to resolve itself down to this point, that it is a question whether the successive governments of this country, having paid out the sum of money which they have for this work, shall halt when they are within $75,000 of the goal, or whether they shall throw entirely away all that has been expended because they feel that the expenditure of $75,000 was not expedient.

Mr. SPROULE. When we were at the goal two years ago?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed that we were not.

Mr. SPROULE. There must have been some strange fabrication then or there must be now.

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly think, from the statements given to me, that we have not reached the goal, and that it will be necessary to have this money expended in order to finish the work.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister made the statement that a certain amount of money was paid out during the last fiscal year. I asked him if it was paid out under the contract made with the Mackenzie government in 1878 or under the new contract at so many dollars per day.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it was paid out under precisely the same terms as contained in the contract entered into originally with the Mackenzie government.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the original contract provided for the payment of so many hundred dollars per day?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; it provided for the payment of $8.40 per cubic yard. Those are the terms upon which the money has been paid out during the last fiscal year.

Mr. BLAIN. When the matter was up for discussion in 1902, and when Mr. Blair referred to the item, the statement was made in committee then that there was a new contract, and that the contract was for $425 per day. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) says that we paid for 298 days in that very year, not under the original contract, as my hon. friend has stated, but under the new contract at $425 per day. What I want to know is when the original contract ceased, when the new contract was entered into, and whether the money expended last year was paid under the new contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. The money paid during the last fiscal year was paid according to the terms of the original contract entered into in 1878. That is that for the work performed of drilling, blasting and excavation, we paid at the price of $8.40 per cubic yard, and it is upon that basis that the work will be carried on during this year if the vote of $40,000 is provided.

Mr. HAGGART. I will ask the hon. minister just to listen to this. He says that he continued the payment under the contract made in 1878. As my hon. friend has drawn attention to it, here are the payments on the

Galops canal, one in 1900-1, 298 days at $425 per day, or $126,654.

Mr. EMMERSON. My statement had reference to the current year. I have been answering my hon. friend in respect to the year ending 30th June, 1904.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister says that he is doing this under the contract made in 1878, and leads the House to believe that that contract is still continuing. The Minister of Railways stated in answer to Mr. Sproule :

He was notified before the 1st of July, 1901; and he had no authority whatever, expressed or implied, for continuing the work after that date.

Then this question was asked by Mr. Sproule.

Why should the hon. gentleman now ask for a sum to pay him if he had no authority ?

To which the minister replied :

I must be lacking in the faculty of explaining myself if the hon. gentleman has not understood me. I say that I am not asking for anything more than sufficient to pay the drawback that was due and retained in the department, as is usual in all contracts, for work prior to the 1st of July, 1901.

Then I said :

I understand what the hon. minister says perfectly well. Does he mean to say that the work done in 1901 amounted to $300,000? It was a daily contract, so much per day, and there could be no drawback in paying for anything before 1901, and there was a drawback for work done to the extent of $500,000 in 1902.

What I want to draw the attention of the minister to is the fact that the contract was virtually finished under my regime; I ended the contract. The contractor was not re-employed under the contract of 1878, but he continued the work under an agreement with the department at so much per day. He received his payment per day for a couple of years. Then the minister assured the House that not one cent would be paid this man in 1901. If the contract continued while he was doing the day work surely it was finished when the notice was given by the department of the termination of the contract in 1901. The justification that the department now attempts to make for this payment was that it was under a contract of 1878 which has continued up to the present day.

Mr. SPROULE. And the ten per cent had been paid back on the completion of all transactions.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister must see that he must give the fullest information to the House especially in reference to the renewal or extension of the contract which he says he made under the contract of 1878. This money must have been expended for an extension of the prism either in width or depth, and he should tell us to what extent that has been made.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it because my hon. friend wishes for a copy of that contract of 1878 that he desires this to stand ?

Mr. REID. That was furnished seven or eight years ago. What I want is a copy of the agreement under which they are paid $425 per day.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you wish a copy of the extension of 1899.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand and have been informed by the minister's predecessor, the old contract was cancelled and a new contract was entered into for this work at $425 per day. The Auditor General's Report shows a contract :

For the use of all plant required in testing and surveying the bottom of the existing 'new channel' and the removal of all loose material therefrom, which may be found above or within the original contract grade or limits (exclusive of 'rock in situ' above said original contract grade, provision being made in this contract for the removal thereof at the expense of the contractors) (days of 12 hours) days, $126,654.25.

There were 298 days in that one season. That was every day of the season at $425 per day amounting to $126,654.25.

Providing, fitting up and maintaining the levelling and testing machinery, as specified. Allowance on bulk sum of $1,000, $500.

Now, then, listen to this :

Rock excavation by drilling, blasting and dredging in deepening and widening on the south side of existing channel, through upper bar, by the removal of a part of the 'Eddy Reef' to ensure a 14-foot navigation at low water, $86,520.

It was only when we saw the Auditor General's Report that we knew that a new contract had been made and now we find on inquiry to-night that there has been another contract made because the original contract was cancelled and a new contract entered into at $425 a day. That contract has not been cancelled because we are now paying this amount.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend objects to going on with this vote without a copy of this contract I think he is quite entitled to it and I am perfectly willing that the vote should stand. I shall bring down everything that is involved in this.

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask why it is that after the statement made by Mr. Blair when Minister of Railways and Canals that all that was asked for in the estimates was

the drawback, there was no appropriation in the estimates for this work at all in 1902-3. If that be true what is the reason that the department has again taken it up.

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume this was taken up last year. There was a vote last year with respect to it. The proposed vote this year is for $40,000. The reason I have taken it up this year is that I think the work should be completed when it will only require $75,000 to do it. I am so advised by the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid), who seems to understand this canal pretty well, has stated that this is a useless expenditure. He has stated that the department took the work up again last fall because they thought the general election was coming on.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was only joking when he said that.

Mr. INGRAM. I am putting the different things together and sizing them up in my own way.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are taking it seriously.

Mr. INGRAM. Very. It looks serious. In 1902-3 there was no appropriation because there was no election in sight; but there was an election expected last fall, and an appropriation was put in for this useless work. There was no election last fall, but there is expected to be one this fall, and the idea is to expend $75,000 more on this useless work, all for political effect. That is the whole thing in a nutshell. This is a game of politics. You are spending the people's money for the sole purpose of getting votes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose that has been done right along—that is the reason all this money was expended in 1878 to 1896, and from 1896 down to the present time—by a parity of reasoning.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that serious ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to carry the joke as far as it will go.

Item allowed to stand.

St. Lawrence rivers and canals—reducing shoals west of Cornwall canal, $25,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a revote. This amount is to be expended in reducing shoals or obstructions and doing some necessary excavation. The total expenditure in connection with that up to the 1st of May, 1904, was $457,686.69.

Mr. HAGGART. How much will it take to finish the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is supposed to be about 37,000 cubic yards yet to be done, at an estimated cost of 70 cents.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have been asked by several marine men if it would not be possible to have what is called Mud Island Shoal at the foot of Carlton Island, near Kingston, excavated. I think it is composed of mud or loose earth which could easily be removed. I know that one steamer, the 'John C. Howard,' worth $150,000, with a cargo worth $50,000, grounded on this shoal and suffered serious damage. All the large vessels when they go to Kingston have to cross this shoal from the main channel, which is on the American side. This is the first opportunity I have had of bringing the matter before the House. It is a very small matter and perhaps the minister could inquire into it and provide for it in the supplementary estimates. From what I have been informed, I judge that the work will not cost more than a couple of thousand dollars. The Americans are putting their channel in splendid shape, and I think the minister might very well provide for this small item, which is really important to make our channel safe.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will call the attention of the Public Works Department to the matter. The dredging or reduction of shoals in the Department of Railways and Canals is incidental to the canal expenditure. All dredging not connected with the canals is under the supervision and control of the Department of Public Works. However, I will confer with that department on the subject.

Electric light power plant, Welland canal, $100,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost of this plant is $250,000. $100,000 was appropriated last year, and the total expenditure up to the 1st of May was $10,766.88. It was estimated that the balance would be paid before the 1st of July, but it will require $100,000 more. The Welland Canal will be illuminated this season by about 250 arc lights of 2,000 candle power, distributed between Port Dalhousie and Port Colborne, a distance of twenty-seven miles. At each of the twenty-five locks there will be electric arc lights, while along the banks of the canal there will be a light every 400 feet. In addition there will be special equipment of arc lights to the piers at the head and foot of the canal. It is expected that the new lighting system will be in operation by July 1st.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is your plant located ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At Decew Falls.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you pay for your horse-power ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The supply of electric energy will be obtained from the Lincoln Light and Power Company, of St. Catharines, the power being generated at

Decew Falls by the Hamilton Cataract Company. The price is $14 per horse-power.

Mr. HAGGART. You do all the connections and put in all the motors and plant ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, tenders were asked for all that material.

Mr. LANCASTER. How long has the contract to run ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Ten years, if I remember correctly ?

Mr. INGRAM. The lighting ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The power.

Mr. HAGGART. They do the lighting themselves.

Mr. LANCASTER. Ten years from when?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is supposed to take effect the 1st of July this year, when we have the material all completed.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much do they get a year for it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $14 per horse-power. I am giving this information from memory and it will be subject to correction. We simply get the horse-power and all the rest is done by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. You can calculate what the cost will be.

Mr. EMMERSON. 25 cents a light is the estimate.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who looks after the repairing of the lights ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We will need a man to supervise—an electrical man—it may be possible that this can be done by the superintending engineer.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that the intention ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter has been discussed. I thought possibly it might be advisable to employ an electrician to have sole charge. Then the other view occurred that possibly it could be in charge of the superintending engineer.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who is in charge now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The works are being put in under the supervision of Mr. Parks, electrician, of Toronto. He is the consulting expert. The construction is under the direction of the superintending engineer. Mr. Parks is the expert upon whose advice the work is being done.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are there not several expert electricians living in St. Catharines, right where the work is being done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As Mr. Parks is the regular electrician of the department all through this section of Canada, I did not think it was necessary to employ an outside man.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose there are several officers assisting him ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who is it intended shall do the work after this plant is installed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no one appointed and have no intention other than that somebody will be employed to attend to that work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then it is not intended that the workmen on the canal shall do it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If the workmen on the canal can do it and at the same time do their other duties, they will do it.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the intention of the government ? Is it intended that they shall or shall not do it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter has not yet been determined.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you intend to use the power for opening and shutting gates and moving bridges ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated horse-power that will be required for the whole ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the information. That was given last year, and the officer who has the matter in hand did not think it necessary to be here.

Mr. HAGGART. You are sure you can do it for $250,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is Mr. Parks's estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. You have only voted $200,000—$100,000 this year and $100,000 last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. An unprovided balance to complete—it will take $50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. If it is to be finished by 1st of July, why does not the hon. gentleman take enough to pay for it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When these estimates were made up the work had not proceeded far enough to warrant us in asking for an exact vote. A supplementary vote will be necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. How many lights do you require ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At each of the twenty-five locks there will be six electric arc lights, and along the banks of the canal there will be a light for every 400 feet. In addition there will be a special equipment of arc lights for the head and foot of the canal.

Mr. LANCASTER. How does this expense compare with what the government have been paying for lighting by gas ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will cost much more.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like a more definite statement. There has been very good lighting by gas lamps—four lamps at each lock, two at either end.

Mr. EMMERSON. By gas it has cost $10,000, but those who patronized the canal were constantly complaining. The modern method of lighting canals is by electricity, and if we are to have an up to date system we must have the canals lighted in this way. The cost will be more—there is no use in pretending the contrary. But the demands of the trade must be recognized. Those having occasion to use the canal seemed to think that the government should light the canal in this modern fashion.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the hon. minister has not yet told us what the difference is.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given $10,000 as the cost of lighting by gas. The cost of electricity will be not less than $15,000, as estimated by the officials.

Mr. LANCASTER. Besides the capital expenditure ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that complaints have been made by the shipping interests that the locks have not been properly lighted ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The better lighting enables them to save time in the operation of the gates. While the lighting of the gates by gas was fairly good, it certainly did not meet the requirements of the traffic, and I am informed that the shipping interests almost unanimously demanded the electric light.

Mr. LANCASTER. I live right there, and I never heard that the locks were not properly lighted, with the four gas lamps at each lock distributed so as to give the best light for opening and closing the gates. I have to come to Ottawa to hear the suggestion that there was any delay or trouble caused by the lighting. I can understand that it may be fashionable to have electric light and, as it is fashionable, it is easy to find some people to say that they want it. Here is a large expenditure of money for the installation of a system and a large annual expenditure to follow. And it replaces a system under which the local gas company, so far as I ever heard, has been giving a satisfactory service. I go along the canal and drive up and down every season, and I have never known one of these gas lamps to be out—wherever you see one you see the four.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was not lighted along the canal, but only at the locks.

Mr. LANCASTER. The locks are all along the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. There may be quite a distance between them, and vessels had to travel long distances that were not lighted. The fact that these people wanted these lights and were dissatisfied with the old ones is quite consistent with the fact that they did not stop off at St. Catharines and ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) to hear their complaints. He says he has to come to Ottawa to find this out. But, the shipping interests would naturally come to Ottawa and make their grievance known to the Department of Railways and Canals. And they were very insistent in their expression of opinion as to not merely the convenience but the necessity of having this light.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where there are no locks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They want a light almost as much where there are no locks as where there are. They have bridges all along the canal. The speed of a vessel along the canal is governed very much by the facility with which it can get through these bridges. With electric power for the bridges the vessel can make very much better time.

Mr. INGRAM. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that 550 lights is the total, distributing as he has described ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This season about 550 lights of 2,000 candle power, distributed between Port Dalhousie and Port Colborne, a distance of twenty-seven miles.

Mr. INGRAM. The cost with gas is about $10,000, and the cost of electricity for 550 lights at 25 cents per light per night would be between $25,000 and $30,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That includes the power to swing the bridges and gates.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not finding fault with this system of lighting, but trying to get at the difference between the two systems. The minister will pay about $30,000 per annum for electric light, and, besides, he is to pay $14 per horse-power to work the locks. And he has entered into a contract for ten years from 1st July. These statements, I understand, are correct. The hon. gentleman has entered into a ten years contract. I do not know whether the government have a right to cancel that contract. If they have put in such a provision it would be a step in the right direction, because it is well known that the cost per horse-power for electric energy, in view of the great improvement at Niagara Falls, is certain to be very materially reduced, and it would be unwise for the government to enter into a long contract for ten years without introducing a provision for cancelling the contract if they so desired. Is there such a provision in the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the government has been very negligent. You cannot find a municipality in Ontario that will enter into a ten years contract for the supply of electric power in face of the wonderful development of electric energy and the rapid decrease of the cost of such development.

Mr. CAMPBELL. $14 per horse-power is a very low price.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not disputing that. But my hon. friend must remember that the development of electric power at this moment, especially in that neighbourhood, is going on very fast, and the cost is being rapidly reduced, and will be reduced much faster.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I doubt if you could get it much lower.

Mr. INGRAM. We must judge the future by the immediate past. Electric power companies of Niagara Falls to-day are going around among the different municipalities in western Ontario trying to get them to enter into a contract for a long period of time, because they know that the cost of furnishing electrical power is certain to be rapidly reduced. It is only the transmission of this power for long distances that seems to be the great difficulty to overcome at this moment.

Mr. LANCASTER. I can confirm what my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has said in regard to the development of electrical energy at Niagara Falls, and I think the government has been negligent of its duty in failing to put in the contract such a clause as he has referred to. I am astonished to find that it has not been done. I understand that in the neighbourhood of St. Catharines, corporations and municipalities, in making their contracts with this very company, say to them : We won't give you this contract unless we have in it a clause by which we can terminate it. But it appears that the government have not asked the company to consent to such a clause being put in. You will not find any village or town or city, or any municipality in the Niagara district, who will make a contract for more than five years without such a clause in it. Everybody in the neighbourhood knows that electrical energy is going to get cheaper all the time, because the cost of the development of that energy is getting cheaper all the time. It is only in its infancy. It seems to me that the government have been remiss in their duty to the people in failing to put in such a clause providing for cancellation of the contract. I venture to say if the government had such a clause in this contract, in five years from now they would be able to get better terms, they would be able to get their electricity 33 per cent cheaper, perhaps 50 per cent cheaper, than they do now. The company would not have objected to putting such a clause in the contract if it had been insisted on.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lancaster) seems to have changed his base. His first objection was to the use of electricity at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. I never objected to using electricity if it was a good bargain.

Mr. EMMERSON. But when the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) gives him another idea then he goes on to elaborate it. Now I venture to make this assertion, that you could not possibly get any electrical company in Canada to furnish this power as cheaply as we are getting it now unless you gave them a term of years. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to get up and make such statements, they are very easily made. But, to seriously consider this as a business proposition ; I know something about these matters and I know that twenty-one years is more likely to be the term asked for before companies will go in and place themselves in a position to furnish power. The ten years we have arranged for is a reasonable period. The price charged is very moderate, and I venture to make the statement that there is not anywhere in Canada a more provident contract entered into in regard to electric light.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister allow me to tell him that in the present time in the village of Flesherton there is a contract running at $8 per horse-power for five years.

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be for a very small quantity.

Mr. INGRAM. Then a larger quantity ought to be cheaper. I will say to the hon. minister that if he will look into this matter carefully in the next few days I will guarantee him that he will not repeat the statements he made before taking his seat. I am quite willing that the statement which I have made to the committee shall be compared with the minister's statement and I will leave the people of the country to draw their own conclusions.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that this item is to put in the plant ? Is any of it for power, and do I understand the hon. minister to say that the plant will cost a total of about $200,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $250,000.

Mr. BLAIN. The plant will cost $250,000 to light the whole Welland canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $250,000 will equip the whole Welland canal with electrical plant.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to the statement that was made when this matter was introduced into the House last year. I want the hon. gentleman's attention.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am trying to give the hon. gentleman my attention. I do not wish to show any discourtesy to my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. This was introduced last year for the first time and the reference to it will be found at page 12,900 of 'Hansard' as follows :

Welland canal, to provide electric light plant, $44,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is this being done by contract and has the contract been let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be done but the work is not yet commenced. We propose to take in this item $55,000 but we have asked in the supplementary estimates a further sum of $45,000, making the estimated cost of the whole undertaking $100,000, which we believe will furnish a complete electric light plant for the whole canal. This estimate is made on the report of an electrical engineer. We expect the work will be done by contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is all right ; that is for the electric lighting part of it, but there is another part, the power to operate the gates and machinery all along the canal. There is $100,000 for electric lighting and $150,000 for all of the other.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman say how much the electric light plant will cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $250,000 will be required for the electric lighting and power plant. The power plant represents $150,000 and the electric lighting plant represents $100,000, the two representing $250,000.

Mr. INGRAM. May I ask the hon. minister when he expects to complete this power and electric lighting plant ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was hoped to have it completed by the 1st of July this year, but on account of some delays on the part of the contractors and of disappointment in getting material from some of the manufacturers, delay has occurred. We are urging the work forward as fast as possible.

Mr. INGRAM. I am afraid I have not understood the hon. gentleman. I understood the hon. gentleman entered into a contract for ten years at $14 per horse power. Will he again explain that ? If the lighting is to cost $100,000 and the government is to pay $150,000 for the power plant, where does this contract come in for ten years at $14 per horse-power ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For the power we get to operate this electric lighting and power plant. We are getting the power from the Lincoln Electric Light Company. We provide all the machinery and plant and we simply take the power from them.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, we have it perfectly plain. It is $100,000 for lighting, $150,000 for installing the power plant and you have entered into a contract for furnishing power at $14 per horse-power for ten years.

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that the contract was to commence on the 1st July. What I meant was that it was to commence when we require the power.

Mr. INGRAM. As soon as you have the plant finished ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, from the time we take the power.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has given an explanation that seems to be satisfactory. He has made a distinction between the power for working the gates and the lighting.

Mr. EMMERSON. That distinction was made in the remarks of last year. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance then explained that he would require $100,000 for the electric lighting plant. This year we ask for electric lighting and power plant $200,000 and then there will be $50,000 which we will have to provide for in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a further explanation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made that explanation some time ago.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has stated that last year the hon. Minister of Finance made it quite plain that there would be an electric lighting plant and that the electric lighting plant would cost $100,000 which money was voted. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us why he puts into this item the electric lighting plant ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Why not put it in ?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. Minister of Finance last year said that to provide the electric light plant for the Welland canal there would be required $100,000. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals now says that that will complete the electric lighting plant. The $100,000 was voted. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us why he is now including in this item a sum of money for the electric light plant when it was stated that the $100,000 voted last year would equip the lighting plant ? The item we have before us reads:

Welland electric lighting and power plant, $100,000.

If the hon. Minister of Finance was correct in his statement last year, and if the money voted last year was put into this

plant, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should strike out the words 'electric lighting plant,' and say 'power plant, $150,000.'

Mr. EMMERSON. No; the sums merge together. They are interwoven. It is all connected with the Welland canal. Surely we are not going to split hairs at this time of the night.

Mr. BLAIN. We are not splitting hairs. It is my hon. friend who is splitting hairs.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not splitting hairs; I am only splitting up the electric lighting from the power.

Mr. BLAIN. That statement was made last year, that this estimate was made on the report of an electrical engineer. Are we to understand that when the electrical engineer was instructed to examine the Welland canal preparatory to the installation of an electric lighting plant there was nothing considered about a power plant at all? I would ask the minister if he would be good enough to give us the two reports of the electrical engineer, the one for the plant for the electric lighting of the canal and the other for the power plant?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think these reports were furnished to the House last year when the matter was discussed, but I shall be very happy to furnish them again.

Mr. BLAIN. There will be no mistake about it? The minister will furnish the two reports to which I have referred?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think they are both included in one.

Mr. BLAIN. And the estimates given by the electrical engineer for the separate works?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will give the whole thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister a few moments ago stated that the old system of lighting was insufficient. Has any accident ever occurred from defective lighting on the Welland canal during the long period it has been in operation?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not aware of any.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. minister says that complaints were made; people may complain against a thing that is perfectly safe, but their complaints may not be well-founded.

Mr. EMMERSON. Horse cars would have done us, I suppose; we need not have had electric tramways. They got along at one time with tallow candles.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does my hon. friend seriously say that at one time there were horse cars running on the Welland canal? The people of Canada want to have the expenditure of their money treated seriously. They do not want a burlesque in this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say anything about having horse cars on the Welland canal.

Mr. BLAIN. We were talking about the Welland canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was endeavouring to illustrate to my hon. friend the fact that we could get along with gas.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have got a lot from the minister to-night.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was better to have the electric light, and the same rule would apply on all the canals. They are using electric lights on canals everywhere.

Mr. LANCASTER. The only reason which the hon. minister gives for incurring the large increase of expense necessitated by the use of electric lighting on the canal is that the demands of the shipping interests required that there should be electric light; yet the minister confirms the information I had, that there never has been an accident upon the canal because of defective lighting. Bearing that in mind, I would ask the minister if there is any other reason for placing this much larger burden on the people of Canada than the one which he gave?

Mr. SPROULE. What number of horse-power have you contracted for?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot recall the number.

Mr. SPROULE. What portion of the year do you require to keep the electric lights going?

Mr. EMMERSON. During the season of navigation only, at the termini and at the bridges.

Mr. SPROULE. What number of months is navigation usually open?

Mr. EMMERSON. From about the 15th of April to about the middle of December, I think.

Item allowed to stand.

Welland canal—to remove obstructions and make other improvements, $225,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a revote of $30,000 out of the vote last year of $217,000. The works include the: Deepening of the rock cut at Ramey's Bend: Total estimated cost, $100,000; voted for 1903-4, $75,000; required for 1904-5, $30,000 revote plus $25,000, in all $55,000. That will finish these works. There is also the removal of the centre piers of three bridges: Allanburg bridge—estimated cost, $50,000; Marlatt's bridge, $50,000; bridge 11, the Grand Trunk Railway, Thorold, $70,000; in all, $170,000. The total expenditure for removing obstructions up to the 30th of June, 1903, was $94,122.98; expended from the 30th of

June, 1903, to the 1st of May, 1904, $97,375.55 ; total amount expended up to the 1st of May, 1904, $191,498.53. The deepening of the rock cut at Ramey's Bend is made necessary by the fact that Lake Erie has been gradually lowering for some years.

Mr. HAGGART. It is rising now, isn't it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is just now ; but it has been gradually lowering for some years.

Mr. HAGGART. How much lower is it at the present time than the standard level on which the entrance to Port Colborne was based ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The rock cut is being deepened two feet, giving 17 feet of water at ordinary level of Lake Erie and 15 feet at low water. The work is being done by contract. The contractors are Waddell, Battle & Manley ; the rate per yard is $2.90. The lowest tender was accepted. The water level has dropped as low as 4 feet below what was known as low level.

Mr. HAGGART. This excavation is still needed a couple of feet lower ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and that is an extreme drop. The averag drop has not been so great. At any stage under these conditions there will be fourteen feet of navigation.

Mr. HAGGART. With the present mitre sills in the locks, if the water is lower by 4 feet than was contemplated when the canal was built, then the deepening you propose to do is only 2 feet.

Mr. EMMERSON. The engineer says that with the rock cut deepened 2 feet there will be 17 feet at ordinary water and 15 feet at low water. Five old centre pier bridges have been removed in the past two years at Humberstone, the Junction, Welland, Quaker bridge and Port Robinson ; the Allanburg and Marlatt's bridge are the only ones remaining on the summit level, to be removed by the departement. Bridge 11 is a bridge built by the department in 1880 for the Grand Trunk Railway, and is operated by the department. It is very badly located and interferes with navigation, more than any other bridge on the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that finish the removal of all the obstructions ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it does not. There is the Niagara street bridge in St. Catharines and several others that have to come under my notice. We are doing the work gradually. It is necessary to remove these centre piers in order to give more freedom to the boats.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose when you allow a railroad to build a bridge over a canal and you choose afterwards to have it altered, you do it at your own expense ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a case like that with the Grand Trunk Railway Company at present. We are calling upon them to do that work. We do it with respect to this bridge because the Grand Trunk was there before the canal, that is, the new canal.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with these bridges, are they to be given by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. And the work now being done is being done by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

To deepen portions of summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold, $100,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount required, and the depth ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The deepening of this portion of the canal is rendered necessary, in order to maintain 14 feet navigation, by the gradual lowering of Lake Erie. Two feet is being excavated from the bottom of the canal, giving 17 feet of water at normal level of Lake Erie and 15 at low water. McGann & Finn are the contractors ; rate, 38½ cents per cubic yard. The estimated cost is as follows :

Amount expended to 30th June, 1903	$125,330
Voted for 1903-1904	100,000
Required for 1903-1904	100,000
Unprovided balance to complete	124,670
Total	$450,000

Mr. HAGGART. So that that portion of the canal, Lake Erie level, is lower than the depth of water on the mitre sill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it got filled in.

Mr. HAGGART. If it was lower than that, you would have to lower the mitre sill also.

Mr. EMMERSON. They did lower the mitre sill four feet the year before last.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there not some talk of doing something at the Niagara river with a view of deepening the water at Buffalo, and would not that have the effect of lowering the water in the Welland canal ? The press of Buffalo is agitating for some action with the view of preventing the lowering of Lake Erie.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Americans are talking that way.

Mr. INGRAM. Would not the deepening of the water at Buffalo have some effect in keeping the same depth of water we have now at the Welland canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not given the matter very much study, and the opinion I might express might not be of value to the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. You deepen the mitre sill at the lake entrance four feet. Does

this improvement take effect on the reaches at the entrance below the mitre sill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are not a foot lower than the mitre sill. That was lowered.

Mr. HAGGART. When do the reaches get to the level of the mitre sill that was lowered ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When they are two feet below the old mitre sill.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the mitre sill of the lock coming into these reaches will be two feet lower than the reaches. What is the object of that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When they had to water out, they put it down to that level.

Mr. HAGGART. For the purposes of navigation there ought to be an average in the reaches of at least two feet more depth than the mitre sill of the lock. You have lowered the mitre sill of the lock four feet. I want to know what you have deepened the reaches. I understand you have deepened them two feet.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you lowered the lock at the other end of the reach to the depth to which you have lowered it at the entrance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is being lowered now.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you contemplate to lower the whole of these reaches to at least one foot lower than the mitre sill of the lock at some time or other, and the new lock that is lowered you lower to the level of the mitre sill coming out at Lake Erie ?

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the policy of the government in so far as the deepening of the Welland canal is concerned ? There has been an agitation to have it deepened to 17 feet. At present the government have deepened the entrance at Port Colborne so that a vessel drawing 17 feet of water can come into the entrance of the Welland canal. A vessel, therefore, if the Welland canal had 17 feet navigation, could go through that canal and carry about 100,000 bushels ; but as the depth is only 14 feet, she can only load 60,000 or 65,000 bushels of grain. If you had the extra depth, the vessels could load at Duluth or Port Arthur and proceed to Kingston where they could lighten. The freight rates are higher, of course, on account of the smaller cargoes, and I would like to know if the government have formed any policy in so far as this is concerned ? The public are anxious to know this, more especially as the Americans are contemplating enlarging the canal from Buffalo to New York. Another matter which I have brought to the attention of the government from year to year is this. Even though they should undertake to deepen the Welland canal, as I have suggested, it would take five or six years to complete that work, and during all that time we would not enjoy the advantage of the additional depth, in so far as getting trade through the St. Lawrence route instead of its going by Buffalo is concerned. I suggested that if the government would take over that small line of railway from Port Colborne to Port Dalhousie and operate it and lighten the vessels at Port Colborne and give them the grain again at Port Dalhousie, they could make it part of the canal system.

The expense of operating this railway would not be very large—not even as great as the interest on the money needed to enlarge the canal. And, by the adoption of my suggestion we would be able to immediately notify the trade that we were prepared virtually to give them the 17-foot navigation throughout the canal by lightering at Port Colborne and taking on again at Port Dalhousie. Of course, this was done years ago, and it is done now if the freights are sufficiently large for the vessel to be able to afford it. But, during the greater part of the season of navigation, freight from Port Arthur to Montreal is about three cents a bushel, and, as this railway charges from 1½ cents to 2 cents for lightering, it does not pay the vessel to take that extra quantity of grain off, because they do not make anything out of it. I do not know whether the hon. minister has ever considered this idea. I have brought it up year after year. It may be he can give us some information as to whether there is a chance of the government taking it up, or he may tell us what the policy of the government is in deepening the canal. As the hon. minister knows even the smallest trifle will have its effect in deciding the routing of grain. Even one-sixteenth of a cent per bushel will decide the route. Taking off the canal tolls appeared a small concession, and yet the result was seen in the great increase in the quantity of grain that passed through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. The suggestion that I make, if carried into effect, I believe, would double the tonnage coming by the St. Lawrence route.

Mr. EMMERSON. Naturally, I have not had much opportunity to study these questions. But the whole question is under consideration in connection with the proposed improvemets at Port Colborne. Of course, I cannot give my hon. friend any idea of what the ultimate result will be.

Mr. BLAIN. Have we at present a 14-foot navigation on the Welland canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, 14 feet on the mitre sills.

Mr. HAGGART. One of the locks, by mistake, was put above the level and there is not the 14-foot navigation on the long

stretch from Lake Erie. The minister is deepening it to give the 14-foot depth.

Mr. LENNOX. In connection with what the minister said about considering the question—no doubt this matter will be dealt with by the Transportation Commission. Can the minister tell us when we may expect a report from that Commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Commission is now visiting different points. They have made an interim report with respect to one section of the country, and it is expected that there will be one covering the Port Colborne section, as they recently went there and made a thorough investigation.

Mr. LENNOX. Which section have they reported on ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have made an interim report with respect to the port of St. John. They started by going to St. John and Halifax.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the lowering of the mitre still done by contract or by day labour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By day labour.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Between $11,000 and $12,000.

Welland canal—improvements at Port Colborne entrance, $300,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This it an item on which there will be a discussion. We want a full explanation of the scheme.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, I think we have gone as far as we can.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the committee rises I would ask the minister if he would kindly leave one item on the Trent Valley canal for discussion until Wednesday. I am obliged to be absent on Monday and Tuesday.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister be good enough to tell us what business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not seen the Prime Minister, but I understood that the intention was to take up Bills on Monday. If there is any change I will see to it that notice is sent to the leader of the opposition. I think several ministers will be absent, and the Minister of Railways will be unable to continue on his estimates. So, the intention is to take up some Bills.

Mr. HAGGART. Any Bill in particular.

Mr. FIELDING. The most important is the Militia Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. I see that that is to be dropped ?

Mr. FIELDING. Is that dropped ? My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) may know, but I have not been informed to that effect.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, the Militia Bill may come up ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it likely. All Bills on the Order Paper will be open.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 11th, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved :—

That item No. 40, House in committee on Bill (No. 73) to amend the Railway Act of 1903 (Mr. Lennox) be transferred from Public Bills and Orders to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

SEED GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce (Bill No. 151) respecting the Incorporation of Seed-Growers' Association.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the purpose of the Bill?

Mr. FISHER. It is simply to give statutory authority for the incorporation of Seed-Growers' Associations. In consequence of the investigations that have been made by my department into the seed business of the country, certain people have expressed a wish to form themselves into an association for growing seed grain and other agricultural seeds. At present, there is no law under which these people can be incorporated and do their work legally as a corporate body. Some years ago parliament passed a statute for the incorporation of live stock associations, and this Bill is very much in the same form, as applied to seed growers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

COLLECTORSHIP OF CUSTOMS, VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. EARLE asked :

1. Is there a vacancy in the collectorship of customs at Victoria, B.C. ?

2. How long has the collectorship been vacant ?

3. Who is performing the duties of collector at present ?

4. How long has he been performing such duties ?

5. When is it proposed to fill the vacancy ?

6. Has the position been offered to Mr. R. L. Drury, M.P.P., or to any other person?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The collectorship of customs at Victoria, B.C., has been vacant, I believe, since February or March last ;—I have not the exact date. The duties of the office are performed by the sub-collector. As to the fifth question, 'When is it proposed to fill the vacancy ?' The Minister is not in his seat, and I cannot answer. The position has not been offered to Mr. Drury or to any other person.

DAMAGES BY FLOODS, CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. Who are the parties entitled to receive an indemnity for the damages caused by flooding, and referred to in item 31 of the further supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1904 ?

2. By what means have these parties established their claim ?

3. Are there any other claimants, and if so, what are their names ?

Right Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The explanation with regard to this vote will be given when the estimates come up for discussion.

THE MILITIA ACT.

House again went into committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the Militia of Canada—Sir Frederick Borden.

Hon. SIR FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). When the second reading of this Bill was under discussion, my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) who preceded me in the department of Militia, asked for some papers with reference to the communications which led up to my attendance at the meeting of the Defence Committee in London. I told the hon. gentleman that I would endeavour to bring these papers down. I have them here. They consist of only two or three cablegrams which I will read. The first was from Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto :—

London, April 20, 1903.

With regard to important amendment contemplated in Militia Act, His Majesty's government earnestly hopes that your responsible advisers will defer action until matter has been fully discussed by Minister of Militia with Secretary of State for War and Commander in Chief. After close of Dominion session of parliament would suggest that Sir Frederick Borden should come to England.

(Sgd.) CHAMBERLAIN.

Ottawa, Nov. 12, 1903.

Referring to Mr. Chamberlain's cypher telegram dated 20th April, Minister of Militia anxious to sail for England about Nov. 28th, so that he may discuss new Militia Act with Secretary of State for War and Commander in Chief, and return to Canada before Christmas. Hope that this arrangement may be a convenient one. Consider mutual discussion important.

(Sgd.) MINTO.

Lord Minto telegraphed later on :—

Ottawa, 23rd Nov., 1903.

Am anxious for reply to my telegram of Nov. 12th, as Minister of Militia wishes to make his plans accordingly.

(Sgd.) MINTO.

The answer from Mr. Littleton was as follows :—

London, 24th Nov., 1903.

Referring to your cable of yesterday's date. Date suggested for visit of minister will be quite convenient.

(Sgd.) LYTTLETON.

I have already stated to the House the substance of what took place at that meeting of the Defence Committee. I only wish to add that my understanding of the object of my being invited to attend that meeting was simply and solely to expedite business. The Defence Committee is no longer, as it used to be, a sub-committee of Council, but is now an independent and advisory committee which has been created by the Prime Minister of England for the purpose of advising the Council, and its functions go no further than those of advisers. It is a business committee, and the object of inviting me to attend that committee, was simply to bring about, in the shortest possible manner the best results. As a result of my attending that committee, we were able to arrange in a short time—in an hour and a half or so—business that could not have been done in less than weeks, or possibly months, by correspondence.

Since the committee last sat, a number of notices of proposed amendments have been given. I have collected all of these amendments, with the exception of one or two, for the convenience of hon. gentlemen who are interested in this discussion, and I shall send two copies of this memorandum to hon. gentlemen opposite. The further amendments will be explained later on. Since the Bill was prepared I have, as already indicated to the House, had an opportunity of studying the new system which has been adopted by the War Office, as the result of the report of the committee known as the Esher Committee, which was appointed by Mr. Balfour for the purpose of investigating and reporting on all matters connected with the organization of the War Office, and making a report. The report is known as the Report of the War Office (Reconstitution) Committee, and is an exceedingly interesting, able and elaborate document. This report has been adopted by the British government, and the details of it are now being worked out. Like any new system it will, of course,

take time to work out all the details, but the main principles have been adopted and, I have been informed, are working very well. In view of the course which has been pursued by the War Office, a course which I may say has resulted from difficulties which were found to exist in working out the complicated system which has obtained in England, and which, to some extent, has been in existence in this country, I have thought it advisable to provide, in the Bill now before parliament, the machinery by which the government of this country may follow the example of the Imperial Government. Without troubling this committee by going into details, I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that it is quite obvious that the system which has been in existence in this country ever since confederation has not worked well. I am not going to animadvert upon or criticise any officers who have been sent out here to assist us in administering the militia of this country. I do not propose to do that, but I think that every one will agree that the system has not worked well, and I am prepared to blame the system much more than the individuals who have attempted to work it. I believe it is an impossible system. I believe it is absolutely and entirely impossible to get on with the system which we have attempted to work in this country since confederation. We have had abundant examples, not confined to the administrations of the Liberal party alone, but under previous administrations as well, when it was found unworkable. There are many difficulties which I think act against the public interest in the endeavour to work out this system, difficulties which will be overcome entirely or very largely by the new system. One of these difficulties is that there has been absolute want of continuity under the existing system. Each new General Officer Commanding who comes to this country seems to be possessed with the idea that it is his duty to overturn and change everything done by his predecessor. There are no records to show in detail the reasons for the conclusions which the different General Officers Commanding have reached. Under the new system, there will be a Militia Council corresponding to what is in England called the Army Council. That council will be composed of the Minister of Militia, as chairman of the council, with four military men and two additional civilians. Everything that is done at that council will be made a matter of record, or at any rate every conclusion of importance which is reached by that council will be made a matter of record, so that if there be a change of ministers or a change of officers the record will remain there for the guidance of those who may come afterwards, and when changes are suggested, means will be found to compare new proposals with old proposals.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are those means not available now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware of that being the case ; they were not found available in the British War Office, and they are very much less likely to be available here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You are describing the British system now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. That is the system which I propose to inaugurate in this country. Of course, the conditions being changed, it was necessary to change some of the provisions with reference to the formation and working out of the system. The Militia Council, as I say, will be composed of seven members, as is the Army Council—four military, three civil. The Minister for the time being will be the chairman ; the principal military officer will be known as the Chief of the General Staff. Then there will be the Adjutant General, the Quartermaster-General and the Master-General of Ordnance. The two additional civilians would be the Deputy Minister and, probably, the Chief Accountant of the Department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not have the Finance Minister of Canada ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend will have an opportunity of criticising these proposals later on.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Or the Auditor General ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That might add to the harmony of things. The minister in this way will have the advantage of being surrounded by his officers, by all the leading men representing the leading departments of the militia service. He will be in constant touch with his officers, and will, for the first time, have an opportunity of knowing exactly what is going on. He will have an opportunity of hearing and exchanging opinions with the technical men, which—if he happens to be an inexperienced man when he comes into office, as he is very likely to be—will be a very great advantage to him.

Mr. FOWLER. As I understand this advisory council, it is to consist of men in the service of the department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you not in the position to call on them now ? Would it not be better to have men from the outside ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am discussing a change which involves dispensing altogether with the services of the General Officer Commanding, and the council will be largely in substitution of that office. With reference to the question

which my hon. friend has just put, I might answer it by pointing to the experience which I have had, and the correspondence in connection with which I read to this House three or four years ago, over a controversy with the General Officer Commanding. I was under the impression that I had the right to consult any officer in my department, and I was doing so when I discovered that an order had been sent out by the General Officer Commanding to each one of these gentlemen not to come to my office without his permission, and after they had come with his permission and discussed matters with me, they were immediately to go back to him and tell him every word that had taken place.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister kindly name the general ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think my hon. friend knows who it was. It was General Hutton.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You have heard of him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may say in addition that I blame the system. These men come here with the idea that they are to command, and that every officer in the Dominion is absolutely under them and them alone, and they are jealous of any interference even by the minister. They object apparently to the minister, who is responsible to parliament and the people, having any direct communication with the officers under him. That is one of the difficulties of the system. It is a difficulty which was found to prevail in England and rendered the system there unworkable. The same difficulty exists here to a very much greater degree. I do not know that I need go further into the Bill just now, because I think the better way is to discuss the section as it comes up. In the discussion we had, many suggestions of importance were made, and I have endeavoured in the new sections to meet these as far as possible. When I introduced the Bill I said we would drop the word 'Defence,' from the old title of 'Militia and Defence.' I have ascertained from the officers of my department that this change is undesirable, because it would render useless large quantities of forms.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not there eventually be a saving in the amount of printing by the omission of this useless word ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have a great many forms printed now. I move, therefore, that the title of the Bill be made to read 'An Act respecting the Department of Militia and Defence.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does that mean that we have given up the idea of a navy ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Or has it been handed over to the Minister of Agriculture ?

The hon. minister has just told us that these men come over here with the idea that they are to command, and objects to the minister interfering with the officers under him. Will he give some instances to illustrate that other than General Hutton ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to take my statement, which is the result of my experience.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think that these gentlemen's reputations are of as much value to them as the minister's is to him. If they have been unfair or unreasonable, we should know, but it is hardly fair to General O'Grady-Haly or Lord Dundonald or any of the others, that a general reflection such as this should be made which might apply to any one of them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I said was that I blamed the system and not the individual, and when I mentioned General Hutton in reply to the question put by my hon. friend, I had no intention of being drawn into any personal controversy with reference to any of these General Officers Commanding. I knew that the hon. member for Victoria does not object in the slightest degree to any unpleasant or unfavourable remarks regarding General Hutton, and as the matter affecting that general had come before the House, and was on record, I referred to the correspondence. I have said that the system is unworkable, but that implies no reflection on the officers themselves. They were sent out, as they supposed, to command. Every officer in Canada is under them, every officer of the Headquarters Staff is under them, but under the new system there will be no question of rank affecting this Military Council. That is carefully left out. The men who come in will come in on an equal footing and their position will be altogether different from that of the General Officer Commanding.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister has made a statement in regard to myself that I cannot allow to pass. He said that he knew that his hon. friend, meaning myself, would take no objection to anything unpleasant which he might say regarding General Hutton. I have been fair to General Hutton throughout the length and breadth of the British empire, and what I would object to in General Hutton I would object to in Lord Dundonald. I do object to any commanding officer coming to this country and seeking to arrogate to himself functions that belong to the people of Canada, but we must be just as careful that the minister in charge of the department does not arrogate to himself functions that do not belong to him. I have been absolutely fair to General Hutton, and I do not think the hon. minister has any right to make the statement that I have been unfair to him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. He was urging that General Hutton would be objectionable to me. The hon. minister knows that I have been fair to General Hutton.

While saying that he is not going to enter into personal matters he says that after eight years of experience he finds that these officers come here with the idea of command. The public records show that Lord Dundonald and General O'Grady Haly have both lived up to the law of the Dominion of Canada, that they have stayed well within their duties as General Officers Commanding and so far as the friends of these gentlemen are concerned we do not want to see these statements going broadcast over the country or cabled backwards and forwards by a hireling cable service that these men come here with this idea of command, that they do not confine themselves to their duties and that they object to the minister who is responsible to the people and to parliament having any communication with the officers under them. I have yet to learn that Lord Dundonald or General O'Grady Haly has objected in the slightest degree to the minister having had communication with the officers under them. I think it is hardly fair on the part of the hon. minister to make a statement of that kind and send it broadcast over the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I say is that this is part of the system. The system is to blame. I do not blame any one in particular, but under the system, as it now exists, the commanding officer commands every officer in Canada and nobody knows better than my hon. friend what that means in the matter of discipline. It is a very difficult position to place an officer in to expect him to be entirely satisfied that officers acting in a subordinate capacity under him shall come to the minister as often as they choose, or as often as he may wish to see them, to consult about matters about which he thinks they ought to be consulted. I am not finding any fault. I am sorry if I have been unable to make myself understood. I am not blaming any officer in particular; I am blaming the system and it is the system we propose to change.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. minister kindly state again the officers who are to form a council ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will mention them when we get to that clause.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister tells us that he proposes to change the system and adopt that which is recommended in England. Would not the conditions in connection with the militia of England be so different from what they are in Canada that we could hardly apply the same system ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No doubt the conditions would be different, but not so very different. I am not speaking without the book. I have taken the pains to consult some of the most eminent military authorities in England as well as in this country, and they agree that while there may be some difficulties and that while some alterations may have to be made in applying the system, it can be applied here equally as well as in England.

Mr. INGRAM. In having read the document the hon. gentleman has referred to, it is a very extensive document and it refers particularly to the system in England. It occurred to me at the time I read it that the conditions were so very different here from those which exist in England as to make it difficult to apply the same system.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that so far as the reconstitution of the Headquarters Staff is concerned the conditions are similar to those of the War Office in England, and I cannot see any difficulty at all on that score. All my hon. friends who have written me on the subject and some of the most eminent military authorities agree that there will be no difficulty whatever in applying the system so far as the War Office is concerned. When it comes to the question of decentralization it may be that we shall not be able to go as far in this country as they have gone in England. I do not think that policy can be carried out in connection with the militia force as easily as in connection with the regular army.

Mr. INGRAM. Under the proposed amendment of the Militia Act which has been brought down by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, it is optional whether we have a commanding officer from England or not. I judge from the tone of the hon. gentleman's language to-day that it is not intended to have a Major General from England in the future. Coupling the change in the system which it is proposed to adopt with the language the hon. gentleman has used are we correct in assuming that we are not in the future to have a General Officer Commanding ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Under the system there will be no General Officer Commanding. There is no Commander in Chief in England to-day and there will be no General Officer Commanding here. There would be a first military officer known as the Chief of the General Staff, the most important military officer in the country as he is to-day the most important military officer in England, except some of the generals commanding in chief in some of the large districts. Under the new system we would have more

important commands than we have to-day. Decentralization would be carried out to some extent, perhaps not to the same extent as in England, so that officers commanding districts would have much greater powers than they have at the present moment, and properly so, because these men, if they are ever to be fit to comamnd, must have experience in times of peace which will enable them to perform the duties which may be required of them in times of war.

Mr. INGRAM. Is not that one of the very reasons why we require an experienced man in this country The officers of Canada have not had experience in handling large bodies of men, and for that reason it seems to me that we should have an English officer of experience in this country. You will have four or five of these officers and if so are there in that number any who are capable of handling large bodies of men ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe there are. I believe, however, that if we never make the attempt we never will learn. Our officers must have experience. I believe they can learn if given an opportunity. They have not been given an opportunity. We think that under this system we shall be able to develop our men, especially as we have been able to make an arrangement with the War Office by which two places are to be given each year to Canadian officers to enable them to learn their duties in the Staff College in England. We shall, after this, I hope, always have two of our men at the Staff College in England learning the staff duties.

On section 2, paragraph (f),

'General Orders' means orders and instructions issued to the militia by the General Officer Commanding, with the approval of the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move to strike out the words 'by the General Officer Commanding.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does that mean that the minister will issue orders ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They will be issued by the Council.

Mr. FOWLER. This clause gives power to the minister to issue orders. Suppose the Minister of Agriculture was acting Minister of Militia again ; he got the country into one mess already, and under this he could issue any orders he likes ; perhaps to take the heads of these officers down to Sweetsburg.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is facetious.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is bad enough to have the Minister of Militia given this authority without military advice, but suppose we have another episode similar to the little conspiracy we exposed the other day where will we land ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As a matter of fact the Minister of Militia must approve.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But suppose the minister choses to act without the consent of his Council he has power under this clause, and we will have a little dictatorship. I admit the minister must endorse the views of the Council but the Council has not the power to interfere with the views of the minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will let that paragraph stand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Under section 123, the Governor in Council makes the regulations.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite understand the effect of the word 'emergency' here. In view of the powers given the government under section 77 ; powers by the way which I very strongly object to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Who do you object to ?

Mr. FOWLER. I object to the word 'emergency' here because of the wide powers given the government in section 77 where the Governor in Council has power to send the militia out of Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But only for the defence of Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. You can call almost anything the defence of Canada—you could call sending the militia to any part of the British empire doing it for the defence of Canada. The Governor General in Council should not have power to do that ; that power should remain in the hands of parliament alone.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have had that power for a long time.

Mr. FOWLER. That makes no difference, we are now discussing this Bill which makes changes in many directions and the existing law can be changed as well in this respect. I do not believe in this centralization of power in the Governor in Council. It would seem that every Act passed in this parliament now inclines to give more power to the government of the day. Parliament has no right to divest itself of its inherent powers; we are here as the representatives of the people and we should hold this power in our own hands. Whether for the defence of Canada or not, the militia of Canada should not be sent out of Canada without the authority of parliament. There can be no 'emergency' arise under which parliament cannot be called together ; war does not spring up in a day or a night. ' If the country were in danger of war it would be an easy matter to call parliament and then parliament could decide if it is necessary to

send our militia outside of Canada. It is a different matter altogether about permitting volunteers to serve in any portion of the empire.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Under the law in Great Britain, parliament must be called within a certain time after the militia are embodied; ten days I think. Why not insert a similar provision in this Bill. I think the Governor in Council should have authority to call out the militia, but parliament should be assembled within a reasonable time afterwards. I do not want to be too captious with my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) with whom I agree in almost everything, but I cannot endorse him when he speaks about 'permitting' Canadians to serve the empire as volunteers.

I maintain that no man requires any permission from any authority in the Dominion of Canada to volunteer to serve the empire in any part of the world. He requires no commission, direct or indirect, from the Governor, the Prime Minister, the Govenor in Council or the parliament of Canada, and the imperial authorities have an absolute right to put their recruiting sergeant in the city of Ottawa to-day, and recruit men without let or hindrance of any authority in Canada, to serve the empire in any part of the world.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like to point out to the hon. member for King's N.B. (Mr. Fowler) that the law now in existence gives wider power than the section of this Bill to which he takes exception. Under the present law,

> His Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for active service, either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable to do so, by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

Under the proposed law :

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof.

This is a decided limitation as compared with the existing law. While I agree with my hon. friend that matters of such importance should be at once submitted to parliament, and parliament should be called, and would be called, nevertheless an emergency might occur when it would be absolutely necessary on the frontier to take advantage of military tactics for the complete defence of Canada. The matter might have to be decided in an hour or a minute.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does not the minister think it would be well to have a clause inserted in this Act similar to that in the English law, providing that parliament should be called say within ten days ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That might be, but my hon. friend will see that while in England there is a standing army of 200,000 or 300,000 men, our militia is the only defence we have.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We have a standing army just as large proportionately.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. What the minister says in regard to the present law is a matter of common knowledge. But we are changing that, and now is the time to make the thing right. The power should be entirely in the hands of parliament. According to this Act, even if parliament were sitting, the Governor in Council has power to legislate without consulting parliament at all. It seems to me that that is wrong.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the present moment we are simply defining what is an emergency, and I do not think my hon. friend will take exception to the definition. By section 77, to which my hon. friend has alluded, the Governor in Council is given certain powers in case of emergency. Perhaps those powers are too great or are not great enough. That is a question to be discussed when we reach section 77 ; but it seems to me that no exception can be taken by my hon. friend to the definition of emergency, which is the only thing before us at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand subsection (f) and there is some information which I shall require when we come to consider it again. When I mentioned my objection, I was referred to section 123, which deals, not with general orders, but with regulations ; and they seem to be two distinct things. Section 123 is relevant to subsection (h) but not to subsection (f). When we come to discuss (f) again, I would like a more definite answer to the question I asked a moment ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I asked that (f) be allowed to stand, for this reason, because it is understood, according to the views of my hon. friend, that we are to dispense with the services of the General Officer Commanding. The duties now performed by him are to be largely performed by an advisory commission. At present, a general order means an order issued to the militia by the General Officer Commanding, with the approval of the Minister of Militia. That is to say, there are two authorities, the commanding officer and the minister. I presume it is the intention of the minister to substitute somebody for the General Officer Commanding, because the regulations ought to be approved by somebody else before they are sanctioned by the minister himself. That is the reason I asked that this clause stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They should be made by somebody and approved by the minister. I would like some further information as to just what the minister means by the proposed change of system. I understood him to say that under the present sys-

tem the minister does not communicate with the subordinate officers directly; but some change is to be made in that regard. Is it to be a general change ? As I understand the present system, if the General Officer wants to communicate orders to the battalion or to subordinate officers, he does so through some person who is near in command to himself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Through the adjutant-general.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the adjutant-general communicates with the district officer commanding, who in turn communicates with the commanding officer of the regiment. Is that the system which it is intended to change ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that system will not be changed ; but instead of the General Officer Commanding, the proposed Militia Board will fix the policy, issue orders, and deal with all questions connected with the administration of the militia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that there were to be some omissions in the means by which the orders were to be communicated. Is it meant that the proposed council is to communicate, for example, directly with the commanding officer of a regiment ? I am not very clear as to what the change is, and I would like to understand it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the hon. leader of the opposition does not understand the situation referred to by the Minister of Militia. He did not refer to conditions such as those which have recently been before us, in which the Minister of Agriculture arrogated to himself, either of his own right or as acting Minister of Militia, to meddle with the formation of a regiment. I think the minister himself, if allowed to speak the truth would condemn that. But what the minister referred to was what, according to rumour, happened when General Hutton was here. The minister chose to speak to one of his departmental officers, but General Hutton refused to allow the officer to approach the minister except through him. I think the minister was justified in the course he took ; but I think it is also courteous for him to notify the General Officer Commanding of any action he takes. I do not think the hon. leader of the opposition understood that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I understood it, but I want to know what the system is to be—whether you are to keep up the old form of giving out instructions through a series of officers, or whether you are to have a different system ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Minister of Militia will keep the same relative control that he does at this moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, what change is to be made with regard to communicating instructions ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The chief of the General Staff, who is the new officer, will have charge of what are called field operations—charge of preparing an army for the field. The Adjutant-General will have charge of certain branches, many of them the same as now—education, mobilization, &c. The Quartermaster-General will have charge of very much the same things as now—transportation and so on. And the Master-General of Ordnance will have charge of the ordnance, guns and so on. Each one of these men will be supreme in his own department, subject of course to the decisions of the Militia Council, and these are the men who would compose the Militia Council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister does not understand what the leader of the opposition wants to know. Under the new system will it be possible for the Minister of Militia or the Minister of Agriculture, as acting in his place, to have officers appointed, the recommendations of whom does not come through the regular channel ? Will it be possible for the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Militia to interfere directly in the appointment of officers ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As regards appointments, under the new system there will be a new method. According to the English system, which I am very much inclined to approve of, that work is all done absolutely independent of headquarters, except that finally, I suppose, the Minister of Militia will have to approve. We cannot very well get around that. This Bill cannot go into force until proper regulations are carefully made, and I could not say at the moment what system will be adopted, but in a general way, greater powers will be given the districts than they have now.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is to be the recognized General Officer Commanding ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Militia Council.

Mr. INGRAM. In that case the order passed in October last applying to General Officers Commanding will be entirely wiped out ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. Who will sign these appointments ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Militia Council will act very largely in the sphere within which the Commander in Chief now acts in England. The signing of the appointments is a matter of detail.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I think it is a matter of very great importance. If the chief staff officer is a man of any military quali-

fication, he should assume responsibility from the military point of view.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As a non-combatant, may I offer a suggestion. We have to determine what will be the character of the body which is to replace the General Officer Commanding. Would it not be well to allow this matter to remain in abeyance until we have threshed out that question and determined what will take the place of the General Officer or what body will assume his duties.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That body will be civil as well as military, but there should be a special committee to deal with the question of recommendations for commissions on the force from a purely military standpoint, as it is now dealt with by the General Officer Commanding.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would it not be wiser to discuss all that when we are discussing the organization of the body ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am bringing it up now so that the minister may have it in his mind.

All the paragraphs agreed to accept paragraph (f.)

On section 4,

The commander in chief of the militia is vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General as his representative

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In what does this differ from the old clause ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The word 'personally' is left out.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would suggest that this whole section would be dropped. It is absolutely unnecessary and in any event would have to be altered. Section 15 of the British North America Act provides :

The command in chief of the land and naval militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue to be vested in the Queen.

That does away with the necessity for this section.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Let the section stand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If it is to stand, I would suggest this modification. Instead of reading, 'The command in chief of the militia is vested in the King,' it should read, as in the words of the British North America Act, 'is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.' Because we are not conferring upon His Majesty authority over the army. That authority is conferred by the constitution.

Mr. BOURASSA. I beg to make a suggestion to the minister. Clause 4 of the present Bill, which corresponds to clause 3 of the existing Act, declares that the command in chief of the militia belongs to the King, and as the Minister of Justice has properly said, we have no power to give any right or power to the King ; section 15 of the British North American Act defines the power of the King, so far as the militia is concerned. But clause 4 of this Bill defines not only the power of the King, but the power of the Governor General. Though the sovereign power, the sovereign command of the militia of any British colony, belongs as does the command of the army of England, to the King, yet the exercise of the command, the organization of the army, belongs exclusively and solely to the parliament of England, as the organization of the militia in any of the self-governing colonies belongs exclusively and solely to the parliament of the colony. And, in the case of a self-governing colony, as in the case of England, parliament delegates such power as it pleases to the government. This section should not only be a declaration of the sovereign right of the King, which everybody agrees to, but it should declare clearly so that it may be understood that the Canadian parliament is as supreme in the governing of militia matters as in others, and therefore, I think it should contain a provision similar to the present clause of the old Act, but clearer. I would suggest the wording :

The command in chief of the militia is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King, and shall be administered and exercised by the Governor General in Council.

That will very clearly and properly define the power of the King and leave it untouched, but it will make equally clear that the exercise of the King's command of the militia belongs to the Governor General in Council according to the powers granted by this parliament under this Bill. In fact, throughout this Bill in every clause where under the existing Act power is given to the King, or to His Majesty or to the Governor General, it is changed, and the words that appear are : 'Governor General in Council.' In fact, in about twenty clauses of the Bill now before us the principle of self-government is asserted in this way. Therefore, it seems to me, in defining the powers which are to be exercised by those to whom the exercise of these powers is to be committed, it seems to me that the same form should be used so as to make it clear that the exercise of the sovereign power over the militia belongs to the Governor General in Council, under authority conferred by this parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) has thrown no new light upon the question. Every one knows that 'Governor General' means 'Governor General in Council.' So far as the

control of the army in England is concerned, the King has no authority direct or indirect. And the same is true of Canada. 'The King can do no wrong,' because the King acts upon the advice of his responsible ministers.

Mr. BOURASSA. Of course, there is no dispute as to that. But if the Minister of Militia and the government think fit to replace the words 'His Majesty,' and 'Governor General' with the words, 'Governor General in Council,' in other parts of the Bill, it seems to me only reasonable to make this section in harmony with the rest of the Bill not only in spirit but in wording. I admit that it is more a question of wording than a question of policy, but, at the same time, it seems quite proper that the wording should be clear and consistent. I admit that, if all classes of the people of the country, and all of parliament, were imbued with strong principles of national self-government, there would be no necessity to put in these words. But as we have heard strange constitutional doctrine in this parliament as well as outside of it, doctrine that, if carried out, would limit or ignore the self-governing powers of this country, this parliament, and this government in militia matters, I think it is only proper that the principle should be laid down clearly in the early clauses of the Bill as is done throughout the rest of it. What I ask is simply to put the clause now under consideration in harmony with the principles and the wording of the rest of the measure. There is nothing new in what I propose and I certainly am not suggesting anything revolutionary.

Mr. GOURLEY. I differ from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) who wants to drive a wedge—that is the meaning of it—between Canada and the mother country. Why is he not square and honest? Everybody knows the constitutional principles that govern this country. The King is Commander in Chief here as in England, and here we exercise the prerogative as parliament exercises it in England. He has only to give us under our constitution the right to exercise that prerogative in this parliament the same as exercised in England. The King's prerogative in the government of the militia of this country devolves upon this parliament, and any attempt to carry that prerogative further than it is carried now would be an attempt to drive a wedge between the old country and this country. And I am surprised that the hon. gentleman on all these occasions should exhibit a disposition to tear this country away in every way by legislation from the old country. I do not wish to be offensive to any hon. gentleman in this House, and I will not; but I am bound to be honest and square; and, in that spirit I say that I am sorry that the hon. member from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) always seems to me to exhibit a desire to establish something in this country hostile to the interests of Canada as a part of the empire. His attempt is simply to set up the prerogative in Canada in opposition to the prerogative of the King.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This seems to be a wordy warfare. I rather agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that there is no necessity for the clause. I think we might allow it to stand in the meantime.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 5,

5. There shall be a Minister of Militia, who shall be charged with and be responsible for the administration of militia affairs and of the fortifications, ordnance, ammunition, arms, armouries, stores, munitions and habiliments of war belongng to Canada, including the initiative in all matters involving the expenditure of money.

2. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such orders as are necessary respecting the duties to be performed by the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move that the words 'and Defence' be added after 'Minister of Militia.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GOURLEY. How does this section correspond with the present section?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is practically the same.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It substitutes the word 'may' for the word 'shall.' This is a mere improvement in the drafting.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would not draw attention to this section but for the peculiar doctrine given to the Dominion of Canada by an Order in Council of this government which establishes as a precedent the right of any minister, in his own district, to have official authority. Does not the Prime Minister agree that that is the meaning of the Order in Council? The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), for instance, has the right to step in and override this in his own district?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) states that the Order in Council lays down the doctrine that a minister has absolute authority in his own district. The Order in Council says nothing of that kind. It says—and I think it will not be questioned by the hon. gentleman himself—that every minister is supposed to look after the interests of his own section.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In all departments?

Mr. INGRAM. Is this to apply in all senses?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In all senses.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, let us apply that and see where it will end. It is a recognized fact that every minister of the Crown is a political head, and he will naturally do that which he thinks will advance the interests of the political party to which he belongs. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always laid down the principle that there should not be any party politics in connection with military matters in this country. I want to know from the Minister of Militia or the Prime Minister how you are going to have military discipline that is to be purely non-political, to have no partisan conduct or action in connection with the militia of this country, if you are going to allow any political head to have anything to do with the internal administration of the militia? I can quite understand that rule applying in any minister's district where anything was involved that might fairly be viewed as a partisan matter or something to be done in the interest of the government from a partisan standpoint, but militia matters should be kept entirely aloof from considerations of this kind. Why? Because if you want to have discipline in the militia of this country you must certainly not have any interference from the outside. If the minister wants to reorganize a militia battalion he will give his instructions through the proper channels and will receive his information from the usual channel and that channel is not a partisan channel. That is if the statement of the hon. gentleman is a correct statement, namely, that he is not administering his department in the interest of party. Is it not a fact that even the corporal is jealous of his rights in the matter of discipline? If you go over a corporal's head in order to give directions to his military inferiors, he at once becomes jealous. You are interfering with the discipline. If you go over the lieutenant to the captain you create a feeling of jealousy. The only way to administer the militia is to administer it through the proper channels. What would be the situation of a lieutenant-colonel of any battalion if he were to communicate direct to the minister instead of communicating through the usual military channel? Imagine the Minister of Agriculture giving his instructions, imagine his interference in the matter of this kind. And then imagine any hon. gentleman saying that we have no partisanship in the affairs of the militia of this country. I say that it is simply impossible and what I fear to-day and fear in the future, the words: 'General Officer Commanding' being struck out, is that instead of having non-partisan feeling throughout the militia of this country as we have had for many years, we are opening the door wide for the introduction of partisan feeling into the administration of the militia. I regret very much indeed that the hon. minister's language has been changed to-day from what it was at the introduction of this Bill. As it was at first, if Canada felt disposed to have an English officer as General Officer Commanding she could have one, and if a Canadian happened to be available for the position, a Canadian could be appointed. The minister has closed the door absolutely to-day against the employment of an English officer. By the argument he has used, this situation is brought about although the Bill does not say so. I, for one protest against the understanding conveyed by the Prime Minister to-day, that any minister of the Crown will have the right to interfere with the appointments made in our militia. I, for one, am a strong believer in the principle that the Minister of Militia and his deputy and the officers connected with his department should have absolute control of matters of this kind.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. fried (Mr. Ingram) will not persist, I think, in that statement in regard to our giving up entirely the utilization of imperial officers, as the scheme is amplified. I have already referred to the fact that under the British system, which we are adopting, a most important officer, perhaps the most important officer, is the Inspector General. Probably it would be considered wise and desirable that an imperial officer should be chosen for this position. A most important position will be that of Chief of the General Staff. It might be considered desirable that an imperial officer, for a time, at least, should occupy that important position. All we want is to have the greatest efficiency possible; we want to get the best men, whether in Canada or in the imperial army. With reference to what my hon. friend said about political interference, he is confounding two things. I agree with him absolutely in what he says as to promotions, and I challenge him to show that any interference of a political character has taken place in the militia with regard to promotions. I do not believe there has been any such interference worth mentioning; at any rate I am not aware of it. But when the hon. gentleman comes to the consideration of the organization of a new corps, that is an entirely different thing. When you are organizing a corps de novo, from new material—

Mr. FOWLER. Why?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Why? If the hon. gentleman would allow me to complete what I was saying, perhaps he would have an opportunity of answering later on. I say it is an entirely different thing in the case of an already organized military corps, every man in that corps has his rights, from the corporal up, and no man should be placed over his head without a sufficient reason; certainly no man should be placed over his head for a political reason. I absolutely approve of that proposition and propose standing by it, but when it comes to

organizing a new corps de novo, from such material as may be found throughout the country, taking absolutely new men and new officers, that is an entirely different proposition. In England, as I stated the other day, the course pursued is that an important political official in each county, in the case of the organization of a new corps of militia or volunteers——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister mean to say that the lord-lieutenant of a county is a party, political officer ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is appointed by the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And holds his seat with the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is the man who selects the officers. Why ? Because he is a prominent man, because he is a well known man, and would my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) say that he himself, as the member for Elgin, if a new corps were to be organized in his county, should not be consulted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think he would say that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, he would.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think there is a man in the House would say that. On the contrary, that has always been the custom in this country. When the militia of this country was organized in 1868 members of parliament in my own county and in every county in Nova Scotia, so far as I know, were utilized to organize the militia at that time, and it was done in this way all through the country. That system has resulted well, no objection has been taken to it as far as I have ever heard.

What I rose to say was that when my friend talks about interference with promotions, he is taking a postion with which we will all agree, but when he talks about its being absolutely improper for a prominent man to assist or to take part in the organizing of a new militia corps, I say he is taking an altogether improper view.

Mr. FOWLER. In the first place my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) did not make such a statement as the hon. minister attributes to him. My hon. friend from East Elgin did not say that it was wrong to call in politicians to take an interest in the organization of any militia corps. But what my hon. friend from East Elgin did say was that it was absolutely wrong for any politician to introduce partisan politics into the organization of any corps. I take issue at once with the hon. minister in respect to there being any difference between promotion and the organization of a corps de novo. Why should there be any distinction between the two ? I shall wait for the hon. minister to give some reason why there should be any distinction between the two. Surely, if a Conservative is worthy of being promoted, a Conservative is worthy of being appointed in the first place. Does the hon. minister propose to lay down the doctrine that when a new corps is to be organized, none but Liberals need apply ? That would be the case if it happened to be in the district presided over by that very broad-minded politician, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). None but Liberals need apply ! It would not make a bit of difference whether they were fit for the places or not ; the only qualification necessary would be to subscribe to the Liberal creed, the Liberal doctrine. I am very glad to know that at least this government have thrown off the mask and I wish to congratulate them upon it. They have been publicly pretending before the people of this country that there was no such thing as politics in the administration of the militia and today the right hon. Prime Minister admits that it is quite a proper thing and stands by the Order in Council which he has made to that effect. I know from my own experience that ever since these hon. gentlemen obtained power, they have been grossly partisan in the administration of the militia. I want to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence that in the letting of contracts for the supplies of the militia camps, because in the town in which I live a militia camp is situated, these contracts have been given in every case to Liberals not because they were the lowest tenderers and given to them in many cases without any tender whatever.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to contradict my hon. friend immediately and promptly. There have been no contracts made without being open to public tender, and in every case they have been let to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. FOWLER. Knowing what I am speaking of I do not propose to take the contradiction of the hon. minister or any other person on the subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The rule is——

Mr. FOWLER. I make this statement and the hon. minister must accept it.

An hon. MEMBER. Nobody believes it.

Mr. FOWLER. I would not want any such character——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order ; sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When an hon. member denies a statement it is the duty of the member making the statement to accept the denial.

Mr. FOWLER. If any hon. member makes a statement about a matter which

is absolutely within his own knowledge he is not obliged to accept a contradiction from any other member. Let me tell you that, Mr. Chairman, and I am not the kind of man to take back water.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give names and dates.

Mr. FOWLER. I will give names and dates.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Were the contracts for the Ottawa camp given by tender ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am asking the question with the permission of the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is clear there cannot be two members on the floor at once.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I ask the hon. minister whether the contracts for supplying the camp at Ottawa were made by public tender ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, I cannot dispute the statement of the hon. minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And I will prove it.

Mr. FOWLER. Were these tenders to which I refer publicly advertised for ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The manner in which the hon. gentleman lets these contracts by public tender is by sending to a number of gentleman a list. I can tell the hon. minister of a case where a certain work was to be done, where a certain building was to be erected——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But the hon. gentleman is talking about militia camps. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that contracts for supplies for militia camps have been given to political friends without tender and without advertisement. I contradict that absolutely and I demand the names and dates.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I will give both names and dates. I say that they have been given to political friends notwithstanding that others submitted lower tenders.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say that is untrue.

Mr. FOWLER. Very well, I will prove it; that ought to be sufficient.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Give us the names and dates.

Mr. FOWLER. I will give the names and dates.

An hon. MEMBER. Now.

Mr. FOWLER. Do not worry ; I will just choose my own time. I am glad my hon. friend is so amused. I will give the names and dates but I will choose my own time. I say that this thing is being done not only in regard to supplies for the camps but that buildings are being erected by the hon. minister——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Department of Public Works do that.

Mr. FOWLER. This is not a case of the Department of Public Works. This is only a small matter involving a couple of hundred dollars. These are small things.

Mr. HOLMES. So are you.

Mr. FOWLER. I am just about as big as any one on the other side of the House, and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to understand that I can maintain my position as well as they can either in the House or out of it. Do not make any mistake about that. I propose to take that position.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The only case I can remember where a building was constructed at a camp without tender was the case of the Lieutenant-Colonel of the 8th Hussars. Lieutenant-Colonel Campbell, a political supporter of the hon. gentleman, constructed stables at Sussex, and the Department of Militia and Defence paid for the building. That is the only case I can recall.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not a usual thing for the Department of Militia and Defence to pay for stables constructed by the 8th Hussars. They have always had to pay for them themselves. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has made a new departure in that respect. In this case the tender was not sent to a builder but to a grocer and this occurred in the city of St. John. This gentleman was asked to put in a tender ? I will get the name and give it to the hon. minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Mr. INGRAM. No, it is not carried yet. I want to have a little better explanation than I have had so far from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence as to what he states about the militia being free from partisan influence. I do not know whether what he says is true or not. He simply made the statement and we can judge of that statement for ourselves. But, we will take an instance that has created a commotion in this country recently and that is the one which has occurred in the eastern townships. Is it not a fact that the department instructed their officers to reorganize a battalion down there and that the officers carried out their instructions by recommending certain parties to the department ? During all that time, according to the state-

ment made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, he was writing to citizens asking them to accept certain positions and he thught he was doing his duty by endeavouring to get them to accept these positions. Was it on account of their military knowledge ? I will not say that it was on account of their partisanship. I do not want to mix party feelings with this question. That is not the question before us. But what I want to point out is that neither the hon. Minister of Agriculture nor any other member of this House who is not delegated with the authority to do so should interfere in a matter in which he has no right to interfere. The persons who were delegated to reorganize that battalion made certain selections and they reported their selection to the district officer commanding. By him these selections were recommended to the department. That was perfectly proper. It is in the interests of the militia of this country that these selections shall be made without regard to the politics of those who are selected. I care not what their politics are. I care not whether they are Conservatives or Reformers.

If your officers are incompetent and are partisans, and will tolerate partisan Tories or Grits solely because they are partisans, then remove your officers. But if your officers are doing what they believe to be in the interests of the Militia, then no member of this House and no minister outside the Minister of Militia has a right to change the names of officers on the list, on account of politics. If we are to understand that members of parliament and ministers of the Crown have the right to do these things, then I differ from the Minister of Militia and I say that under such circumstances you are bound to have a partisan militia and you cannot help it. How on earth can you prevent it, if the foundation of the militia force is based on party lines ? We had the reorganization of a militia battalion in my own city, and I can say that during the time I had the patronage of that county I never interfered in militia matter no more than the man in Halifax. I have always held that it was the duty of the officers to select fit men for the battalions, and if the department is not satisfied, then they should remove the officers. I am zealous for the success of the battalion in my city, and I am zealous for the welfare of our militia force generally, trusting that they will be a credit to Canada, but you can never have that result if you introduce partisanship. I thought the Minister of Militia was, notwithstanding all that had occurred, still in favour of a non-partisan force, but the statement made by him this morning leaves room for little hope.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I can say, in endorsation of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram), that in my capacity as a member of parliament I have never in the most remote way interferd with the militia in my county, because I know my place better than to do anything of the kind. I also endorse the words uttered by the leader of the opposition the other day when he said that politics in connection with the militia was unknown in the province of Nova Scotia. The District Officer Commanding commanding in that province is a prominent Conservative, but I never knew that he allowed his politics to interfere with his duties as commanding the militia in Nova Scotia. Only the other day, I saw that a young officer in the city of Halifax, a young gentleman with whom I am intimately acquainted and who is a prominent Conservative, was promoted. Militia officers should be kept in their positions and promoted, because of their qualifications alone, and if in their positions they begin to interfere with politics, then it is the duty of the government to take notice of it. But, in the formation of a new regiment, the question is not whether a man is a Liberal or Conservative, but whether he is the best and the most efficient man in that district to organize that regiment.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I should be very sorry to think, and I should regret it very much if there were the least indication that politics would be introduced into the militia. I think my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), who knows more about the militia of late years than I do, will say that it is his experience when he was in command of the battalion in his own county, that there were no politics in the militia.

Mr. FOWLER. I heard the Minister of Militia say 'Hear, hear,' when the hon. member (Mr. Ross) gave utterance to sentiments with which we agree on this side of the House, but which were utterly divergent from the sentiments uttered by the minister, who said that the case of the formation of a new regiment was entirely different from the question of promotions. The hon. member (Mr. Ross) laid down the same rule both for promotions and for the formation of a new regiment. It is singular that the Minister of Militia cannot understand the plain English used by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross) who said, that politics should not be introduced into the formation of a new regiment, and that the only question which should arise was that of the military qualifications of the men appointed as officers. The Minister of Militia said it was entirely different in the case of a new regiment, but he failed to give any reason except that old woman's reason : 'Because.' Well, we all understand what 'because' means.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that when the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross was Minister of Militia in the Mackenzie government, there was an attempt made to bring influence on Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to introduce politics into the

formation of a certain regiment, and Alexander Mackenzie's answer was that there must be no political interference with the militia. I am sorry that rule has not been rigidly adhered to. I believe that my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) when he was Minister of Militia took the ground that there was to be no political interference, and the same rule was laid down by Sir John Macdonald. As it is now one o'clock and there are a number of gentlemen who wish to speak on this question, I think the committee should rise.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

House recumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that before the recess some remarks were being made with regard to political interference with the militia. I understand that the hon. minister made the statement that when a new regiment was being formed political interference was considered legitimate.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I made no such statement.

Mr. DANIEL. Then I was misinformed, and I understand that the hon. minister considers that there should not be political interference at any time with regard to the militia. I am very glad indeed to hear him make that statement, because I think it is a course which if pursued will be acceptable to the people of this country, more especially to the militia. But I would like to bring to the hon. minister's notice the fact that that has not been the case in the past. In my own town, when work has been put up to tender, it has been put up only among those people who are on the patronage list. Now, I hold in my hand a patronage list of the Department of Militia and Defence for the city of St. John, for the year 1902, and I will read it: T. McAvity & Sons, hardware; A. B. McLean, paints, oils, &c.; C. McDonald, paints, oils, &c.; Mooney & Sons, mason; Wm. Melliday, carpenter; Haley Bros. & Co., carpenter; G. S. Fisher & Sons, roofing; John Johnston, painter; Driscoll Bros., lumber; P. Campbell & Co., plumber; Jas. Boyle, tinsmith; C. P. Clarke, drugs; Canadian Drug Co., drugs; R. B. Travis, drugs; R. Leonard, sailmaker; Godsoe Bros., washing; O'Brien & Co., stationery; A. W. Adams, rope; C. E. Harding & Son, small lumber; A. W. Andrews, repairs, tents, &c.; King & Noble, wood and wood work; I. E. Smith, wood work and gun platforms; J. & A. McMillan, stationer. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that I. E. Smith, who is put down here for wood work and gun platforms, is a retail grocer in the city of St. John, and not a carpenter at all. I know him very well; he was for some years an alderman of the city. He obtained the contract for doing repairs on the drill shed on the west side of the city of St. John.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Might I make a suggestion to my hon. friend? I really do not see what bearing this has on the Militia Bill. All my estimates are yet to go through, and my hon. friend will have all the opportunity he wants to discuss this matter. It seems to me that we might now deal with the Militia Bill.

Mr. DANIEL. My remarks will not be prolonged, and I will not inflict very much pain on the hon. minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not mind hearing it, but I think it is out of place, that is all.

Mr. DANIEL. The amount of this contract to which I refer was a small one, amounting to only $185. But the point I wish to bring out is this, that this work was not put up for tender in the ordinary way, but was put up just among a certain few, and there is no doubt that was done by authority. The officer commanding the district sent down an order to the commanding officer of the regiment to call for tenders among those who were on the patronage list. The list was sent down, and that was done. If that is not bringing politics into the militia, I for one cannot understand what is meant by the term. I might refer to another case. All of us in this House know the gallant colonel who represents the city and county of St. John. At one time he commanded the 62nd regiment in that city, and at the close of his services there was a request from the regiment that he be made honorary colonel of that corps. That was done. I have no objection to that. I do not think any of us have, but shortly after the officer commanding the 3rd. Regiment of Canadian Artillery completed his term of service, and the officers and members of his corps applied to have Lieutenant-Colonel J. R. Armstrong made an honorary colonel of his corps on retirement; but it was not done. If the hon. minister has any reason that he could give to this House for not considering that request favourably, other than the political reason, I would like to hear it. I may say that Colonel J. R. Armstrong is a Conservative, and a man well known in military matters. He commanded the Shoeburyness team, and I think that was the only time that team brought back anything in the shape of rewards. More than that, he has a son who was so imbued with loyal feelings towards this Dominion and the empire, that after making application for a commission in one of the corps that went to South Africa, and finding that he could not obtain one, he resigned his rank and enlisted as a private trooper, and went to serve in the mounted corps. Fortunately he did not lose his life, but was invalided and lost a limb. This gentleman was well thought of in our town. The corps which Col. Armstrong commanded were very much in favour of his being appointed hono-

rary colonel when he retired from the command, and they were very much disappointed when that was not done. If these things do not show a tendency to run the militia on political lines, I would be very glad indeed to hear from the hon. minister that there was some other reason for not acceding to the request that was made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. At this stage I would appeal to the committee, in order that we may make some progress, to confine themselves to the clause under discussion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This clause is very germane to the question at issue. I will just read the clause :

There shall be a Minister of Militia, who shall be charged with and be responsible for the administration of militia affairs.

Now, we want to know whether the Minister of Militia is going to continue in charge of that department or whether some subordinate person is to come in. The minister has said that there is no difference whatever, in regard to the introduction of politics, between the formation of a new corps and promotion in an old corps. I am certain the House misunderstood the minister this morning.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I said was this, that there was a great difference between a corps already established and the composition of a new corps. I said nothing about the introduction of politics into anything. I said that in the case of a corps already existing, every man in it, from the corporal up, had certain rights which must be respected—rights of promotion, if his behaviour was good ; but in the case of a corps not yet in existence, but to be organized, the conditions were entirely different. Selections had to be made. I see no reason why the best and most influential people—and you have to take these people from both sides of politics—should not be consulted to assist in getting the best men to join it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then the hon. minister condemns the recent interference of the Minister of Agriculture ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We may take it for granted that he does, as he says he will not allow any more meddling on the part of that inferior individual in the affairs of the militia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Relatively inferior.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have heard the Minister of Militia say to-day on two occasions that after a regiment has been organized promotion shall be made regularly from one rank to another. Listening to the hon. minister one might be led to understand that no violation of that principle has taken place, and I do not wish any such impression to go forth to the country, because, while possibly he may act generally on that principle, we cannot forget that there is one notable exception.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to have a reply from the minister as to whether it is really the policy of this government to ask the general public to tender for supplies required by the Militia Department. I should like also to have a reply as to why the request that Colonel Armstrong be made an honorary colonel was refused.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As regards the first question, it is entirely out of place in this discussion. However, I have no objection to informing the hon. gentleman that in the case of supplies to the amount of a few hundred dollars it is to-day, and always has been, the custom of the Militia Department, as of all other departments—a custom which I found in existence when I took charge—to invite tenders from a limited number of people. In the case of the camps, it is the invariable rule to offer to public tender all the supplies for all the camps in Canada. With regard to Colonel Armstrong, I endorse everything the hon. gentleman has said about that officer. I have the pleasure of knowing him, and I can assure my hon. friend that, as far as I know, politics had nothing whatever to do with the fact that he was not made an honorary colonel.

Mr. ALCORN. I understood the hon. Minister of Militia to state pointedly that he always had been, and was still, in favour of what we all believe should be the rule in the administration of the militia affairs, namely, that partisan politics should be rigidly excluded. I understood him to give that principle his most complete assent except in the case of the formation of a new militia corps. He said that exception in such case must be made.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I do not know how many times I shall have to correct my hon. friend. I said nothing of the kind. I made no statement that politics should be allowed to influence this government in the formation of a new corps. What I said was that the formation of a new corps is altogether different from promotions in an established corps, and that, in the formation of a new corps, it was proper to consult men of influence, irrespective of politics, and get their assistance.

Mr. ALCORN. Where is the difference ? If it be the general rule that politics are to be excluded, why should that rule be departed from in the formation of a new corps ? Are we to allow the formation of a new corps to be based on politics—and that must be the result if the cabinet minister from the

district or members of parliament supporting the government from the district are to dictate what appointments are to be made—I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why, in the formation of a new corps, he should depart from the principle applicable to existing corps? I should also like to know whether the government has, since this Order in Council was issued, received any information of concurrence or dissent from the imperial government on the subject. I should like to know whether the imperial government are of the opinion that the interests of the country as a whole and the interests of the militia will be well guarded by the issuance of the Order in Council, and how the hon. gentleman thinks matters will work out, if, in all matters, including militia, the minister from the district interested is to have a say. What will be the result to the militia if such a course be followed ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) both seem unwilling to answer although the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) put to them plain and fair questions in a respectful manner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not understand my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) to ask any information from me. I thought he was putting his case in the form of an argument rather than anything else. But, if he puts it in the from of a question I have no objection to tell him that in my opinion there is much wilful confusion in this matter. There is no constitutional principle underlying this—none whatever. In England, they do not follow the same method as we do in the organization of their cabinet. In this country, under our federative principle, it is admitted, all parts of the Dominion must be represented ; and, for reasons of common sense if nothing else, whenever a recommendation comes to the Council it is to be presumed and believed that all members of the Council have a right to their opinion, and that, as a matter of fact and, I think as every one will agree as a matter of common sense, the members of the Council will defer to the judgment of the man who represents the district affected by the recommendation. He knows more of the local conditions than anybody else in the Council. That is all that is implied in this doctrine. In regard to the question whether we have received any intimation from the imperial authorities on that point, I would say that we have received none at all.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not know that there is any difference of opinion as to the rights of a cabinet minister. If, for instance, there were before the Council two applications for a contract in connection with military stores in the eastern townships, and the minister representing that district were asked which of two applicants he would recommend, one would suppose that he would naturally recommend the one who was his friend and a supporter of the government. We do not object to that or to the recognition of such a principle in matters of patronage of that character. Also he has a right, as a member of the cabinet, while discussing, say a military list, to express his opinion. Nobody questions that right. But when officers of the Department of Militia to whom duties have been delegated make a recommendation, and a member of parliament or a minister of the Crown undertakes, by correspondence, to interfere with the selection of men recommended by that officer, then we say that that member of parliament or that minister is going outside the line of his duty and is doing that which we say is inimical to the interest of the country. As I said before, the moment you lay a political foundation in your militia force you do that which makes an efficient militia impossible, because this spirit of party domination of the militia will extend—you cannot prevent it. We must be practical, and when you regard this matter from a practical standpoint you see that this is the necessary result of allowing interference by party politicians in the affairs of the militia. The Prime Minister speaks of wilful confusion in this matter. I desire to tell him that I have no wish to introduce any wilful confusion in the discussion of any public matter. The difficulty in the case before us was that a minister of the Crown was interfering with the acts of an officer to whom certain powers had been delegated—the minister went out of his way as a member of the cabinet, to interfere and that interference was for a political purpose. And I care not whether the interference is on behalf of Grit or Tory I say that the logical and necessary result of that interference is to make impossible a non-partisan militia force, I have not, during the time I have been in this House, spoken one word from a partisan standpoint in connection with the Militia Department. Nor have I any wish to do so. There are issues outside of the militia upon which we can fight this government, and, in party warfare, I am willing that those should be the only issues. A Conservative can fight as well as a Grit and I am willing to admit that a Grit can fight as well as a Tory. There is no necessity for the introduction of partisanship into the consideration of our militia, and all we object to is that hon. gentlemen opposite do not show the same willingness to leave partisanship aside when dealing with militia matters.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Militia has stated that political considerations have not entered in the promotions or retirements in the militia. I do not vouch for the accuracy of the statements I am about to give to the House, but I am satisfied that they will be found absolutely correct. It may be only a series of coincidences,

but it is a rather striking series. Take, for the present, the province of the Minister of Militia himself with the facts concerning which he is familiar. I will not touch the others in the meantime. Take the First Canadian Artillery, Halifax, N.S. ;—Lieutenant-Colonel Oxley had to retire, his five years of service having expired. He retired and another officer was appointed ; Lieutenant-Colonel Oxley was a Conservative.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He went out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is what I say—he was not granted an extension.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His tenure of office ended by the effluxion of time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But the minister knows that he was eligible for the three year's extension.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But that is only granted under special conditions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But I am showing that these special conditions do not seem to exist in the case of the Conservative. In the case of the 63rd Battalion, Halifax, Lieutenant-Colonel Crane was retired and was given no extension—no special consideration. 66th Regiment, Halifax, Lieutenant-Colonel Weston, Conservative, retired and no extension was allowed in his case. This convenient clause was not allowed to operate in favour of these gentlemen. In the 68th Regiment, King's county, Lieutenant-Colonel Chipman got one year's extension when his time was up. I understand—though I do not say I speak with authority—that Lieutenant-Colonel Chipman, though a Conservative, is a supporter of the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is not. I manage to get on without him.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are not the minister and Lieutenant-Colonel Chipman on the best of terms ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In my county we are able to be political opponents and still be on good terms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And so it is, let me tell the hon. minister in every county in Canada where we meet with gentlemen—just as in this House. The 69th Regiment, Annapolis county, Lieutenant-Colonel Shaffner, a Liberal-Conservative, was given no extension. The 78th Royal Regiment, Colchester county, Lieutenant-Colonel Lawrence, who retired on 21st May, 1903, was given a year's extension. That year expired last May, and Lieutenant-Colonel Lawrence still remains in command though the senior major has been qualified and ready for promotion ever since. I need not say that Lieutenant-Colonel Lawrence happens to be a staunch Liberal, and I believe that the major who would succeed to the command is a Liberal-Conservative. The former commander of the 75th Regiment, Lunenburg, was Lieutenant-Colonel Kaulbach. When the question arises in this House whether he is a Liberal or Conservative, his name would indicate the answer. When his time was up he was retired. I think we in this House are safe in concluding that he is a Conservative. The 93rd Regiment, Lieutenant-Colonel Oxley was retired as was his predecessor Lieutenant-Colonel Harrison both Liberal-Conservatives—not an hour's extension given in either case. No extension was given except in the case of Lieutenant-Colonel Chipman and Lieutenant-Colonel Lawrence, the latter being a strong Liberal, the former a warm friend of the Minister.

Mr. LOGAN. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that the successor to Lieutenant-Colonel Oxley is also a Conservative—so there is no politics there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am glad to hear it. That is the regiment of which my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) is a member. I am glad to know that it is an efficient regiment. The 94th Cape Breton regiment, Lieutenant-Colonel Bethune was given a year's extension when his time expired. He is, and was, at the time of the extension, a Liberal, though formerly a Conservative.

Mr. INGRAM. He is a non-partisan ; he is on both sides.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have nothing to do with it myself. This statement is sent up here from Nova Scotia by a gentleman who should know the state of affairs in that province. The minister can hardly, I think, give a satisfactory explanation of why some one or other of all these retiring colonels is refused a year's extension. It is not charged that the officers retired had been long in command ; some of them had only been in command five years ; nor is it alleged that the new officers who were to succeed them were men of long standing in the force or of great prominence. I would not have introduced this subject, but the minister made this statement that politics have never been allowed to enter into the militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will give the hon. gentleman a very much better authority than his correspondent as to whether or not politics have entered into the administration of the militia in Nova Scotia; I quote to him the statement of his leader, who, a few days ago, said that so far as he knew or had heard, he knew nothing of politics entering into the militia of Nova Scotia. I presume that statement is up-to-date, so that the gentleman who is communicating with my hon. friend must have passed over the gentleman with whom he would naturally have communicated, the leader of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, to do as some other people have done—without the very greatest amount of success—select the hon. gentleman as a cham-

pion. I may say two or three words with reference to this statement. In the first place, I criticise it as absolutely unfair; and I say that any insinuation that there has been any politics whatever in any one of the cases mentioned is absolutely untrue, so far as the 63rd battalion is concerned. If he will ask his leader, that gentleman will give him some information. As to the 66th, I think he can get information from the same quarter. So far as my own regiment, the 68th, is concerned, Lieutenant-Colonel Chipman had been a colonel for over thirty years. Next to him was a Conservative almost sixty years of age, who wanted an opportunity to get a reward for his twenty or thirty years' of service, and Colonel Chipman went out and a Tory colonel went in as usual—no very great injury to the Tory party in that case. As to the 69th, the same thing happened. The hon. gentleman might have gone back to the time of Colonel Starratt, whose time, I think, may have been extended one year, but a further extension was refused. The next senior officer was a Conservative, and when Colonel Shaffner's time was up it was not extended. Colonel Shaffner wished his time extended, but could not get it, in order that a good Tory senior major might have an opportunity to be colonel of that regiment. So I might go through all the regiments in Nova Scotia. I believe that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), who commanded the 75th, was not granted an extension of time. I do not know that he wanted it extended but at any rate the command fell into the hands of a good Conservative. The same thing was done in the case of the 93rd and so far as I know, in the case of the 94th. The regulation provides that the term of command of an officer shall be five years. Automatically his command ceases at the end of five years unless something intervenes. What? In the event of a report being made by the district officer commanding that there is a strong reason, in the interests of the corps and the militia, that there should be an extension of command, an extension may be granted, and nobody knows that better than my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes). I wish to say at once that I am opposed to those extensions of command. I do not believe in them, and I believe we should change the regulations and extinguish the possible three years' further extension of command. If I remain in the position of Minister of Militia this will be one of the first things I shall do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would heartily agree with the minister——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—in not granting this extension. I may say that when my own time of command was up—I do not know whether the district officer commanding had authority or not, but I presume he had—I was offered an extension of three years. I declined to take an hour of it. I thought the officers next under me should have the right. I had done my duty. The minister loses his temper once in a while.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Possibly it would be as well to keep that business out of this matter. Too many gauntlets had better not be thrown down lest some of them might be picked up before this matter is put through. The minister has referred in rather sarcastic terms to certain matters being entrusted to me. I think he must feel hurt, because the success of the different matters entrusted to me has placed him in a very unenviable light in the Dominion of Canada, and has placed his junior in the War Department, the Minister of Agriculture, in a much more undesirable light than the Minister of Militia. When I undertake to take hold of the Minister of Militia, I think he will find that it is a little more than the reading of a statement sent me by friends in Nova Scotia. The minister has not disputed the authenticity of one word of what I read. He has not given a very satisfactory convincing explanation of why extensions were granted in some cases and not in others. He has referred to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). The military experience of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, as he stated the other day, was confined to serving his country in the 63rd long years ago. I know the commanding officers in nearly all the regiments to which I referred, and I am not finding fault. I was very careful in the statement to ask the minister for an explanation. He was asking credit for giving an extension in certain cases. I do not think he has satisfied the House. Colonel Chipman was granted a year's extension, although he had been in command for thirty years. I have no objection to Colonel Chipman. I believe his family are loyal, honest citizens, but it strikes me as peculiar that extensions are granted in some cases and not in others. I do not want to introduce politics into the discussion of the militia. I have avoided that ever since the Liberal party came into power and long years before. When we have had an opportunity to criticise the minister rather adversely on some occasions, we have chosen the broad, fair line of appealing to his reason, and trying to get him to realize the proper position which he, as minister, occupies, and we have tried to keep politics out of it. If he had rigidly adhered to the line which I believe he tried to adhere to for a long time, and had, at all events, sat upon the Minister of Agriculture, in regard to the establishment of the 13th Light Dragoons in the eastern townships, if he had brushed that gentleman aside and maintained the line he had long maintained, it would have been better for the House and for the country, and some unfortunate incidents that have arisen would not have arisen.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is the clause that opens up the whole business ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would it be out of place for the hon. minister to give an explanation in detail of the proposal ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be very glad.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I received two letters this morning, one from Colonel Ward of East Durham, who is just closing up his camp, and another asking that this important clause may be held over until they are here to-morrow.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No objection.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I see the hon. gentleman is leaving out any reference to the appointment of General Officer Commanding.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You are retaining that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Section allowed to stand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We might go back now to section 2, paragraph (f). The hon. leader of the opposition and other hon. gentlemen took exception to the striking out of the words 'General Officer Commanding' and suggested that either these words should be left in or that other words should be substituted. Under the new system it may be that there will not always be a General Officer Commanding so I propose to return to the system which actually now exists under the present law and put in the words :

'General orders' means orders and instructions issued to the militia by or through the adjutant-general, with the approval of the Minister of Militia.

That is practically the condition now. I therefore beg to move that the section be amended by substituting for the words 'the General Officer Commanding' the words 'or through the adjutant general' and that after the words 'Minister of Militia' there shall be added the words 'and Defence.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In what section of the present Act is that provision found ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Section 119.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is as follows :

All general orders of militia or other militia orders issued through or by the adjutant-general, shall be held sufficiently notified to all persons whom they concern, by their insertion in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As a matter of fact they are all issued by the adjutant-general and have always been.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That will cover it.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 4 reconsidered.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I consulted with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and he thought that in view of the amendment suggested by the hon. Minister of Justice it would be well that the matter should stand. The statement of the hon. Minister of Justice was satisfactory to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as to the qualification that should be embodied in the clause.

Mr. BOURASSA. Do I understand that you want to carry section 4 simply in the form of a repetition of section 15 of the British North America Act ? I think it is most ridiculous that we should in the law simply repeat the disposition of the British North America Act. The British north America Act is very proper as it exists. It would be simply repeating the law to insert that clause in the Bill. If we retain that clause in the Bill it is to define the powers of the Canadian government and not to define the power of the King. The power of the King is defined by the British North America Act which is an imperial Act of parliament and which we have no right to interpret in any way. Here is the clause in the British North America Act :

The commander in chief of the land and naval militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

That declaration of the power of the Queen, or at the present time, of the King is the same as the declaration of the power of the sovereign over the executive government. Compare that clause with clause 9 of the British North America Act.

9. The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

Why do you not in any Bill in which you define some of the executive powers of the Canadian government or of a department of the Canadian government repeat clause 9 that the excutive power of Canada continues to be vested in the King ? That clause 4 has no value whatever in this Bill unless it is to define the powers of the Canadian government. Therefore I claim that if it is thought proper to repeat the declaration of the sovereign power of the King, which nobody disputes, it should at the same time contain a declaration of the executive power of the Canadian government. It is for that reason that I suggest that the clause should read as follows :

The commander in chief of the militia is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King and shall be exercised and administered by the Governor General in Council.

If we have no right to make use of these words then we had no right to pass the present law. The present law says :

> The commander in chief of the land and naval militia, and of all military and naval forces, of and in Canada, is vested in the Queen, and shall be exercised and administered by Her Majesty personally or by the Governor General as her representative.

In fact, I think that clause is absurd because it is a declaration that the command is thereby vested in the Queen as if we were granting to Her Majesty the command of our forces. Then it is said that the command shall be exercised by Her Majesty personally or by the Governor General. The whole thing is certainly ridiculous. I think if the clause has any value whatever it is to define the executive power of the Canadian government, and while recognizing the undoubted and indisputable principle that the command of the Canadian militia as well as the defensive forces of all parts of the British empire belongs to the King, it must be remembered that the execution of that power as far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned belongs to the Canadian government, and therefore if we do not assert in this clause the principle of self-government we must drop the whole thing. It is most ridiculous that we should, in a law of our own, repeat entirely the clause of the British North America Act. Only the British parliament has power to amend that Act, and so, I do not see that we should pass legislation here that would simply hold us up to ridicule. If there is any value in that clause it should contain both the principle of the sovereign power of the King, and of the executive power of the Canadian government. I move in amendment that the clause should read :

> The command in chief of the militia is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. gentleman says it is nonsensical that the phraseology of this section should follow the British North America Act——

Mr. BOURASSA. The present law says that the authority shall be exercised and administered by Her Majesty personally, which would mean that in case of an emergency the sovereign would have to come across the ocean and take up personal command of the army, or, it could be done by the Governor General as representative of the sovereign. I think the old clause was absurd, and the Minister of Justice said this morning either we should drop the whole thing, which I think would be better, or, that we should repeat the language of the British North America Act. With all due respect to the minister, I think he himself will admit that it would be absurd on our part to repeat the clause of the British North America Act. If there is anything to be added to the clause of the British North America Act, it should be a declaration of the power of the Canadian government, without any infringement upon the right of the King.

Mr. ALCORN. I always understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) to stand very strongly for responsible government in this country.

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Mr. ALCORN. Therefore I am surprised that he should now advocate placing the militia under the control of the government, which is but a committee of parliament, rather than under the control of parliament itself. It is highly proper to my mind that the clause should remain practically as suggested by the Minister of Justice. I submit that the clause was very properly construed by the Minister of Justice this morning and that it should stand as he advocates. It is parliament to whom the nation should look ; there is no reason for placing the power in the hands of the government. It seems to me that the object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) is to get control of the militia.

Mr. BOURASSA. On the contrary, I want the condition to remain exactly as it is now, only I want the law to define an actual condition and not an imaginary one. The position now is that the sovereign authority over our militia, is in the King. I never disputed that.

Mr. ALCORN. Then why do you object to put it in ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I am in favour of the principle and as long as we are a British colony we cannot be in favour of any other principle, but I say the execution of that power belongs to the Canadian government which is responsible to the Canadian people. My hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) wants to make a distinction between the Canadian government and the Canadian parliament.

Mr. ALCORN. You are doing that.

Mr. BOURASSA. The executive power of the government will be limited by this law, just as the power of the minister of another department is limited by other legislation. There is no infringement of the right of parliament in giving the power to the Governor General in Council, because parliament has control and can amend the law whenever it likes.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. gentleman is endeavouring to becloud the issue.

Mr. BOURASSA. Not at all.

Mr. ALCORN. So far as I can gather from his remarks, his real object is to take

the control of the militia out of the hands of parliament and invest it altogether in the government. We are not satisfied to do anything of the kind. If that had been done at the time of the South African war the course pursued by Canada would probably be vastly different from what it was. The hon. gentleman says we are merely repeating a provision of the British North America Act. That is an imperial Act which we cannot affect, and we cannot too often affirm a basic principle or a good proposition of law. Therefore, I think it is highly proper that we should repeat, even word for word the provision of that imperial Act, and declare our assent to the principle that the sovereign is the head of the militia of Canada. I say that we should leave the matter in the hands of parliament, and that being my opinion, I dissent from the proposition of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa).

Mr. GOURLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa), states a very curious position. He is opposed to us repeating what is practically the grant of power under which we are legislating, but he goes further and says we should repeat the constitutional principle which is the basis of the government of Canada as well as the government of the empire. The constitutional grant of military powers to this country is in the King; and the hon. gentleman's amendment would only say that that grant of power should be carried out constitutionally in Canada; that is upon the advice of his ministers and parliament. The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) would be absolutely a redundancy, because it only states what is the constitution of the country. The British North America Act gives us a grant of parliamentary and executive power in this country on all fours with the executive and parliamentary power of England. Therefore it is nothing more than courtesy when we are attempting to frame a militia Bill, to refer to the grant of power under which the militia of this country is organized, and then, from that statement develop our Bill. But it would be absolutely unnecessary; and therefore I cannot understand the logical sequence that is said to be in the mind of the hon. member for Labelle, when he would object to a very proper restatement of the constitutional law as laid down in the British North America Act. But he would do that which is absolutely absurd—he would say that we should have in this country parliamentary and constitutional law, which is given us in every line of the British North America Act. Therefore I would oppose the amendment as being utterly illogical from beginning to end, and would maintain the keeping in this clause, which is simply a repetition of the basis of power on which we propose to amplify our Bill. I was told this morning that the fourth section of the new Bill was a copy of the original section. I find in the old Act that the command of the naval militia and naval forces of Canada are given to the Governor General, but I find no reference to those forces in this Bill. I want to know why this Bill is confined to the militia, while the old Bill embraced the military and naval defences of Canada?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because there will be another Bill introduced this session covering the naval defence.

Mr. GOURLEY. You propose to deal with the two systems separately?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Before voting upon this amendment, I would like to understand what the hon. mover has in view. As I understand it, the only change he proposes is to add the words 'in Council' after 'the Governor General.'

Mr. BOURASSA. And to strike out the words 'His Majesty' in the second part.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like the Minister of Justice to explain the difference between the Governor General and the Governor General in Council, because, as I understand it, 'Governor General' means 'Governor General in Council.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The constitutional principle which governs the raising and control of the militia is of course the same in this country as it is in England. There can be no departure with respect to His Majesty's forces in this country from the principle that obtains in England. The principle in England I will state briefly from the books, is that the sovereign has not constitutionally any power to raise a military force without the consent of parliament but when a force is raised with that consent, he can, subject to any enactment, regulate it in any manner that appears good. Parliament controls the levying of the force, its equipment, maintenance, distribution, payment and all that; but the control of the force when raised is in the sovereign as head of the executive. The same constitutional rule applies to the colony; but in the case of the colonial forces, the consent is given by the colonial legislature instead of by the imperial parliament; so that our position in that respect is the same as that of the imperial parliament. My view with respect to the old Bill, with all due deference to the draughtsman, is that there was an oversight. Some one drew that Bill who had not a proper regard for the true constitutional doctrine that controls the militia. The section in the old Bill reads:

The command in chief of the land and naval militia, and of all military and naval forces, of and in Canada, is vested in the Queen,

and shall be exercised and administered by Her Majesty personally or by the Governor General as her representative.

It is quite apparent that that section was merely intended to be declaratory of the law; because we had no power to depart from the constitutional principle laid down in section 15 of the British North America Act. Therefore a proper form to have adopted would have been: 'The command in chief shall continue to be vested;' because we had no power to vest anything in the sovereign, and the doctrine laid down in section 15 of the British North America Act is the old law established after the restoration in a statute of Charles the Second, that the control of the army is vested in the King. That is my first criticism of that section. My next critism is as to the words added. My hon. friend and I differ in this respect. I hold that no word should be put into a statute that can be avoided. If you can avoid the use of unnecessary words, you will confer a blessing on humanity. Words are intended, as a Frenchman once said, to conceal our thoughts rather than to make them clear, which my experience has proved to be true. In this section, after the words, 'vested in the Queen,' where it ought to stop, it says, 'and shall be exercised and administered by Her Majesty personally.' The use of these words is a constitutional heresy. Her Majesty or His Majesty personally has no control over the army.

Mr. GOURLEY. But in reading the words one would subordinate them to their constitutionality.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would prefer not to have to go through the mental act of subordination. I would rather eliminate the words. Then we have these other words: 'or by the Governor General as Her representative.' I should like to say that the Governor General means the Governor General in Council, but I cannot, because I have before me the Interpretation Act staring me in the face, and I find that paragraph 7 of section 7 defines the expressison 'Governor General' to mean 'the Governor General for the time being of Canada, or other the chief executive officer or administrator for the time being carrying on the government of Canada on behalf and in the name of the Queen, by whatever title he is designated;' and the next paragraph, paragraph 8 of section 7, defines the Governor General in Council as meaning the Governor General of Canada, or person administering the government of Canada for the time being, acting by and with the advice of, or by and with the advice and consent of, or in conjunction with, the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.' So that if you are going to add the words, 'and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General in Council,' you are adding words that are of no value, because His Majesty means necessarily His Majesty acting under the advice of his ministers. 'His Majesty' has no other meaning under our constitution. There is always of course the personal prerogative of the sovereign with respect to the control of the army, but it is one of those which has been encroached upon to such an extent by modern parliaments that now practically it is never exercised, except under the control of parliament. Otherwise the doctrine the King can do no wrong would not prevail. If Her Majesty had been personally responsible for the conduct of the Boer war, criticism would have been directed against her, but it is always the impersonal person known as Her Majesty who acts through the council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And in the case of the abolition of purchase in the army.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, I could give a lot of details but shall not weary the House. We might leave the clause merely as a declaration or reaffirmation of the principle which we have in the British North America Act, but the minister has control of the Bill, and to preserve the continuity of legislation, wants to import into it the words in the section of the old law with respect to the Governor General. There is no harm in that except the harm that every useless word may have, and the use of the words 'His Excellency the Governor General' seems to be unnecessary, especially in view of the fact that in the letters patent which are issued to the Governor General, there is contained this clause. This is from the King:

> We do hereby require and command all our officers and ministers, civil and military, and all other inhabitants of the said Dominion to aid and assist our said Governor General.

So that under these instructions, it would appear as if the representative of the Sovereign had control, but this control is only to be exercised after parliament has determined within what limits it shall be exercised. Parliament is the supreme arbiter. Parliament controls everything connected with the militia, in so far as its organization and creation are concerned; but after it is brought into existence, it is controlled by the Sovereign, acting through his executive, and we come back to the old difference between legislative and executive jurisdiction. We exercise the legislative power over the militia and the Sovereign exercises the executive power; and our views ought to be to maintain, in so far as our militia is concerned, absolutely the same principle as they have in England. In fact we could not do otherwise even if we wanted to. On the whole I would be content with the clause in the form in which it is in the British North America Act, but I can see no harm in allowing these extra words to be added.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister read the clause as he suggests ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would suggest that it read as in the British North America Act :

The command in chief of the militia is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.

To this my hon. colleague adds the following words : 'and shall be exercised and administered by the Governor General as his representative.'

Mr. BOURASSA. I think that the opinion just given by the Minister of Justice confirms what I have said. He has pointed out the absurdity of the clause in the old Bill. At the same time he pointed out the danger of putting useless words into any legislation. The danger is that they may be used for other purposes than what they were intended for. I may remind the House that although we may have no doubts as to the powers of the Governor General, although we may have no doubt that he cannot exercise them except upon the advice of his cabinet, at the same time I do not see why we should not take the precaution of asserting that principle, if we are to have a clause of the kind proposed at all. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) will uphold me in this view because only a moment ago he was very jealous of the rights of parliament. As the Minister of Justice has shown, when the term 'Governor General' stands alone, that does not mean Governor General in Council, but His Excellency personally. This reminds me that at the time of the Boer war, a celebration took place in Montreal at which an address was presented to His Excellency, and in making the presentation, a lawyer, who has a high position in the Canadian bar, Mr. McMaster, gave utterance to the opinion that the Governor General had the power, under our law, to take hold of the militia, without consulting his advisers or parliament, and send them anywhere in Canada or outside. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) was very anxious that the Canadian government, which is responsible to parliament, should not be given the power to send the militia out of Canada. Well, what would he think of confiding that power to the Governor General ? And according to a leading light of the Montreal bar the Governor General has that power in his hands without control by anybody. And His Excellency accepted the speech and thanked Mr. McMaster for his good advice.

Mr. GOURLEY. Did the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) say that he would have a clause in this Bill to prevent the militia of Canada from being sent abroad?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly he did, and I was rather scandalized at that exhibition of little Canadianism. While I agree with the hon. member for King's on the general principle, I do not think we should frame a law so narrow that the Canadian government should not be free to send our militia beyond the borders of Canada for the defence of Canada. But if the hon. member for King's is afraid to leave in the hands of the Canadian government the power to do what they like with the Canadian militia, he should all the more object to a clause which, though in practice it may be inoperative, lays down the doctrine that the Governor General personally shall have control of our militia—the same doctrine as was expounded to His Excellency by Mr. McMaster, and which His Excellency evidently accepted. If the Minister of Justice were free to act, he would either leave this clause out altogether or frame it so that it assert the principle of self-government in Canada as regards our militia.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is there.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, it is not. He has destroyed that argument by reading the clause in the Interpretation Act, which shows that when the term 'Governor General' is used, that means the Governor General himself personally, and that when we want to make a difference we use the words 'Governor General in Council.' The clause itself is not necessary. As the Minister of Justice has properly said, we cannot change the powers of the King or the law that determines the relations between the British government and this country. That is all settled in the British North America Act, and there is no need to repeat it in any clause of this Bill. But if you want to repeat clause 15 of the British North America Act and add anything to it, we cannot add anything else than a declaration of the self-government of Canada in militia matters as well as in others. But to put in a clause in an Act respecting the militia of Canada declaring that the command of our militia is in the hands of the Governor General personally, would show lack of dignity on our part.

Of course it may be said that it was contained in the old Act. But, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) has very properly said—and I agree with him—we are making a new legislation, and we are trying to improve upon the old. Therefore we ought to consider any section that is proposed to the committee upon its own merits. And surely if my hon. friend from King's, or my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) would express their own opinions they would agree with me. Perhaps the hon. member for King's would be embarrassed, on account of his friendship and neighbourship with some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side by admitting that he agreed with me, and even though he agrees with me would not

like to say so before parliament or elsewhere. But that is not the question. The question before this committee is not whether the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) proposes an amendment or not, but the question is whether we are going to declare that the executive power in Canada, so far as the militia is concerned, belongs to the Governor General personally or to the Canadian government. There is no way out of it. Of course, you may get out of it by a side argument or by a vote, but that does not affect the truth of my position. I stand by the amendment and surely, when the question is put squarely before the people of Canada, they will say that they want the militia to be dealt with by the Canadian parliament. I hope that the sentiment of self-government, the pride in our institutions, those institutions that have been granted to us by the British people, will cause us to maintain our rights without diminution. I admit that, in practice, it may make no change. But I think it would be improper, even though it may be ineffective, for this parliament to declare in the text of a statute that we are ashamed of our right of self-government and do not wish to proclaim. I repeat there is only one of two things to be done—either to drop this altogether and leave it as it was, or make it a declaration of self-government on our part.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) says that the object of his remarks is to preserve the principle of self-government in Canada. Let me draw his attention to the phraseology of this section, and I think he will agree with me that that is exactly what we are doing. This section declares that this power is to be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General as his representative. 'As His representative.' That is as the representative of the King. That means that the command of the militia in this country shall be exercised by His Majesty's representative as that power is exercised by His Majesty where he is his own representative. In other words, we are preserving self-government in Canada by providing that the Governor General is to act in regard to the militia as the King acts in regard to the army.

Mr. BOURASSA. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Alcorn) prepared to state before the parliament of Canada that what he desires for Canada is the exercise of executive powers by the Governor General without the advice of his cabinet ?

Mr. ALCORN. That is not contained in this section.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is just what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) states —that where the words 'Governor General' appear it means the Governor General personally, but where the Governor General with his cabinet is meant, the words used, are 'Governor General in Council.'

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not so understand the Minister of Justice. I think his argument is clear and fair. I do not think the hon. minister would say that the use of the closing words of this section would mean that the Governor General could act independently of this parliament. The language is not exactly proper to the section, but, still, any lawyer, reading the section would hold that the words 'Governor General as his representative' would refer to, and be governed by the foregoing words. I agree with the Minister of Justice, therefore, that the latter words of this section are redundant. Under the general patent, by which the powers of the Governor General are conferred in this country, as of any other self-governing colony, it is set out plainly that the Governor General is the representative, in this country, of a constitutional government, as the King is the representative of a constitutional government in England. So, these words need not be there. I learn, from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the hon. Minister of Justice has said, that the words were offensive. I would be sorry to know that the Minister of Justice has said anything of the kind. I think he would respect too much the men who made the constitution. This legislation, fixing the powers of this parliament, and governing the distribution of executive powers, is legislation of a very high class. And, if the draftsmen of that time used redundant words, there was more excuse for them than there would be for us. We have had thirty-seven years of the work of the courts in interpreting the meaning of these words, and the definition of the powers of the executive, and we ought to be able to express our laws in clearer words than did these men at the inception of confederation. And I can easily understand, that the words were put in there for greater caution. The power of the Governor General was given by special commission and instruction—our general patent was not settled for years after. Therefore, I can readily understand that these draughtsmen would say : We will not let instructions or commission interfere with the administration of the militia, but we will introduce words that will settle the matter. We have much more light than they had. I think that the suggestion of the Minister of Justice is a very proper one—that we should leave it out. I see that the words in this section 9 of the British North America Act are very clear and very terse. See the few words in which these men established constitutional government in this country :

> The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

We have always had constitutional government ; they wanted to say that this was

to be continued, and this they have done. The latter words of this section are the very words suggested by the Minister of Justice. I do not know whether he borrowed them from this section, but I say they are very happy words, and we might well adopt them, in the case, declaring that the command of the militia is to continue and be vested in the King. These are very proper, and apt words. Now, with regard to the Governor General's name being mentioned, I do not think it is necessary, in any Act, to refer to the Governor General. He is the King, and there is no necessity to repeat it. The Governor General is not a separate entity,—he is King, and he is here for the purpose of administering the government for the King. If the King were here, he would exercise the power himself and the Governor General would disappear. I hope the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) will make his position clear, as it would be most unfortunate for us who sit on this side of the House to have among us a gentleman entertaining opinions such as those ascribed to him. I hope it will be always clear that the militia of Canada will be ready to serve in the most distant part of the empire. If a contrary sentiment is to be heard anywhere, it should be heard only in the county of Labelle. In every other part of Canada I hope there will be a distinct repudiation of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) has said. I wish to say to the hon. member for Labelle that, if he wishes to improve the feeling in this House—and I would like to esteem him highly, he should cease wounding the feelings of every Anglo-Saxon in Canada, as he has been constantly doing. I do not wish to say anything offensive, but it certainly does not promote amity in this House, or elsewhere, for us to have our most sacred feelings raked over by the hon. member for Labelle. I wish the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) to rise and dissociate himself from that hon. gentleman.

I want to say here and I will undertake to give my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) this information that although he had a million tongues in Canada, whenever the militia and in fact every man in Canada is required in India or the farthest isles of the sea, we will be there ; we will spend every dollar of money of Canada for that purpose, and the sooner the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) finds that out the better. If there was a government in Canada hostile to that idea we would hang them in twenty-four hours.

Mr. FOWLER. I would refer the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) to 'Hansard' of to-morrow, for the remarks I made, and I am sure he will be perfectly satisfied when he reads these remarks. I would not like him to take his authority for them from the hon. member for Labelle. With respect to the proposed amendment I understood, as I said, that the British North America Act provides, exactly as the Minister of Justice has stated, that this authority is in the hands of the government. Therefore I fail to understand what good a declaration of it would be which would not be effective. Supposing we adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) what advantage do we derive ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I told the committee very frankly that I did not see the use of any of these declarations, that it would be just as well to drop the whole thing out altogether. I may reply to my hon. friend's question by asking another. What is the advantage of declaring there that the supreme command belongs to the King when that declaration is already in the British North America Act ?

Mr. FOWLER. You are making a declaration according to law, but if you make the other declaration it is a declaration not according to law.

Mr. BOURASSA. If my hon. friend claims that it is against the law to state that the exercise of the command of the militia belongs to the Canadian parliament I am greatly surprised. I would not have it declared in this Canadian parliament that we have not that right.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is provided in the constitution, in Section VI of the British North America Act :

> It shall be lawful for the Queen by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the legislature of the provinces.

And in the list of subjects reserved to the Dominion parliament we have :

> Militia, military and naval service and defence.

We have a constitutional grant of power to manage the militia in every respect.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is right.

Mr. FOWLER. And that power when the law is passed, is exercised as a constitutional right by the King, advised by this his Privy Council for Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it would disfigure an Act of parliament to put in a clause saying that the government of this country is to be administered by the King with the advice of his cabinet ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. It would be an absurdity.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will take the section as I understand it, we are all agreed that the section will read :

The command in chief of the militia is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.

We are all agreed up to that point. Then the only dispute is as respects the other words that are here. My view is that even stopping the paragraph at the word 'King,' that applies to the control which vests in the sovereign, acting on the advice of the Canadian government. The other words, it seems to me, ought to be struck out for good drafting, but if we mean to leave them in I take issue with my hon. friend for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) when he says that the clause will then mean that the parliament of Canada are willing to declare that the administration of the militia affairs will be in the hands of the Governor General personally. That is his point. I take issue with him on that point and while I say that the drafting might be very much improved, still, as it is, it means that this power shall be in the hands of the executive, because while the words 'Governor General' taken alone, mean the person who may fill the position of Governor General and the 'Governor General in Council' has a different meaning we must take all the words that are here.

The command in chief . . . . shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty.

Now, if you stop there, what would be the meaning? His Majesty, acting as the head of the executive of course. Now to what extent do the following words amplify that?

Or by the Governor General as his representative.

That would be 'or by the Governor General as the representative of His Majesty' acting as the head of the executive. That would be the result and as I said before, we are putting in a lot of words to no purpose.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is tautology.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not wish to criticise the minister who has had the responsibility of this Bill and all the trouble connected with its preparation, and who is much more familiar with it than I can be, but I must admit that if you put the word 'Governor in Council' there the result would be to make it more clear than it is now. But the effect would be the same. I cannot see that it would in law produce any different effect.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going to carry this discussion any further, but I will take the declaration the minister made now and the one that he made a little earlier. He told us that it was a bad thing to put in useless words. Now, he tells us that if we stop after these words:

The command in chief of the militia is vested in the King,

Then the exercise of that power shall come back to the Canadian government. He says also that if we leave the other words about the exercise of power by His Majesty, the position will not be changed; and even if we leave it to the Governor General, there is no change again. For one purpose we are here making three declarations. If ever there was an example of three lines needlessly used, it is in this case. Therefore I say that so far as the use of unnecessary words is concerned, this clause is a striking example.

I never said that by reason of the exercise of that power being vested in the Governor General, we were expressing the view that the Governor General could become the personal head of the army. I simply say that after the definition by the Minister of Justice of the Governor General personally and the Governor General in Council, it is an absurdity on the part of the Canadian government to declare that the exercise of this power is in the hands of the Governor General personally. I have said over and over again, agreeing with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), that we cannot change the constitutional law of this country. At the same time I have said that it is not a proper thing to allow words in a law that can be interpreted falsely, especially in view of the interpretation that was taken up and accepted by the Governor General four years ago. I have at the time quoted to the House—and it cannot be contradicted—an article saying that on the 31st of October, 1899, at a concert in Montreal, Mr. Donald MacMaster told the Governor General personally, in the presence of a large meeting, that according to the constitution of Canada the Governor General had the power to take the whole militia of Canada and send them where he pleased without the consent of Council, and His Excellency did not contradict that statement.

An hon. MEMBER. Mr. McMaster was clearly wrong.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. McMaster was clearly wrong, but at the same time I say it is a dangerous thing when one Governor General would allow that to be said in his presence without correcting the statement, and explaining it. He permitted that to be said in his presence before a thousand people. It was published in all the newspapers in Canada that the Governor General could take hold of the militia of Canada and do with it as he pleased. I think it is only proper that we should make our law so clear that no future Governor could make that mistake. I think that we in Canada should make our constitution so clear that a Governor General could not make such a mistake and that no future governor should permit any such breaches of what we might call constitutional etiquette in their presence as the Governor General did some four years ago, because

probably he did not know the real meaning of the law.

The text of the law allowed him to accept that interpretation and if we leave the text of the law as it is there in the future the Governor General may adopt that interpretation. As the hon. minister has made it perfectly clear that interpretation has not been contradicted and although he opposes my amendment now he is at the same time obliged to admit that the words 'Governor General' mean the Governor General personally, and that the words 'Governor General in Council' mean the Governor General assisted by his Council. If we admit that and everybody admits it, this clause must be interpreted as giving to the Governor the powers of execution that this parliament will give to him concerning our militia. I will agree with everybody that this clause is useless, but if it were left in would we have a word of truth in it? I say that it is the contrary of the truth. We put words into this Bill that will allow this or any Governor General in the future to adopt such a false interpretation of the law as was repeated in the presence of Lord Minto and accepted by him some four years ago.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have no doubt that Lord Minto did not accept it. There is one thing that an Englishman is trained in and that is in very good manners and it would not be very polite for Lord Minto to get up in a public meeting and contradict Mr. McMaster. It was simply a question of good manners on Lord Minto's part to allow the thing to go by.

Mr. BOURASSA. Undoubtedly His Excellency will be very thankful to the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) for having constituted himself his defender.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think it is very offensive for the hon. member for Labelle to attribute to the Governor General what would be clearly a usurpation of power in this country.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am attributing nothing to His Excellency. I am simply stating that in the presence of the Governor General a leading lawyer of Canada declared publicly that the Govenor General, under our present law—as far as that law is concerned it is not changed by this Bill—had the right to take hold of the militia and send them wherever he liked for whatever purpose he liked without overstepping his functions. That was stated publicly and not contradicted.

Mr. ALCORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The only object which the hon. member for Labelle can have in making this statement and reiterating it several times as he has is to criticise His Excellency the Governor General and no member of parliament has a right to do so in this House.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is no part of my desire to criticise the action of the Governor General. If I desired to do so I would criticise the action of the government but I am simply stating a public fact repeated throughout the press of Canada to show what the result of a miswording of the law might be. I have no desire to show any lack of respect to His Excellency the Governor General. I do not think there has been anything in my words which expresses disrespect of the Governor General.

Mr. ALCORN. Whatever the hon. gentleman's intention is, certainly that is the effect of his words.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to say that when His Excellency the Governor General was present on this occasion Mr. McMaster made a statement in regard to his interpretation of the law. I understand that what the hon. gentleman said was that on a certain occasion Mr. McMaster stated his interpretation of the Act as to the power of the Governor General to call out the militia and that His Excellency made no reply. There was no reflection on His Excellency in that.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes there was.

Mr. INGRAM. The point is this: Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) in order or is he not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This hon. gentleman is quite in order unless he has been guilty of the accusation made by the hon. member (Mr. Alcorn) who took the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Has he?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think he has. There is no reflection on the Governor General in that.

Mr. GOURLEY. Mr. Chairman, I——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The chairman has been called upon to give his decision and it is that in stating that the Governor General in the presence of Mr. McMaster did not express an opinion as to whether he had the power or not, the hon. member for Labelle was casting no reflection upon the Governor General and therefore the point or order of the hon. member for Prince Edward is not well taken.

Mr. ALCORN. The point of order I took was that under the rules of the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not want to be lacking in respect for my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) who is a gentleman, but the point of order has been settled.

Mr. ALCORN. I suppose I have the right to discuss it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The point of order has been settled.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No it has not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order raised by my hon. friend for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) has been settled. If there is another point of order raised I will rule upon it.

Mr. BOURASSA. If hon. gentlemen opposite had not interrupted me at the time I would have shown them very clearly that I did not in my remarks show any disrespect to His Excellency. On the contrary I have stated and I repeat that on account of the respect we have for Governors General, for this one, for those who have come before and I hope for all those who will come in the future, we should make the law so clear that there can be no mistake on their part as to its interpretation. The point I was making was that at a public meeting to which the Governor General was invited a gentleman made the statement there, based upon the British North America Act and upon his interpretation of section 3 of the Militia Act, that the Governor General personally could do whatever he liked with the militia, that he could raise militia corps and send them inside or outside of Canada wherever he pleased without the advice of the government. The Governor General did not express any contradiction of that statement. My hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) upon that rose to make a plea in favour of the Governor General by suggesting that he did not do so upon the ground of etiquette. I am not discussing that point at all. I am not saying that the Governor General should have corrected Mr. McMaster's opinion or should not have corrected Mr. McMaster's opinion; I simply say that the Governor General was there and that he did not contradict the statement.

Mr. INGRAM. And you are finding fault because he did not.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not finding fault from that point of view. On that occasion the Governor General was not present as the head of the government. He was received personally. The principle was settled in this House six or seven years ago by the speaker that when we speak of the Governor General's Act personally as apart from the government we have a right to consider his speeches and actions, and surely all Governors General if they express an opinion or assume an attitude that may lead the people to believe that they have functions to exercise as the representative of the British government outside of their functions as the head of the Canadian government we have a right to criticise them. In fact in the Empire of Germany, where I do not think there is more freedom than there is here, the speeches of the emperor are criticised in parliament. Whenever the emperor thinks it proper to make political speeches these speeches are criticised. The next day after that speech was made Mr. McMaster's opinion was printed in all the newspapers of Canada, it was accepted by several leading newspapers and the fact that the Governor General was present gave rise to a misinterpretation especially at a time of popular excitement that we should avoid in the future. I say therefore that if we take it from a purely legal point of view there should be no definition of powers because we have no right to define these powers. These powers are defined by the British North America Act. Then, if we take it from the point of view of propriety of policy, or of the interpretation of the law or of the powers which the Canadian government have, we should then make it clear that the Canadian government have the power of execution or we should declare nothing at all.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think very much follows from this reference to Mr. McMaster's opinion.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I had the floor before the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I am an older man, perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Jabel Robinson) will give way to me. I do not think very much follows from the little incident that occurred in Montreal. His Excellency, being a layman, possibly did not like to contradict Mr. McMaster, who is a very eminent lawyer, and that His Excelency did not agree with Mr. McMaster is quite apparent, because he did not act on his advice. The word upon which Mr. McMaster relied to give his opinion was possibly the word 'personally' in the old law, That word is omitted from this Bill, and therefore the same difficulty cannot occur again, and we may pass on to something else.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let us take the minister's suggestion.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. The question raised by the member for Labelle more than an hour ago is just a quibble on words, and if the Minister of Justice had expressed his opinion at the time he would not have discussed it further. The member for Labelle has been on his feet six times, and when I rose once I was put down, but I won't be put down now. The British North America Act is supreme in this country until the British government thinks proper to change it, and it would be ridiculous for us to seek to change it by legislation in this parliament. All this waste of time is not worth the money we are expending on it. I suppose the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was in his right, but at all events every time he gets an opportunity he avails of it to pitch into the British government and the British North America Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. BOURASSA. Even though I should hurt the feelings of my hon. friend (Mr

Jabel Robinson), I shall speak for the seventh time. In reply to the Minister of Justice, let me say that though it may not matter much legally speaking, yet it is in time of peace that we should make the law so clear that no difficulty shall arise about it in time of trouble. The Governor General seems to have accepted tacitly the argument of Mr. McMaster. Mr. McMaster's opinion was not based upon the word 'personally' as referring to the Sovereign, but it had reference to the personal powers of the Governor General that according to the law he could take hold of the militia. The word 'personally' in the old Act applied to the Queen, and Mr. McMaster did not suggest that the Queen should come over in person to command the militia. Mr. McMaster said that according to the law the Governor General personally had the right to do whatever he liked with the militia. The words referring to the Governor General, which Mr. McMaster based his opinion on, are left in the new Bill. That is what I object to. We should not leave words in the law that may give rise, in time of excitement, to misinterpretation, either by the government or by anybody else who would see fit to advise the Governor General outside of his legal advisers.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Who is Mr. McMaster; is his opinion supreme ?

Mr. GOURLEY. He announced it late in the morning, I hear.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. We have the Supreme Court, which is a higher authority than Mr. McMaster. I do not know who he is ; I never heard of him before, but I have heard of the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and I notice that he can discover all these little things that occur in connection with such questions. The member for Labelle may be right sometimes, but if so, he is generally right at the wrong time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that at the luncheon hour I took the liberty of suggesting to the leader of the opposition the proposition made by the Minister of Justice, and it met with his hearty approval.

Mr. INGRAM. This Bill omits any reference whatever to the naval militia and the naval forces of and in Canada. We were told recently by the First Minister that the government would bring down a naval Bill——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of one clause only, and that clause was to continue in force the old law so far as it refers to the naval militia.

Mr. INGRAM. And not only does the Marine Department take away some of the powers of the Department of Public Works, but it is to take the naval forces out of the control of the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House when I stated that the Colonial Defence Committee and the naval authorities in England strongly urged that any work in the direction of organizing a naval militia in Canada should be placed under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department, because there is already there the nucleus, in a small way, of course, of a naval militia.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Marine refused to state to the House the policy of the government on this important question, and now that the naval force is to be taken out of the control of the Minister of Militia, to whom are we to look for information ? In the estimates the government has asked for a vote of $7,500 for this naval force. Is that all the government proposes to do in regard to it ? Let us have some understanding as to what the policy of the government is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Within two or three days at most the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will have a full explanation of the policy of the government on this subject.

Amendment (Mr. Bourassa) negatived.

On section 7—minister to have control of military buildings, &c.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is the old law.

Mr. FOWLER. Does that include the building of drill sheds ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that is assigned to the Public Works Department.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it intended that the Militia Department shall take over the construction of armouries ? I understand that was recommended.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it might be convenient to have an arrangement by which buildings up to a certain cost, say $10,000, should be placed in the hands of the Militia Department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why should not the Minister of Militia have control of all the works in his department ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When it comes to the construction of buildings costing half a milliion of dollars, the Public Works Department is better equipped for the work.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you not have your own architect who designs all these buildings ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Certain works for defence declared public works.

Mr. BOURASSA. How are the powers of expropriation exercised ? Are they exercised directly by the department ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are exercised through the Department of Justice and the

proceedings take place in the Exchequer Court in the usual way.

Section agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that sections 9, 10, 11 and 12 be struck out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These provisions are all covered by the Criminal Code ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

On section 13—conversion of property on emergency.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I propose to strike out the words 'General Officer Commanding,' and insert in their place, 'Officer Commanding the Militia,' in order to make the clause read in harmony with the rest of the Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In case of the new proposition being carried out, would not the officer commanding the militia be the Inspector General ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In time of emergency there would be immediately a Commanding Officer appointed, it might be in a district, to exercise the powers under this clause.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think some word as 'general' should be there ; otherwise, what officer would it mean ? It might mean half a dozen different officers in a locality.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not see any objection to the expression 'general officer commanding' even if you change the law.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would suggest the words, 'officer commanding the militia.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In time of war an imperial officer commands, and you could scarcely call him an Officer Commanding the Militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He would be commanding the militia here. I think the intention is that every officer commanding a division should have this authority.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We might want to use this power instantly.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How would it do to say, 'the officer commanding the militia in the locality'?

Mr. ALCORN. How would it do to use these words : 'Whenever an emergency exists the officer commanding the militia of Canada or an officer commanding a unit of militia.' ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that 'Officer Commanding the Militia' will answer the purpose, because he can delegate his power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But we have none under the new provision. In a case of war, of course we would have an officer commanding, but an emergency might mean a riot or insurrection, when there would be no officer commanding.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There would have to be somebody.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Justice suggests the words 'in the locality.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, 'the officer commanding the militia in the locality' would do. I move that the clause be amended so that it will read :

But when an emergency exists, the officer commanding the militia in the locality, or any officer duly authorized, and so on.

Motion agreed to.

On section 13 (b.) compensation for land taken.

Mr. FOWLER. Should not the officer responsible give the party entitled to compensation some voucher ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When this was up before I suggested that some clause should be put in, ordering the officer who commandeered anything, to give some receipt or acknowledgment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would be a matter of regulation.

On section 15,

The following persons only shall be exempt from liability to service in the militia, and such exemption shall terminate in the case of a 'levée en masse' —

Members of the King's Privy Council for Canada ;

Judges of all courts of justice ;

Members of the Senate and House of Commons ;

Members of the executive councils of provinces ;

Members of provincial legislatures ;

Deputy ministers of the federal and provincial governments ;

Clergy and ministers of all religious denominations ;

Telegraph clerks in actual employment ;

Officers and clerks regularly employed in the collection of the revenue ;

Wardens and keepers of all public prisons and lunatic asylums ;

Professors in colleges and universities, and teachers in religious orders ;

Persons disabled by bodily or mental infirmity ;

The only son of a widow, being her only support ;

Pilots and apprentice pilots during the season of navigation ;

Persons who, from the doctrines of their religion, are averse to bearing arms or rendering personal military service,—under such conditions as are prescribed.

2 Half-pay and retired officers of the regular forces shall not be required to serve in the forces in a lower grade than that of their rank in such forces.

3 No person shall be entitled to exemption unless he has, at least one month before he claims such exemption, filed with the commanding officer within the limits whereof he resides, his affidavit, made before some justice of the peace, of the facts on which he rests his claim.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the words 'and such exception shall terminate in case of a levee en masse' be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that in the section 'wardens and keepers of all public prisons and lunatic asylums' the word 'officers' be substituted for 'keepers.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you exempt professors of colleges ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because we do not think it wise to interrupt the education of the young, and in this we are following the old Act.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not see why the professors or teachers should be exempt any more than the business men.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They can volunteer.

Mr. FOWLER. But they should be under as much compulsion as any other.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not desirable to break up a public institution. Such an institution is different from the store or office of a business man.

Mr. FOWLER. It is certainly a great hardship to have a man's business destroyed, quite as great as to have a man taken from his position as teacher.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But the hardship in the case of the teacher or professor would be not to the man himself, but to the pupils.

Mr. FOWLER. But it is not an injury that cannot be remedied. It only means an interruption, whereas the drafting of a business man means the destruction of his business. It seems to me, that the argument is all the other way so far as the teachers are concerned.

Mr. ALCORN. It would mean that in the case of a levée en masse, the pupils will be taken and the teachers will be left.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hon. gentlemen will see, by referring to section 14, that there are two things involved. The section provides first, that all the male inhabitants of Canada of the age of eighteen years and upwards and under sixty, and not exempt or disqualified shall be liable to serve in the militia. That is one thing. But it also provides that the Governor General may require all male inhabitants of Canada, capable of bearing arms, to serve in the case of a levée en masse. In this latter case there is no exemption.

Mr. FOWLER. In the case of a levée en masse, would you call out the clergy ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 21 of the Act provides that certain persons shall be exempt from enrolment and from active service, and among these are the clergy. But under section 14 of this Bill in the case of a levée en masse there is no exemption.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. What is meant by a levée en massse ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It means that all the inhabitants able to bear arms must go to the front.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Who is to take care of the women and children ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a matter at the discretion of the executive. Perhaps the women and children might be brought along with the others.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to move an amendment to section 15. As at present drafted, members of the Senate, and House of Commons, are exempted from service in the militia. I cannot imagine why this body which ought to set an example to the country, should desire exemption. I would take it as an insult to have such words appear in the statute. I would be in a very bad position in my country, to ask other people to rise and defend the country, if I were exempt myself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) is exempt, there is nothing to prevent his volunteering.

Mr. GOURLEY. No, this is invidious, very invidious. The members of the House of Commons should be like others under the law. Then, they will be able to go into the country, and exercise their influence, under proper conditions. It would be a most amazing thing, if the very leaders and directors of public opinion in Canada should be sulking while they asked the ordinary citizen to take up arms in the defence of the country. I regard this as a stigma. Why should we, sitting here as legislators, skulk behind a provision of the law ? We ought to make our position clear, and, I think the judges, who are also exempt under this section, should unite in protest against it. Why should a judge be exempt ? In the case of a conscription, the judiciary would not be very much affected—only three or four of them would be chosen in the whole of Canada. The wheels of justice would be but little interfered with by such a conscription, and, so far as the House of Commons in concerned, it would mean that only ten or fifteen of our members would be called. And, in order to

avoid that, it is proposed that we should adopt this section, which would be not in accord with the highest feelings of the people. This is a serious matter. It seems to affect the morale of the country, that the Senate and the House of Commons having the power of legislation should exempt themselves. I really feel like calling upon the self-respect and dignity of the House to eliminate this section. I leave the Senate to look after their own dignity, but I would move that the section be amended so as to remove this exemption of the House of Commons. I find that this exemption is not in the old Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it is.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have the old Act here and I cannot find it. The people of the time when this old Act was passed would not stultify themselves so far as to provide for such an exemption.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think we had better strike it out. It was not in the old Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Was it not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. Strike it out.

Mr. BOURASSA. If my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) wants to make the thing complete and be sure that there will be no possible exemption of the House of Commons, I would suggest to him to strike out from the fifteenth line the words 'persons disabled by bodily or mental infirmity.'

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not pretend to be very strong mentally. I am only here as an honest citizen.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to know whether I understood the Minister of Justice correctly. Does he hold that as it stands now there are no exemptions in case of a levée en masse?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. PUTTEE. It seems to me that is hardly a proper way to have it. The country needs people to serve it in all branches.

Mr. GOURLEY. The Minister of Militia regulates that when he calls out the levée.

Mr. PUTTEE. Even if that is done I can hardly see that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) is a good one.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) is right there. Of course I do not want to throw cold water on the patriotism of anybody, but we must have some common sense besides patriotism. Suppose that in the case of a levée en masse we keep no person to look after the jails.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. In that case the prisoners would go to the front too.

Mr. BOURASSA. But at the same time what will you do with the wardens and officers of lunatic asylumns?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That will be the responsibility of the executive.

Mr. BOURASSA. We must have common sense in these things. If the minister tells us that the Governor General may make some exemptions in a levée en masse all right, but if the law is to read as it is now according to clause 14, the Governor General cannot make any exemptions and every one in the country may be called out. It may create an awkward position.

Mr. FOWLER. If every one was called only a few would be selected. The Gospel says that 'many are called but few are chosen.' The Governor General in Council under this law has the right to call every one, but in the administration of that right the department would make such exceptions as might be necessary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In case of national emergency you cannot have any exceptions; you have to trust to the good sense of the administration of the day.

Mr. BOURASSA. I would like to know, not by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley), if the Governor General in Council or the Governor General will have any right to discriminate in case of a levée en masse.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is done by a military officer not by the Governor General. In that connection——

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not speaking to my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes). If he will excuse me I have the floor and I am putting a question politely to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am going to ask a question, and I do not think that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), with all his nerve, has the right to say when I shall or shall not speak. If he will be good enough to look after the disruptive elements of the empire it will keep him busy. Under the amendments no member of parliament can claim exemption. It should be clear that any militia man who is a member of this House should be free to use what language he chooses in conformity with the institutions of this House and of this country, and that no enactment here should possibly bring him under the control of any militia force which would prevent us having a free parliament.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My answer to the last difficult conundrum propounded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is that there is no exemption in

favour of a member of parliament. He would be obliged, with every one else, when called upon, to take service, but a summons to parliament would supersede the call to arms and he would be entitled to answer his summons to parliament. I am not familiar with the subject of the levée en masse, except in so far as my general reading applies, and I take it that a levée en masse refers to cases of national peril, national danger, when the people of the country capable of bearing arms must go to the assistance of the country. Of course it would be a matter for the exercise of discretion to see to it that the national peril was not increased by allowing the lunatics and criminals to escape, and leaving the women and children unprovided for. That would be adding to the national burden and it will be assumed that those in charge will see that all these interests are provided for.

Mr. FOWLER. This same amendment should be made to apply to the provincial legislatures.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that if one goes out the other should go out.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Provincial legislators go out.

Mr. BOURASSA. Do I understand that the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) is accepted ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not think it is proper. It is simply giving way——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, if the time should come when it would be necessary for any one to go to the front, I think I would be there before many people who talk war all the time in this House. But I think it is perfectly ridiculous to give way to an appeal to prejudice of that kind. I think it is necessary for parliament to keep itself going, just as necessary as the other public services, and therefore, if we are prepared to exempt the judges, the deputy ministers, the professors of colleges and universities, it would be just as proper to keep the members of parliament, both federal and provincial, in the list of exemptions. I think it is giving way to a small appeal to militarism which is not going to appeal to many sensible people outside of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Sir Frederick Borden moves to insert the following subclause :

Members of the naval militia, members of the police force and fire brigade in incorporated cities, towns and villages——

Mr. FOWLER. In many cases 'fire brigade' would cover the whole male population.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think not.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I know that in my own town practically the whole male population belongs to the fire brigade. I think it is true of every small town.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We might say 'cities.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How would it do to say 'permanently employed.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very well, that was the idea I had.

Firemen permanently employed in incorporated cities, towns and villages.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By the police force I meant the officers and men permanently employed in the police force.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. If you take every man away what is the use of leaving the police force at home ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I object to the amendment proposed. That proposed by the minister was all right, that the police forces and fire brigades should be exempted. If you make it read in that way it will give exemption only to the fire brigades and police forces of the large towns and cities where policemen and firemen are employed all the year round, and you will place policemen and firemen in the smaller villages in an awkward position. They have very small fire brigades and only three or four policemen in these small villages, and they have to do something else to earn their living. If you force them into the militia you impose a hardship upon them. I do not see why you should pass legislation for the large cities and not for the small villages. I understood that an amendment was proposed to cover, not only the large cities, but the small villages as well, but you strike out the small villages and towns from the benefit of that provision. I know that in my own province in many places the fire brigades and police forces are not permanently employed. They are supposed to give their services alternately. They have fire brigades in several of the towns and villages in Quebec in which one man will give his services for so many days in the month. They organize voluntary fire brigades of eight or ten men, who look after the safety of the village from fire, and at the same time earn their living.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is proposed to amend the clause by adding the following paragraph :

Members of the naval militia and members of police force and fire brigade permanently employed in incorporated cities, towns and villages.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister may remember that I gave him notice of a

proposed amendment, that people who have religious objections to taking up arms shall be required to furnish a substitute or bear any expense in providing the substitute incurred by the government. I do not believe in interfering with peoples' religious doctrines or forcing them to fight, but I think that any person who enjoys the protection of the government and of the militia should be required to provide a substitute.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is simply a re-enactment of the law as we have it. Paragraph 3 provides that persons of different forms of religious belief—

Shall be exempt from such service when balloted in time of peace or war, upon such conditions and under such regulations as the Governor in Council from time to time prescribes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then you can make regulations to cover the case of a substitute.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The exemption shall be provided for by regulation.

Mr. BOYD. What is the necessity for putting this in at all? I do not see why you should publish it to the world that people having a certain religious belief may come here and be exempt. I think it is sufficient to deal with the emergency when it arises. We have thousands of people in Manitoba who will not take up arms, and I think this provision could be left out and the matter dealt with when the emergency arises.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They came into the country knowing that this provision was in our militia law, and I think it is only fair that we should continue the provision, which is to be under the control and subject to regulations to be issued by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. INGRAM. Apart from that, I understand that the Mennonites came in some years ago with the understanding that they would not be asked to take up arms.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under the Militia Act every person bearing a certificate from the Society of Quakers, Mennonites or Tunkers, is exempt under such conditions and under such regulations as the Governor in Council prescribes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If you will look at section 2, you will see that 'prescribed' means prescribed by this Act or by regulations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Well, then, you need not amend that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is all right.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What I want to impress upon the hon. minister is that in his regulations provision shall be made for that point. These regulations, I presume, will be submitted to parliament.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; under the law they are obliged to be submitted to parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I hope that point will be covered.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The regulations will be made before the Act goes into force.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before this clause is carried, I would like to point out to the hon. minister that persons who claim exemption have, under paragraph 3 of section 15, to give their notice at least one month before they claim their exemption, and that by section 16 they have to give proof of the ground upon which they ask exemption. Does that mean that in case of the organization of a corps in any district persons who may be exempted or who may be called are, if they have not filed their exemption one month before, bound to serve for the time for which they are called, and that the exemption will only apply when they are called the second time?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The service is not compulsory.

Mr. BOURASSA. There is a clause in the Bill which allows the Governor in Council to call people up for enrolment in any district of the country in order to fill the ranks when there are not sufficient volunteers. Therefore, it is useless to say enrolment is voluntary. It is voluntary as long as there are people enough willing to engage. Suppose the Governor General in Council decides to organize a regiment in a district of the country in which the people do not come forward to enlist, you have all the powers here necessary to enforce them to come in within their classes. You call the first class, then the second class, then the third class and then the fourth class, and then they are enrolled by ballot. Suppose a man is called by ballot and is enrolled, should he have filed his claim for exemption at least one month before his enrolment? He has not filed his exemption because nobody thinks of filing this exemption and if he does not desire to serve voluntarily what would be his position? Will they be subject to the enrolment, and will their proof be useless if they have not given notice one month before they are called.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think so.

Mr. MONET. If that is the case, as I understand the Minister of Justice to say it is, it would be very hard indeed on certain persons. While the general principle prevails that every citizen is supposed to know the law, yet it would be rather an extreme view to take of it, that every citizen should know that the clauses of this Bill oblige him to give notice one month before even he may suppose that he may be called. I believe this provision should be stricken out of the Bill.

Mr. BOURASSA. Or else, there should be a provision that when a man is called upon to be enrolled by ballot, he should have a certain delay to prove exemption.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would be covered by section 33 of the Bill which gives the Governor General in Council power to make regulations.

Mr. BOURASSA. But suppose they do not make regulations. This Bill will provide for one month's notice and you incorporate that in the Act, and do not leave it to regulations.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It may be necessary to enroll the militia at any time without thirty days' notice. There is something to be said on both sides, and I think this matter can be left to the regulations.

Mr. MONET. We ought to be informed that there is some great pressing necessity for such a clause as this.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This law has been on the statute-book for forty or fifty years and no hardship has ever resulted from it. The suggestion of the Minister of Justice is the correct one, namely, that this matter will be dealt with by regulation.

Section agreed to.

Section 17 agreed to.

Section 18 stricken out.

On section 19,

Cadets or cadet corps shall not be liable to service in the militia in any emergency save only in the case of a 'levée en masse.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved to strike out the words 'cadets or.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there any definition of what a cadet corps is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The reason I ask is that a great many public schools are wishing to form a cadet force corps.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should you strike out the word 'cadets ?'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is unnecessary; 'cadets corps' covers the whole thing and later on the Act deals with the organization of the cadet corps.

Section as amended agreed to.

At Six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

On section 20—classes of militiamen.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is exactly the same as the present law.

Section agreed to.

On section 21—division of militia into active and reserve.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—Practically no change.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—period of service.

Mr. MONET. Many young men who enlist for three years' service drop out after one year. It is perfectly useless for a young man to go to camp for only one year. I think the terms of the engagement should be strictly enforced.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with my hon. friend that it is desirable that young men should continue in the service for the full term; but I do not agree with him that it does not do a young man good to go for only one year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the increase in the pay will induce them to continue for the full term. You cannot force men out.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. If you force a young man to go to camp when he perhaps loses a good job for doing so, you will be unable to get another young man from the same neighbourhood to go to camp afterwards. I think the increased pay will have the desired effect.

Section agreed to.

On section 23—present corps continued.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Practically the same as the old law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is applicable to the permanent corps, I presume ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 24—compulsory and voluntary retirement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is nothing there about dismissing an officer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is as wide as the old law, providing for six months' notice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is perfectly right to provide that a man be permitted to retire on giving his commanding officer six months' notice. Of course, the Governor in Council always has authority to dismiss a man for cause, and I do not know that it is necessary to provide for it in the law. Of course, it is understood that it is to be for cause ?

Sir FREDERICK. BORDEN. Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 25—discharge on completion of service.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is new.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I would like to ask the minister exactly what that means. When the term of enlistment expires, is a man *ipso facto* discharged from the service, or must he make application for his discharge.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He goes as a matter of course.

Section agreed to.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the present time he has to purchase his discharge. Under this clause he would require only to give six months' notice.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move that this clause, paragraph 'a' shall not apply to the permanent corps.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 26—military districts and subdivisions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved to strike out this clause and insert the following in its stead :

The Governor in Council may direct that any portion of Canada shall be a military district for the purposes of this Act and may cause two or more districts to be grouped together for the purposes of command and administration, and may divide any military district into such sub-districts, brigade, regimental or company divisions as may appear expedient.

Motion agreed to.

On section 27—constitution of active militia.

Mr. BOURASSA. I beg to move that the following section be inserted between sections 27 and 28 :

That the total peace establishment of the active militia shall not exceed fifty thousand men.

Under the old Act there was no limit. There was no limitation provided. But in the clause providing for the training of men, clause 58, there was a limitation of the number to 45,000 active militia men. It limited the power of the government to order the training of more than 45,000. This clause is omitted in the present Bill, so that in the Bill which is before us there is no limit whatever to the number of corps that may be organized by the minister, and there is no limitation whatever to the peace or war establishment of the militia, no limitation to the number of men that may be drilled every year. I think it is about time that we should pause a little and reflect on the proposed increase of our militia, and the expenditure connected with it. I admit that we have been passing through a period of military enthusiasm, which has been kept up in this House by a few military gentlemen like the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and a few laymen like my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley), who perhaps would not care to enroll themselves in the army, but who are still making a good deal of stir about army and militia matters. But the sensible people of this country, the business men and the farming community, are beginning to realize that we are going a little too far. Of course I am not going to touch the military question per se, I am not going to say what number of men we require to be trained in Canada, either for peace or for war. But I think I can agree with one statement that was made in the Toronto 'News,' which said that if we considered this question from one point of view we have altogether too small a force, and if we considered it from another point of view, we have altogether too large a force. If we mean to organize an army to resist the United States, which is the only country that we are likely to be at war with, there is no doubt that 30,000, or 100,000, or 200,000 would not be sufficient. It has been suggested that small countries like Belgium, Holland and Switzerland, have much larger armies than we have and that we should follow their example. Well, the Toronto 'Globe' has made a calculation on that basis, and concludes that if we followed exactly in the footsteps of those countries and were to support a military establishment proportionately as large as theirs, we should have an army of between 26,000,000 and 40,000,000 to do it. The establishment at present proposed, authorized by the Governor in Council on the 23rd of February last, provides for a peace establishment of 4,871 officers, and 41,162 privates, a total of 46,033 men. The present establishment is 3,406 officers, 39,241 privates, a total of 42,647. It will be noticed that the greatest increase is in the number of the officers. I presume the purpose is, though I do not pretend to be a judge of such matters, to have such a staff of officers on a peace footing as would be sufficient in case a war establishment were organized. In that case the total war establishment would be ; officers 4,885, privates 99,733, a total of 104,618. Therefore the amendment that I propose would merely place a limitation on a further increase. It does not decrease the figure proposed by the minister and approved by the government, on the contrary it would still leave a margin of about 4,000 officers and men on a peace footing. Therefore I do not see what objection the Minister of Militia can have to the amendment which I propose. I think it would contribute to reassure the public, to allay that feeling of uneasiness that is growing among the peaceful part of our community, which I pretend composes the majority of our people, who fear that we are launching into a large military organization and a large military expenditure. My amendment would still leave a force sufficient for the purpose which seems to be contemplated by the min-

ister and the government, while at the same time it would show that we are not prepared to give a free hand to any minister or any government, at present or in the future, to organize an active militia of any number they please. I hope the minister will see his way to accept that amendment, which does not propose to reduce the number that has been approved by Governor in Council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The statute now existing to which my hon. friend refers provides that 40,000 is the minimum number that should be trained ; it is not at all a limitation.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is what I said. I said there was no limitation at present except as regards the number to be trained.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understood him to say there was a limitation to the number that could be trained. I have taken the trouble to look up the old debates, and to read a speech made by Sir Geo. Cartier in 1868 in introducing his Bill, which was modified in later years by Sir Adolphe Caron. I find that Sir Geo. Cartier made this remark :

> He expected under the provisions of this Bill to provide that the number of trained men within the Dominion should not be less than 40,000.

So he was providing for the compulsory training of 40,000 men. Sir Adolphe Caron, in introducing his amendments in 1883, said:

> I have taken the number of men as laid down in the original Bill.

He introduced a provision by which the number of 45,000 might be drilled by authority of Order in Council. Now it seems to me that a limitation of this section is undesirable. I think it is undesirable that any particular number of men should be named in the Bill as necessary to be drilled. That is a matter that should be left to parliament and to the government to regulate from time to time as the government may deem expedient. My hon. friend knows quite as well as I do that no training can be done, no drilling can be done, without the authority of parliament. That is an expensive operation, that requires money, and each year we have to come to parliament and make a statement of the number of men we propose to train and we ask for money for that purpose. We are absolutely tied up and limited to the amount of money which parliament sees fit to vote us. I think it is undesirable that any limitation of this kind should be placed in this Bill. In a clause which will come later, I have placed a limitation to the number of the active militia. The active militia, as my hon. friend has shown, at the present time, is somewhere about 45,000 officers and men, about the number named in the present Bill ; and I propose to give to the Governor in Council power, under a clause which we will come to later on, to call out the whole of the active militia, subject of course, as it always must be, to the vote of parliament.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am glad to concur in the view taken by the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). I am glad that there are many subjects on which members of parliament can agree, affecting the general interests of the country. I concur in the proposition of the Minister of Militia and will go further. I see that a malicious effort is being made to persuade the people that because we desire to get into a state of preparation for defence we are introducing militarism. I do not know what militarism means ; I cannot give it an intellectual meaning as applied to this country. I know what it means in the old world, but in regard to many countries where they have been overridden by militarism I am bound to say, as a student, that I believe it has proved a benefit. I believe that the great and unprecedented advance that Germany has made in commercial progress in the past twenty-five or thirty years, has been due, in a large measure, to her system of conscription. And I would not be averse, while glorying in freedom, while believing that every man in this country should be free, to the establishment of some measure of conscription. I believe that the German government has given to that nation great power and virility given it great creative power, by taking young men at the age of fourteen, when perhaps they would be idle about the streets and putting them for four years in the army. In that way they are not only given military drill but are given a splendid mechanical education and after they leave the army they are ready to enter factories. Why has Germany become a great manufacturing country in twenty-five years ? Because these men are trained in the army to habits of industry and discipline and are given a good mechanical training so that when they leave the army they are fit, with very little training, to go into a factory and become producers. If Germany has risen in twenty-five years from a weak commercial state into a powerful commercial state that result is due to militarism.

Mr. MONET. What about the progress that has been made by the United States ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Some hon. gentlemen go about the country thinking evidently that the people of Canada are under-educated and under-bred. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that in the county which I have the honour to represent there is not one man who possesses less intelligence than any man in the House of Commons of Canada, and if I should undertake to indulge in clap-trap of that kind, in talk of militarism I would have a dozen men asking me : What do you mean by mi-

litarism ? I would ask these hon. gentlemen or any hon. gentleman in this House : What do you mean by militarism ?

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Does the hon. gentleman want a definition ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I would not expect it.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I think I might suggest one.

Mr. GOURLEY. You cannot possibly understand what militarism means, but I would be most happy to hear your definition.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I think it is rather more than adequate military protection.

Mr. GOURLEY. That may be your meaning of it and I must say that I would attach to it a somewhat similar meaning. But that meaning is not the meaning attached to it by these gentlemen who use it for claptrap political purposes. I was surprised that Sir William Mulock, ordinarily an intelligent and a very sensible man should have gone to Toronto some months ago and made a speech in which he talked about militarism. It was done evidently to appeal to the vulgar passions of the people. He must have fancied that the people of Ontario were absolutely uneducated and untrained in mental processes. He should have been called down by one half his audience because it was clearly not an appeal to the intelligence of the country but to its prejudices. Sir William Mulock and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) do not use the word militarism in the sense in which Colonel Thompson uses it. The meaning they attempt to convey by it is that if you vote any sums to the militia of this country you are going to be ground down by the heel of a military tyranny which you cannot control, you are going to be put under the control of an autocrat. This is militarism in the odious sense and it is in that sense that these gentlemen seek to have the word understood in this country. Where parliament controls the expenditure of the militia every year and can alter the militia laws every twenty-four hours, it is worse than idle to talk of militarism. I want to see every man in Canada prepared ; if war comes we wish to be on top. What was Japan fifteen or twenty years ago, before they became a military people ? Unheard of, almost, and despised when heard of. To-day, if they win out in this war, they will occupy the proudest position among the nations of the earth because they are a military people, a people trained in the defence of their country against all odds. I want Canada to be in a similar position. I do not want war, but if war is thrust upon us I want this country to win glory in the way that Japan is winning it in her fight with Russia. But, Sir, if men like the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) were to have their way we would be like the poor Chinese, the object of contempt the world over. They abhor militarism and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and those gentlemen who think as he does would have us pursue a course which in a few years would reduce us to the state of the despised and despicable Chinese, and we would be properly despised as they are.

I want my boys as soon as they become old enough to go into the militia for physical training, for training in habits of discipline, because they will get it in the militia better than in any other way. I glory in the military institution of the country. It gives back-bone and discipline and education to the people, and I say that money, no matter how much, if wisely spent upon the militia of this country, is money spent in the education of the youth of this country, in training them for the high duties of citizenship. Good military training is next to good university training, and the two should go together. While the mind is trained the body should be trained also.

It should be made active and disciplined, ready to respond to the highest impulses of human life. Therefore, I support the minister in his proposal ; I hope the militia of this country will finally embrace every man in it, and I hope that the age of admission will be reduced from eighteen years to fourteen years so that a boy at the age when he is likely to be learning to smoke cigarettes and to be idle about the streets may be taken into camp and trained to habits of discipline. I venture to say that if that system prevails the people of Nova Scotia and of Canada when they leave the militia will be better able to discharge the duties of citizenship than in any other way. I hope the force will be enlarged until it embraces all the able-bodied men in the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is not going to reply to the castigation he has received, I have a few imperfect remarks which I should like to make. I am at a loss to understand the tactics of that hon. gentleman. We all know that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has no thought of his own outside of some of his directors to pop up and express these peculiar sentiments from time to time. He has enunciated the policy here to-night that there should be 50,000 volunteer soldiers in Canada. I cannot understand what his meaning may be. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) not long since, in a public address in the city of Ottawa, advocated that the rifle should be placed in the hands of 1,000,000 men in Canada.

Mr. MONET. That is the very reason why we want to support the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monet) will have the opportunity of taking his own liege lord, the right hon. Prime Minister, to task, because, upon a very recent date, when he was anxious to stand well before the public and make himself a little more loyal, more British and more patriotic than his actions were supposed to lead the public to believe him to be, he came out and stated that he wanted those militia companies in every city, town, village, hamlet and rural district in the Dominion of Canada. He endorsed the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior. Then, we have two members of the government in favour of having from a million or a million and a quarter of trained men in the Dominion of Canada. I stand here to say I heartily endorse that proposition. Let every young lad of the age from 12 to 14 years receive his training in militia drill. It has the physical advantage of making young fellows keep their heads up, march well and understand how to control themselves and how to control others judiciously. These are all advantages from the view point of citizenship. Then, look at the ranks of criminals in Canada. To the credit of the militia force be it said that, although they are exposed in camps and in times of jubilation to go to extremes, the records of criminality in Canada show that members of the militia force of this country are conspicuous by their absence from the ranks of criminals. All these are arguments in favour of the militia force. Now, the hon. member for Labelle, with the bee in his bonnet, which has been buzzing there for a long time, is endeavouring to impress upon the people of the province of Quebec that there is danger of an inundation of militarism. He is preparing for the elections, so that he may be able to go around and tell the people how he has been anxious to keep down the military spirit which is being forced upon us by these military foreigners and by people from other provinces in the Dominion of Canada. The militia system is the antithesis of militarism. The policy of the Liberal party at one time—I do not know whether it was under the regime of my hon. friend from Victoria, Nova Scotia (Mr. Ross) or not—was to do away with the militia force of this country, and to establish instead a standing army of from 4,000 to 5,000 men. We know that a number of men who were in parliament at that time on the Liberal side advocated it very strongly. It even received serious consideration at the hands of the government, but the better element prevailed, and those who opposed it saw that a standing army in a young country like this was the beginning of a spirit of militarism, but a proper spirit triumphed and the militia system was continued. I am very glad to know that two members at least of the government within very recent times have expressed themselves as being in favour of placing from 1,000,000 to 1,250,000 militiamen on duty in the Dominion of Canada. It may involve a somewhat heavy bill. I do not know whether the right hon. Prime Minister figured it up. They talk of the suppressed report involving an expenditure of $12,000,000 or, as some say, $35,000,000; but, even though the policy of the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of the Interior were to involve an expenditure of, say, even $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 for placing rifles in the hands of the volunteers, I maintain that it will be money well expended, provided our young men are trained to handle these rifles and understand manœuvring sufficiently well to make them a mobile force in the field.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not able to accept all the explanations which have been given by the hon. Minister of Militia, to say nothing of the opinions which have been expressed by the two hon. gentlemen who have last spoken. But, as far as this amendment is concerned, it does not propose to interfere with the policy of the government. If I understand the policy of the government so far, it is that they want to induce a greater number of people to engage in target practice. I understand that the right hon. Prime Minister, at the reception that was given to him in the camp at Ottawa, wanted a greater number of young men in our villages and hamlets to know how to shoot. I am in favour of that idea. I am ready to support the clause which the hon. Minister of Militia is going to bring in to deal with rifle clubs; in fact, I do not think I am guilty of any breach of confidence in saying that some months ago when this Bill was introduced I told the hon. minister privately that I entirely approved of his idea of organizing rifle clubs, and that I would be happy to extend help to him, in so far as the province of Quebec was concerned, to induce young men to engage in shooting practice in their villages. But what I am opposed to is the government organizing a greater number of regiments of regular militia. I do not think 50,000 or 25,000 more men are of any use to this country from a defensive point of view. I think it is perfectly absurd to contend that we should organize this country on a war footing to resist an attack presently from the United States of America. I think it is perfectly absurd to say that we have that possible occurrence in view when we discuss our militia matters. What I think perfectly legitimate and proper is to keep up in our population a proper spirit as to their duties in regard to the defence of the country, and to endeavour to induce a greater number of our young men, without drawing them from their peaceful avocations, to take up rifle practice. I think that is the foundation principle of our defence. To go to a heavy military expenditure, to increase the number of our militiamen, to buy a larger number of cannon or rifles for the militia, I think is time and money lost. I admit that a

greater number of militiamen could be organized under the present law and that the militia can show a great number of fine fellows, but there is no doubt that while the militia has among it a great number of fine people, there is also a great number of good-for-nothings and loafers. There is no doubt that a number of young men are drawn into the militia because of the uniform and the camp, and certainly some of these men are not useful to the country. I do not think it is a proper policy to try to instil the idea into the minds of young people that they are more useful to their country, that there is more glory to them, that they can despise the farming community, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has been doing all this afternoon by insulting the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that they are going to improve their position, that they are going to render greater service to their country, that they are going to gather more glory for themselves by entering the militia, by putting a plume on their head, by carrying a sword and by going to camp at the country's expense for from twelve to thirty days. I think that is not sound doctrine. Of course, I will admit that there must be a certain number of militiamen, but I think there should be a limitation to that policy. When it comes to the organization of rifle clubs, I am ready to join hands with the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence and to try and organize them as rapidly as we can throughout the whole Dominion.

As far as the cadet corps is concerned, I am also of the same mind. Of course, I would have opposed strongly the clause of this Bill referring to cadet corps as it came forward in the first draft imposing an obligation to serve in the militia. But since the minister has withdrawn that provision, and the cadet organization is perfectly voluntary, I have no objection.

I differ from the Minister of Militia with regard to the control of parliament. Time and again for the eight years I have been here, I have heard members of this House declare that it was absurd to increase our expenditure on militia, but nevertheless, they voted for increased expenditure when the government proposed it. If I were in the English parliament I might rely upon the independence of the House to revolt against what might be proposed by a minister of the Crown, but that is not so under the conditions in Canada. Without flattery to the present Minister of Militia, I may say that I have reason to rely on his common sense and judgment. I believe that between two sessions of parliament he would not create a number of militia battalions, and then come back to parliament and ask for ratifications of his act. But, we are not passing legislation here for one minister or for one government; we are passing legislation for all ministers and all governments in time to come. If in years from now—years far off I hope for the peace and happiness of Canada—the Conservatives should come to power, and a great military man like the member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) should become Minister of Militia, what might be expected if the law placed such power in his hands? There is no limitation in the law, and if we had to rely only on the common sense of such a minister, it might be a dangerous thing for Canada. We should look to the future when we are passing such legislation as this. We have not always had sensible men as ministers, and no doubt if the opposition should come to power, the member for North Victoria would make a strenuous pull for the portfolio of Militia and Defence.

Mr. LOGAN. And the member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley).

Mr. BOURASSA. The member for Colchester would probably be his outside adviser or general inspector. If such a man were minister, he might under the authority of this Act, create ten or twenty new battalions during the recess of parliament, and then come here asking parliament to foot the bill. I do not think we can infer from past experience that the majority in parliament would reject the proposition of the minister and would force the government out of power rather than ratify the expenditure. I am not prepared to say that this great faithfulness of the majority to the government is wrong; I am not prepared to say that our party system is worse than the English system, but the conditions here being such as they are, it is not sufficient precaution to say that because parliament has to ratify an expenditure it provides a sufficient safeguard. I admit that when Sir George Cartier proposed the present militia law he did not impose any limitation on the total number of the militia, but in those days the spirit of the country was different. There was then no danger of a military craze in Canada. To-day there is no use denying that certain of our public men and certain of our newspapers, Conservative and Liberal, have for ten years been working up a military spirit in this country. The fact that only this afternoon the Minister of Militia allowed himself to be guided by the members for Victoria and Colchester, and accepted amendments from them is a proof that even a strong Liberal government is apt to give way to pressure from high Tory and strong military sources. We should, embody the necessary safeguards to the people in this law and not leave it to chance. It may be that the farming community or the business community of this country is an inferior class; it may be that the military men are the only independent, sensible, and patriotic citizens; but after all, the business people and the farmers have a right to be heard

in this parliament. I am ready to give my vote and lend my influence in my country and my province to secure endorsation for any sensible proposition of the Minister of Militia towards maintaining the defences of this country, but when I hear that we should be prepared so that on declaration of war by the United States we can rush at once to the defence of the country the proposition is absurd. No sensible man in Canada will say that the parliament of Canada and the people of Canada should incur the expenditure necessary to place Canada on a war footing, so as to render her able to cope with the United States. What we have to do is to rely as long as we can on the good common sense of the Canadian people, the British people, and the American people. That is our strongest defence for the time being. We ought to vote as much money as we can afford for the purpose of increasing the population of this country and developing its resources, before we commence to spend money on rifles and cannons for a great miltary force. If we are to keep up the proper spirit amongst the people, let us teach our young men how to shoot, which I suppose is one of the first requisites of defence, but let us not bring our young men off their farms and from their useful occupations to enter military camps. It may be that military organizations will increase the standard of education as we are told, but from what I have heard and seen in this parliament—I will make exceptions to the general rule—it does not seem to me, that the fact that a man belongs to the militia necessarily shows that he is a man of superior judgment, great common sense, or even good education. We have militiamen in this House; some of them are sensible—some of them I shall not qualify. We have farmers and business men in this House and many of them are sensible and some of them are not. I am not going to classify myself. I might even be ready to accept the definition given by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) as to my mental and patriotic qualifications, but as to that I will rely on the judgment of the good people who have sent me here, and they are no less sensible and no less patriotic than the electors who have returned the members of Victoria and Colchester to seats in this parliament. I will go further and I will say that there are a great many members of this House—well perhaps not a great many—but there are several members of this House, not French Canadians, but English; not from the province of Quebec but from Ontario and elsewhere, who at the bottom of their hearts know that it is a foolish military policy we have been indulging in for the past few years. Were it not for that peculiar sentiment of party allegiance and party fidelity which exists in this parliament, these members would say so frankly and sincerely and the time will come when they will be obliged to speak out because the more the people of Canada know of this question the wider their eyes are open to it. The entire Liberal party in the province of Quebec has been denouncing military expenditure. In the elections of 1896 one of the strongest war cries in the province of Quebec was that the Conservative party were betraying the interests of Canada because they wanted to buy one million dollars worth of rifles and cannons.

Mr. GOURLEY. It was a very false cry.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not now dealing with my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley); I am dealing with my friends on this side of the House, and I say that the Liberal party in 1896, previously, not only in the province of Quebec but in other provinces, have stood as a party of peace, progress, and development. We have reproached the Conservative party for spending so much money upon armament. We have said it was a useless expenditure, and it was foolish for this nation to arm in the hope of contending against a neighbouring nation of 80,000,000 people. Therefore it is that I say we have no right to give way to a few noisy Conservatives who may stand up in this House and upbraid the Liberals with the cry of treason. We have successfully withstood such tactics for many years, and we can withstand them longer. These gentlemen tell us now of the great loyalty of Alexander Mackenzie, but the old Grits in this House must remember that time and again Alexander Mackenzie was charged with disloyalty and treason. But Alexander Mackenzie withstood it, and the Liberals have withstood it, and they can continue to withstand it. It is therefore a mistake on the part of the Liberal government and the Liberal party to go back on their footsteps, especially with regard to this question, and to be dictated to from Tory and jingo quarters as to what their policy should be.

I think it is not an exhibition of Liberal independence to accept amendments at the hands of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) or the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley). Outside perhaps of those two counties, I do not think it would be considered a piece of great judgment on the part of the government to accept their military policy from those two gentlemen. In some small quarters of this country those hon. gentlemen may be considered to be great lights in parliament and the proper men to consult in regard to the military policy of this government; but as a general rule I think it will be considered that the Liberal party, by sticking to their principles and their pledges to the people, will do more to get the support not only of Liberals but of common-sense Canadians, than by taking the advice of the hon. member for Victoria and

the hon. member for Colchester, and delighting the military party by adopting their jingo policy. As the years go by, I believe it will be acknowledged that I am no worse Canadian or British subject than any member of this House who talks more about his loyalty. It is as a Canadian and a true British subject that I oppose an increased military expenditure in this country. The worst service we can give to the Canadian people and to the British empire is to launch the country upon a policy of militarism that will lead the American people to reply. If we boast that we are going to organize more regiments and build a navy for this country—that we are going to organize ourselves so as to be able to stand a fight against the United States—can we be surprised if any of the border states of New York, Michigan, Minnesota or Dakota, shall wish to expend as much on naval and military organization as we do? Instead of rendering a service to Great Britain by launching on a policy of this kind, rather than pursuing a peaceful policy, we shall be sowing the germs of greater embarrassment for Great Britain and the British government. My hon. friends who talk so much about their loyalty made a good deal of noise last year at the time of the Alaskan boundary award. If the majority of this House or the majority of the people of this country had been of the mind of the hon. member for Colchester, it would not have taken a week to have launched the whole empire into a war with the United States. By being peaceful and dignified, by pursuing a Canadian policy in our military affairs as well as in other affairs, we shall certainly render a greater service to the British empire than we shall do by continually boasting about our loyalty, and trying to provoke animosity on the part of foreign nations, the United States especially. Therefore, without interfering at all with the plans of the hon. Minister of Militia, I think the amendment I now propose should commend itself to every sensible man in this House who wants to see a peaceful policy predominate in this country instead of that kind of warlike and noisy policy which we have been unfortunately following in the last few years.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. As I understand the law at present existing, it is that we are under obligation to train 40,000 militiamen in Canada every year. It was in the year 1868, some thirty-six years ago, that that was considered the least force upon which Canada could rely for the preservation of order within her boundaries and the protection of her territory from foreign invasion; and now the hon. member for Labelle, by the amendment he proposes, wishes to limit our forces to 50,000 men.

Mr. BOURASSA. On a peace establishment.

Mr. BOURASSA.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. That is what I am speaking of. As a matter of fact, we do not propose to re-enact the old law, compelling us to drill 40,000 men per year. If the law suggested by the Minister of Militia carries, we may drill very much fewer than 40,000. We may drill only 10,000 or 15,000 per year if we see fit, or we may drill more, if we see fit. To my mind this whole question is one of the power of the purse, and that is still under the control of the House of Commons. I know something of the militiamen of this country and their spirit; but I will say this, and it is no disgrace to them, that you will not find them turning out to drill in tens of thousands unless you pay them; so that we have the say whether they will turn out or not. I was surprised at the inconsistency of some of the statements of the hon. member for Labelle. I was delighted to hear him say that he was in favour of the establishment of rifle clubs far and near throughout Canada, and that in his own section of the country he would encourage the learning of the art of rifle shooting. But I was more than surprised to hear him say that he set his face against any further expenditure for the purchase of arms. I ask the hon. members what would it avail if we taught the young men how to shoot, and then sent them to do their shooting with pitchforks? That is what it would amount to if, after training them to the use of arms, we had only 40,000 stand of arms in Canada, which is our present supply. This Bill is not making very rapid progress, and it is not my intention to prolong the debate; but I thought it necessary to make these observations, and one more. I was disappointed when the hon. member for Labelle—I trust carried away by his own eloquence, and not appreciating the meaning of the words he used—said that we must admit that the militia draws to itself a great number of loafers. Sir, I resent that. For seventeen years I have been closely associated with the militia of Canada; I was for a number of years in a city regiment, and I have been for a number of years in a country regiment; I have never missed a camp of instruction in fourteen years; I have been in the Niagara camp many times; and I can say that that is a most unjust reflection on the militia of Canada. In so large a force there may be a few loafers some of the sheep may be black, or with a slight south-down tinge about them; but the assertion that it attracts a large number of loafers I deny emphatically, from that long experience and close attention which I have given to the subject.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Labelle, like myself, is not a military man, and he finds fault with those on this side of the House who offer, as he says, Tory and jingo suggestions. Well, I have listened to

military men on the government side of the House ; I have listened to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat state that even after our expenditure of millions of money on the militia force of the country, we had only the shadow of a skeleton of a force. If any hon. gentleman on this side of the House has offered a suggestion, it is for the purpose of bettering the militia force of this country, and I believe we are all willing to incur a reasonable expenditure for that purpose. I have never heard any one on this side agitate for the establishment of an unreasonable army or to go into unreasonable expenditure for an extravagantly large force. But I have heard the policy advocated of having a number of men drilled, what you would call skeleton corps, who could be used for the purpose of instructing others who had not their advantage. Such a suggestion as that has been offered from this side. So far as the rifles are concerned, the hon. member for Labelle must admit that if we have not sufficient rifles to-day, we will have to spend money to buy more. If he is in favour of our young men being trained to shoot, he must admit that we shall have to purchase more rifles. On this side we are in favour of encouraging shooting among our young men and of developing the militia in every reasonable way, and I do not see that there is any jingoism in taking that stand. Before I take my seat, I wish to condemn the methods taken in 1896 of denouncing the late government for the expenditure of a certain sum on the purchase of rifles. If the hon. member for Labelle took part in that agitation, I do not think that he was acting in the interests of this country or that he was doing anything of which he ought to feel proud as a Canadian.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I shall not take up much time in discussing the subject which the hon. member for Labelle has brought before the House, because no one takes that hon. gentleman seriously. It must have been very galling to him this afternoon to find that the amendment which he proposed, and which he supported by a very eloquent speech, had no one to vote for it but himself. Not even our good friend from Napierville (Mr. Monet) would give my hon. friend his support. We can easily understand how ruffled must have been his feelings. He has endeavoured to show that it is the terrible Tory party which is responsible for all the ills the militia is heir to in connection with this Bill. It was the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) and myself who led the House this afternoon and licked the Minister of Justice into line as well as the gallant colonel from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) the Minister of Militia, and even that little war lord, who has been dictating to the Militia Department so effectively of late. Our hon. friend from Labelle is deserted by his own party. They dare not take sides with him and there is not any respectable riding in Ontario or elsewhere in the Dominion which would listen with patience to the views he advocates. The hon. member has said that a good many men in the ranks of the Canadian militia are loafers. Well, probably the militiamen might have an equally unflattering opinion of the hon. gentleman. But I may tell the hon. gentleman that a Presbyterian clergymen, who objected to young men joining the regiment I had the honour to command, on the ground that he thought volunteering was not a good thing for our Canadian youth, experienced a radical change of view when he became better acquainted with the militia. I thought it would do him no harm to join the ranks and induced him to enter the regiment, and he became one of the best chaplains we ever had in the militia, and one of the most enthusiastic volunteers in the Dominion. I do not know whether my good friend from Labelle would care to sit on the soft side of a sand bank with his legs crossed and eat his meals off his knees like a Turk, but he might possibly join as provisional lieutenant or quartermaster-sergeant. If he would only come to a camp and associate with the boys, he would find that the militiamen of his own county are not the loafers he says they are and would have a better opinion of the lads who wear the jacket and are ready to give up their lives for the good of their country. I am glad that the right hon. the First Minister is here now, because I think I might appeal to him. Recently, when he was endeavouring to appeal to the patriotic sentiments of the people, he spoke in favour of having militia corps, not rifle corps, but volunteer corps, in every section of the Dominion. Well, the arming of those men and everything else would cost upwards of $50,000,000. I was proud to hear the First Minister use that language, and I trust that our Minister of Militia will be able to boast of still larger expenditures on the Department of Militia. There is no money expended in the Dominion which finds its way back so readily and so quickly to the cities and other distributing centres. There is no money which so quickly comes back to the people as the money spent on annual drill, and there is no money so widely distributed. We are training our people in the art of drilling themselves, in the art of being ready to defend their country, and money spent in that way finds its way back to the people more readily than money spent in Grand Trunk Pacific contracts and other extravagant schemes which do the people no good but drain them of their wealth.

Mr. OSLER. I had not the pleasure of hearing the first part of the speech of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), no doubt he spoke with his usual elo-

quence ; but I should hope sincerely that there are very few men from the Atlantic to the Pacific who would echo the sentiments which he expressed in the last part of his address. He said in effect that Canada cannot be defended, that it is not worth while defending it. Let us become the humble hewers of wood and drawers of water and take the kicks of any nation.

Mr. BOURASSA. Do I understand the hon. member to say that I made use of any such language ?

Mr. OSLER. I say you did in effect.

Mr. BOURASSA. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman said that we cannot defend ourselves, that if the United States should attack us, we would have to succumb, and therefore it was useless our trying to provoke them by spending money on military affairs.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, what I said is that to organize at present in Canada on a military footing with the idea of making a fight against the United States is a foolish policy. I never said that we should not make any defence whatever, but that the idea of organizing defence against the United States was a foolish one. The best defence we could have and the best way to organize ourselves is to increase our population as rapidly as possible.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman has affirmed what I stated, and I should be sorry to think that there was another man from the Atlantic to the Pacific who holds the views to which he has given expression. If this land is not worth fighting for——

Mr. BOURASSA. Absurd.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman stated that this land is not worth fighting for, that if the United States choose to attack us, we would have to lie down like whipped curs and take our medicine. He said we had no defence, but he omitted to say that we had England at our back.

Mr. BOURASSA. As in the Alaska business.

Mr. OSLER. But probably he does not intend that we shall have England to defend us long.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). What about Scotland and Ireland ?

Mr. OSLER. They will defend us as long as we stand by the old flag. They will defend us even if there are men in this country like the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Then you should not speak about England alone.

Mr. OSLER. I apologize to the Scotch. I know that the men who come from the north think that they are the greater and include the less.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is where you come from.

Mr. OSLER. No, I come from the south.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I thought you were a Scotchman.

Mr. OSLER. No, I come as far away from Scotland as it is possible in the sister isles. I come from Cornwall. I have no fear that if we get into trouble with any nation, England, Scotland and Ireland, or Scotland, Ireland and England—the latter will perhaps satisfy my hon. friend better—would come to our defence, but only on condition that we help ourselves, and I say that we cannot spend money better than by supplying our young men with rifles and teaching them how to shoot. I say again that I hope the hon. member for Labelle is alone in holding the sentiments he has expressed in this House.

Mr. PUTTEE. It is only right that we should judge this amendment by its own terms and not by the extravagant meanings that have been ascribed to it. It appears that the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has got himself into this position, that if he found it necessary to read the Ten Commandments to this House, there are a number of hon. gentlemen here who would get up at once and denounce them as disloyal, traitorous and anti-British. Now, Mr. Chairman, clause 27 that we have just passed, in its first two lines, plainly gives the Governor General in Council power to organize as many regiments as he pleases. That means that when at any time the public mind is inflamed, whether in regard to internal or external politics, some Minister of Militia who may be holding that office might take it into his head to organize to a tremendous extent ; and every man knows that when a responsible minister has done a thing and afterwards comes to parliament and asks for its endorsement, the party supporting the government of which he is a minister will not turn him down. We know that in such a case the House of Commons would sanction an act of which it would have disapproved if it could have voluntarily pronounced upon it in the beginning. Now, the member for Labelle moves an amendment that the peace establishment of the active militia shall be limited to 50,000. At the present time we have not got 50,000 on the peace establishment ; therefore, he is not asking the minister to reduce the number, he is still leaving a margin up to which any minister may recruit before he is obliged to come to parliament. If then there is any necessity for it, parliament can increase the number beyond 50,000. I say, with all due respect to those who have put forward alarmist notions this afternoon, that the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle should only be

considered on its own merits and not in view of the meanings that have been ascribed to it, merely because it comes from a certain source. Now, there is no doubt that the people are getting alarmed at the growth of our militia expenditure. I think we have seen this afternoon that it is almost impossible at the present time for some hon. gentlemen in this House to discuss militia matters in a sane and reasonable manner. It seems to me that an amendment of this kind, and perhaps other amendments limiting the power of the Minister of Militia during the recess of parliament, are right and proper, and should be adopted by this committee.

Amendment (Mr. Bourassa) negatived.

On section 28, with the form of oath as follows :

I.....swear that I will well and truly serve Our Sovereign Lord the King, his heirs and successors in the.....for the term of.....years or until lawfully discharged, dismissed or removed, and that I will resist His Majesty's enemies and cause His Majesty's peace to be kept and maintained, and that I will in all matters appertaining to my service faithfully discharge my duty according to law. So help me God.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I propose to strike that form of oath out, and insert the following in lieu thereof :

I, A B, do solemnly promise and swear (or solemnly declare) that I will be faithful and true, and bear true allegiance to His Majesty.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a very excellent change, and simplifies the oath. But the minister has left out the term of years in this section.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is actually the old oath.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 29 :

The permanent force shall consist of such permanently embodied corps, not exceeding two thousand men, as are, from time to time, authorized by the Governor in Council

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I propose to strike out that clause and replace it by the following :

The permanent force shall consist of such permanently embodied corps, not exceeding 2,000 men, enrolled for continuous service, as are from time to time authorized by the Governor in Council.

This amendment is found necessary. We have added an Engineer Corps, an Ordinance Corps and an Army Service Corps ; and we are adding to depots, one to be located at Montreal, with probably 200 men, and one somewhere in the Northwest Territories, with probably 100 mounted men. Later on there will be a depot in British Columbia.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there a permanent corps in Nova Scotia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No ; but we have a depot and permanent corps in New Brunswick, which answers every purpose. Once a year the artillery is brought to Halifax from the country districts for instruction with the regulars.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where do the officers get their certificates for training ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At Fredericton.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the permanent corps that is to be organized in the Northwest permit of the Mounted Police being moved further on ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, there will probably be a small detachment. As the country settles up, the militia will gradually supply the place of the Northwest Mounted Police, and the police will go further north to more remote districts.

Mr. FOWLER. These will be mounted ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It will be a cavalry corps or mounted infantry.

Mr. GOURLEY. How many constitute a corps for a district ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That depends on what arm it is. About 100. The mounted infantry is about 88 or 89 and the infantry from 100 to 125. There are 100 in a company.

Mr. GOURLEY. How many are there at London, for instance ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One hundred.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think I will ask you to add a couple of hundred more. Two hundred at Truro would be a great education for us.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Two thousand, I think, will supply the number.

Sections 35 to 44 allowed to stand.

On section 45—appointment of district officers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the following be inserted as subsection (a) :

The pay and allowances to officers of the General Staff, Head-Quarters Staff and District Staff, not provided for by this Act, shall be fixed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the present salary of the General Officer Commanding ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $6,000.

Mr. FOWLER. These will not exceed that amount ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, they will be less.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know whether it is worth while bringing it up now but I think a great many officers throughout the country would like to know what the hon. minister's intention is in regard to officers. The pay of the men is fairly satisfactory. If the hon. minister is not ready to give an expression to-night I will not press it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot to-night but I think before we get through with the estimates I may be able to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 46—commissioned, warranted, and non-commissioned officers.

Mr. BOURASSA. Why not use the term 'Governor in Council' instead of 'His Majesty'? It is only a matter of form. The change has been made in all the other clauses of the Bill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There has always been some fiction of this kind in reference to His Majesty and we thought we would leave it.

Mr. MONET. Why not have the reality and say by the Governor in Council?

Mr. BOURASSA. The fiction has been left aside and the reality taken up by the hon. minister in sixteen other clauses. I do not see why the fiction should remain in this clause.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. It is sixteen to one.

Mr. BOURASSA. In clauses 45 and 44 you provide that the appointment shall be made by the Governor in Council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Since we have done so well, perhaps my hon. friend will allow that to stand.

Mr. BOURASSA. Why? If there is a reason given I have no objection but it seems to me we might as well be logical. It is only a matter of form.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman has never seen a commission.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have seen a commission. I have seen the commission of my grandfather and of my great grandfather granted when they served in the militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am glad the hon. gentleman has ancestors who have served in the militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Let this clause stand and I will make inquiries about it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The commissions are signed by the Governor General.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And signed by the minister also. There is something in section 47 about the commission being signed by the Governor General.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The commissions are granted by the Governor General and you cannot change that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That settles it then.

On section 47—Governor's signature to commissions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think this is the same as the old law and although it would have been a very great job to have these all signed I know the officers of the militia would think much more of their commissions if they were all signed.

On section 50—rank of officers in time of peace.

Mr. FOWLER. As soon as the brigadier-general is out of office will he go back to the rank of colonel?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is only temporary. That is the rule in England. He only takes the rank of Brigadier-General during the time he is in charge of the brigade camp.

On section 51—rank of officers when called out.

Mr. FOWLER. Will this be only temporary?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I think not.

Mr. FOWLER. The term 'emergency' has a very broad range.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Section 51 applies to qualified officers. It would not apply to any one who was not a qualified officer.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose there was a riot in Toronto or Montreal and an officer was sent down to deal with it. He might dispose of it in a couple of hours and he would be a major general.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We would have to take our chances on that.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not confine this to active service in time of war?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It would be done under regulation anyway.

On section 52—Honorary rank on retirement.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Why confine that to officers of the Headquarters Staff? We know of some officers who have given their time throughout long and useful lives to the militia force, some in command of districts now whose names occur to me. I do not care to mention any. It seems to me that it should not be made to apply to the headquarters alone.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no objection.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I drew the hon. minister's attention to that when it was up before.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes; I know.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It also contains the words 'or in the department.' What does that mean ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the Militia Department, I suppose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It provides that the civil servants in the Militia Department are eligible.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Why not leave it at the word 'appointments' and strike out all the rest except the words 'for valuable services rendered to the country.' I beg to move the words 'on the Headquarters Staff or in the Department' be struck out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister interpret an executive officer to mean the District Officer Commanding ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No question about it. I move to insert the word 'staff' instead of the word 'executive.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think it is better.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 53 stricken out.

Section 54 agreed to without discussion.

On section 55,

Officers of His Majesty's regular army serving in Canada may be granted a temporary commission in the militia of rank equivalent to their army rank and antedated to have the same date as that of their imperial commission.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a proper thing to do.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have officers serving here temporarily and I think we should only give them the rank they have as imperial officers.

Mr. FOWLER. I am very strongly in favour of that. I do not believe in giving these regular army officers superior rank to our Canadian officers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear, you are a good Canadian.

Mr. FOWLER. I am a good Canadian and a good Britisher ; you're right I am.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This will not prevent giving them senior rank if you choose to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 56—uniform and equipment of officers.

Officers of the militia shall provide their own uniform and equipment, with the exception of mounted corps, to whom saddlery may be issued as prescribed

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move that the word 'officers' be substituted for the word 'corps.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Officers' uniforms are too expensive in this country and the result is that in many cases you cannot get first class men to take commissions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No doubt.

Mr. FOWLER. For instance, it is perfectly absurd to have these Hussar uniforms in this country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. The best men to officer cavalry regiments are men brought up on the farm and used to riding horses. You must as a rule draw your rank and file from the country districts. If you officer a regiment from the rural districts with the sons of rich men from the city the result is not satisfactory. Many of these city officers put on so much side and style that the men do not like them. It is very important that the department should simplify the uniform and render it less expensive.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and I hope the time will soon come when we will be able to adopt some sensible, simple and useful uniform, which will be of a Canadian type. I do not know why in the world we should stick to these old uniforms, which of course have a history in England, which they wish to preserve, but which so far as we are concerned are useless importations. I believe we should adopt a system of our own.

Mr. MONET. I endorse what has been said by the Minister of Militia. I have been to the Laprairie camp recently and it is absurd to see our soldiers exposed to the heat of the sun wearing small caps that did not cover the half of the head. A straw hat would not cost any more and would be much more serviceable. Let us have a good Canadian uniform which will be far better suited to our needs than these imported things from over the sea.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am in favour of a common sense Canadian uniform which will suit not only in Canada but anywhere in the world.

Mr. MONET. You need not go out of Canada to find common sense.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The men in charge of the Laprairie camp did not know their

business, because if they had asked they could have had straw hats issued instead of the caps. Our corps have been using straw hats in camp for years.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Or light helmets.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It was neglect on the part of the officers that the men did not have straw hats. I agree with my good friend (Mr. Fowler) with regard to officers' uniforms, and I think the government should meet the cost to a certain extent. In England, volunteer officers get an appropriation in lieu of uniform, and I am satisfied that every officer in Canada would prefer an allowance for uniform to the beggarly pittance he now receives. The minister has today seen the influence which the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has in the House, and if he provides a common sense uniform to be supplied to the militia officers, he will be endorsed heartily by the people of Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. If the department provides that the officers' uniform shall be simple, useful and economical, the officers would purchase it themselves. It takes from $800 to $1,000 to fully equip an hussar officer with uniform and accoutrements, and that is perfectly absurd.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) knows anything about militia matters now or not, but we have it on the authority of the great minister of war who meddled in the eastern townships regiment, that the cost of a uniform, is $55, sword and all. I do not think an officer should be called upon to expend even $55 on his uniform. It is true, some officers in those swell corps go to an expenditure that is quite uncalled for. There is no regulation in force in Canada that requires any officer in a city or other corps to purchase an expensive uniform. That was settled in the House in favour of the less expensive uniform; so that no man now need get an expensive uniform unless he wants to become a dandy, and I think there are few of the officers foolish enough for that.

Mr. FOWLER. I have seen my hon. friend from North Victoria dressed out in full uniform, and will guarantee that it costs more than $55, and no man would wish to appear shabby in a regiment beside my hon. friend from Victoria. The cost of the uniform should be the same for all officers, so that there would not be any possibility of a man going beyond his means in order to provide himself with as good a uniform as that of his neighbour.

Mr. INGRAM. Have any complaints come from soldiers who have purchased their uniforms, and have had to wait for months to get their money from the department?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not heard of any.

Mr. INGRAM. Take the staff sergeants, for instance. The government allows them $44, or something like that, for their clothing, and it costs them about $60, and I think they have had to wait for some time to get their money. Have there not been complaints of that kind?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not heard of any, but I will inquire.

On section 57—importation of saddlery free of duty.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not a new departure to supply saddles to the militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister give us an idea what it costs for saddlery?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About $40, I think.

Mr. INGRAM. Do the men get the same as the officers?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think they do.

Mr. INGRAM. Who inspects the saddles?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend will wait until we come to the estimates, I shall be very glad to give him all the information. It is a most extraordinary thing to mix militia stores up with the Militia Bill. The inspector of saddlery in this city is Lieutenant-Colonel Brown.

Mr. INGRAM. Is he a practical saddler?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe he is. At any rate, he is the commanding officer of the cavalry corps here. He has done the work for a long time, and done it satisfactorily. He did it for the imperial government for a year or two, while saddles were being shipped to the old country, and I believe he gave entire satisfaction. The inspector in Toronto is an old English sergeant of the name of Woodcock. Lieutenant-Colonel Graveley is in charge of the stores there. These are all I can remember at the present moment.

Section 57—Importation free of duty—struck out.

On section 58—responsibility for damages—

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. With regard to deficiency in equipment, I do not care how careful an officer commanding a regiment or company may be, there are bound to be some shortages, some losses, in every camp of instruction, after the articles have been

in use for a few years ; and it has struck me as a hardship—and it has impressed the men in the force in the same way—that after some article has been in use for four of five years, and is perhaps more than half worn out, it should be charged up against the commanding officer at its first cost price. It seems to me some regulation might be made by which a certain reasonable life would be assigned to every article. For instance, in the old days it would be easy to ascertain the life of a haversack or a knapsack, and write off each year a certain amount ; so that when an article was lost, the officer would be charged with its value at the time of the loss. When the new rifles were given out in place of the old Sniders, some of the old rifles were lost, and the proposition was to charge them up at $25 each, the original cost of the rifle, when at that very time the same rifle was selling at Eaton's and Simpson's in Toronto as a curiosity at $1 and $1.25 each. I call the attention of the minister to this in the hope that something will be done in making a regulation along the line I have indicated.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On the first draft of the Bill I drew the minister's attention to this very thing, and he promised to attend to it in the regulations.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is in the hands of the officers now.

Section agreed to.

Section 59 agreed to.

On section 60—when only men may appear in uniform——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is an old law.

Mr. INGRAM. Some of the soldiers object to being compelled to wear uniform, when others are allowed to go in civilian clothing. I have a complaint on that subject which it may be worth while to read :

Formerly non-commissioned officers and men as above were occasionally allowed the privilege when on leave of wearing plain clothes, and it was much appreciated by those who had the good fortune to obtain such leave. Now, however, all is changed and militia order 225 (4) of 1903 was issued cancelling such privileges. Now, Sir, a recruit of about three months' service can get an employed job as a servant to an officer, do his chores, and blacken his boots, and empty the slops, result, he can walk out in plain clothes because he is an officer's servant. Also, he does no duty, does no guard or fatigues, just merely attends to his master alone. Is he of high born degree that such a most unfair regulation should be made in his case as allowing him to wear plain clothes ? The cook in the officer's mess and the assistant cook, grooms, and the pantry waiters in the officer's mess are all privileged to wear plain clothes when off duty to walk out in, but a well conducted soldier, or a non-commissioned officer of over fifteen years' service are refused this privilege. Why ?

Officers as a general rule only wear their uniform about four hours a day when one can run across them down town in 'mufti' almost daily. Why should not non-commissioned officers be allowed it ? Policemen are, postmen are, asylum employees are, jailkeepers are, but Tommy Atkins of the permanent force is the worst of all, and he, poor fellow, must wear the uniform night and day. To add to the discomfort the hottest days in summer he must tramp to church in a heavy cloth tunic flannel-lined, heavy leather waist belt tightly fastened around waist (if it is a little loose, you are reprimanded on parole for slovenliness) and a big helmet and everything imaginable to add to the discomfort of a soldier in July and August.

It is not necessary that I should go on with a lot of this stuff.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not at all necessary.

Mr. INGRAM. But if there are such privileges granted, they should be open to every well-conducted soldier. No one will pretend that on a day like this, a lined tunic, a big heavy helmet and a belt tied tightly around the waist, would add to a man's comfort.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware of the circumstances, but will make inquiry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This clause only covers the ordinary active militia, and not the permanent corps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose regulations will be made to cover the cases of the permanent corps.

On section 63—annual drill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move that the clause be amended so that it will read as follows :

The Governor in Council may order the active militia, or any portion thereof, to drill or train for a period of not more than thirty days in each year.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you strike out the minimum ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We might want to drill a certain corps for only four or five days, and we do not want to be tied up.

Motion agreed to.

On section 64,

Officers, warrant officers and non-commissioned officers of the permanent force shall be entitled to daily pay and allowances at rates to be prescribed.

2. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, fix the sums to be paid to privates of the permanent force, regard being had to length of service, good conduct and efficiency ; but the ordinary pay shall not exceed the amounts following, that is to say :—

	Cents.
For privates per diem..	75
For buglers under 18 years of age, per diem..	40

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have explained before why that is done. Certain portions of the Permanent Force, who have been taken over from the Stores Branch, are in receipt of $1.25 to $1.50 per day, because they do not get their rations allowance, which the ordinary Permanent Force man gets.

Mr. GILMOUR. Is the pay of a private increased from 40 cents a day ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It will begin now at 50 cents and increase according to length of service and good conduct to 75 cents.

Mr. GILMOUR. You intend to increase the minimum figure under this clause ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the meaning of the word 'ordinary pay' ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is inserted because special corps, labourers, &c., are given special pay, not the ordinary pay.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are they not sworn in as members of the permanent corps ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would 'permanent corps' not be the correct words to use here ? A man in the stores department gets $1.25 a day, but he wears his uniform and is sworn in. Is he not a member of the permanent force ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is not in barracks.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where does the minister get authority to pay a man in the stores department $1.25 a day ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He gets it from a special vote for pay and allowances.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would not this clause keep him from getting it ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that would be a matter of regulation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You cannot override an Act of parliament by a regulation. If the law says you shall not pay him more than 75 cents a day there may be difficulty in paying the man $1.25. I am only pointing it out for the safety of the men.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the interpretation was that the expression 'ordinary pay' overcame that difficulty.

Mr. GILMOUR. Is it the intention to increase also the pay of the officers, warrant officers, and non-commissioned officers as well as of the privates ?

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Gilmour) will see that the pay of non-commissioned officers is based upon that of the privates ; it is so much more than that of the privates.

Mr. GILMOUR. How much ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A sergeant-major gets $1.50, a warrant officer gets $1.25 and $1, but there will be an increase.

On section 65—pay of active militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have an amendment to be substituted for section 65b. It was arranged in the Committee of the Whole some time ago. It is as follows :

For privates at the rate of 50 cents a day, which rate may be increased as may be prescribed, but not to exceed a maximum of $1 a day.

I have also an addition to be inserted as section 65c which is as follows :

An allowance of $1 per diem or such other rate as is prescribed shall be paid to each officer and man for every horse necessarily used by him on active service, during the period of active drill, or when otherwise on duty as aforesaid.

We omitted in the Bill to make any provision to pay for horses. This simply is restoring the clause which is in the present law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is not intended as a slap at the new war lord for hiring his horse ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You must not be so vindictive.

Section as amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Frederick Borden, House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 12, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

RESIGNATION OF LT.-COL. GREGORY.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) moved for :

Correspondence and papers respecting the extension of the command of Lieutenant-Colonel R. W. Gregory, commanding officer of the 2nd Dragoons, his subsequent resignation, &c.

He said : These papers were asked for by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I have them here and, if the resolution is carried, will be ready to lay them on the table. I would like to say, in

this connection, that, while I have brought all the papers relating to this matter, I hope this will not be considered as establishing a precedent, because some of the papers are of a confidential character, being reports by the commanding officer upon the efficiency, &c., of officers under him. It is not usual to lay such papers upon the table of the House. I think that in this case it is absolutely necessary that it should be done, but I should deprecate the suggestion, if it were made, that this should be done in every case.

Motion agreed to.

ARBITRATION WITH THE GRAND TRUNK.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) respecting an arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. He said: The object of this Bill is to confer upon the arbitrators appointed to inquire into certain troubles that have arisen between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government certain powers mentioned in the Bill. These troubles arise under the contract respecting the acquisition by the Intercolonial of the old Grand Trunk from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis, or, rather, to a station called Hadlow, and to other difficulties that have arisen out of the operation, under the agreement made in 1898, of the line between Ste. Rosalie Junction and Montreal. These questions have been referred to arbitrators to be determined by them; but it has been ascertaned that the arbitrators have not, under the deed of submission, the necessary power to examine witnesses under oath or to order the production of papers. In order to have a full and complete inquiry into the matters in dispute, it is necessary to have the powers mentioned in this Bill conferred upon the arbitrators.

Mr. KEMP. It is, to some extent, in regard to freight traffic—division of earnings?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The question of the division of earnings and diversion of traffic arises under the second contract that of 1898. the troubles that have arisen under the first contract, that of 1878, are as to the use of the portion of the line between Point Lévis and Chaudière Curve. I may say that that portion of the line is divided into two parts. Under the agreement, that portion between Point Lévis and Hadlow is the property of the Grand Trunk, while that portion between Hadlow and Chaudière Curve is the property of the government. It is provided under the agreement that each party has the right to use the line of the other. But difficulty has arisen concerning foreign freight cars carried over these lines. The government claim that the Grand Trunk had no right to charge them for foreign freight cars—cars belonging to other railways—carried over the Grand Trunk portion. But the Grand Trunk have made a charge of a fairly large amount on each car. The question is whether they had the right to do that, and whether they have the right to do it in the future.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is it provided that there may be an appeal from the finding of the arbitrators, or will that finding be final?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot answer that question off hand, but when the Bill is under consideration in committee, I will be able to do so.

Mr. GOURLEY. I can understand how necessary it is, with reference to the charge of freight cars, that there should be an appeal to the courts, instead of leaving the matter to the final decision of the arbitrators.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The other matter is of even more importance—that arising under the contract of 1898 relating to the diversion of traffic. It was understood that the Grand Trunk was to hand over to the Intercolonial all the traffic intended for the maritime provinces. Instead of that, the traffic has been diverted and sent to other places.

Mr. KEMP. Sent to Portland.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And some of it to Sherbrooke; I do not know exactly how it has gone.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does not all this go to show that the Grand Trunk Corporation is a rather difficult one to deal with, that it is hard to compel them to live up to their obligations? We seem to be getting into a mass of litigation with this concern, and yet, it has been entrusted with the national transportation proposition. It does not wish to obey the Alien Labour law; it seeks to build up United States seaports; in every way a great deal of litigation seems necessary to compel them to carry out their obligations.

Mr. GOURLEY. All I wanted to know is whether in these important matters provision will be made for an appeal, if necessary, to the Supreme Court and ultimately to the Privy Council.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot answer at the moment. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) is aware that the usual course is to appeal from the arbitrators to the Exchequer Court, and from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court. I cannot say, at present, what provision has been made with regard to these proceedings.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if

he has gone through the necessary formalities with respect to the production of the papers relating to the harbour dues of Montreal, referred to by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Mr. Tarte).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I shall be able to bring it down at an early date.

Mr. LEFURGEY. An order of the House was passed on 30th May last for the production of certain papers in the department of the Minister of Agriculture. The papers are not yet down. It is to be hoped that the session will soon come to a close and so we would like to have these papers brought down as soon as possible.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). To what papers does the hon. member (Mr. Lefurgey) refer ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Papers relating to the chicken-fattening stations.

Mr. FISHER. I will look it up. I thought the return had been laid on the table.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I inquired of the officials this morning and was told it was not down.

THE MILITIA ACT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the Militia of Canada.—Sir Frederick W. Borden.

On section 68,

At or near as possible to, the headquarters of every regimental division, there may be provided a rifle range with suitable butts, targets and other necessary appliances ; and the Governor in Council may stop, at such time as is necessary during the target practice of the Militia, the traffic on any roads, not being mail roads, that cross the line of fire, and may make such other regulations for conducting target practice and registering the results thereof, and for the safety of the public, as are necessary, and may impose penalties for wilful damage to any such butts, targets and appliances ; and all such ranges shall be subject to inspection and approval before being used; and the owners of private property shall be compensated for any damage that accrues to their respective properties from the use of any such rifle range.

Mr. BOURASSA. I propose an amendment to this clause by striking out all the words after the word 'used' in the twenty-first line, and inserting the following in lieu thereof :—

His Majesty shall be liable to make compensation for the death of any person, or for any injury to the person caused by a bullet wound arising from the use of any rifle range for target practice, and for any injury to property arising from such use; provided that there shall be no claim to compensation where the death or personal injury was due to negligence on the part of the person killed or injured, or where such person, at the time the death or injury was sustained, was at the rifle range for the purpose of taking part in, or in some official or other capacity in connection with or as a spectator of the shooting, or in the case of injury to property, where such injury was due to negligence on the part of the owner of the property.

I may recall to the committee a very sad case that occurred some years ago in the county of Jacques Cartier, at the Côte St. Paul rifle range, I think it was, where a man named Larose was maimed for life. He sought compensation before the Exchequer Court, and I will read an extract of the judgment which shows a defect in the law in that respect. The judgment assimilated his case to a case of damage on government property, and was rendered under that subsection of clause of the Exchequer Court law.

Every claim against the Crown arising out of any death or injury to the person or to property on any public work resulting from the negligence of any officer or servant of the Crown, while acting within the scope of his duties or employment.

Naturally the judge of the Exchequer Court held that the rifle range could not be considered a public work under this definition, and moreover it could not be proved that the man was wounded by a bullet coming from a rifle made by a militiaman, as it might have come from some amateur practising there. As the judge remarked :

Parliament has made provision for compensating persons for damages accruing to their properties from the use of a rifle range ; but not for personal injuries, and it is not for the court to add to or to extend the remedies that parliament has provided.

The case was taken before the Supreme Court and the judgment of Judge Burbidge was upheld. The judgment of the Supreme Court was delivered by Sir Elzear Taschereau who, quoting the article of the Exchequer Court law which I have just read, added :

Moreover it is not proved who fired the shot that wounded the suppliant. It may have been fired by one of the amateurs or volunteers not on duty, who were there practising on that day, with the men having what is called in the case, government practice.

Therefore I propose to supplement the present law so that persons suffering damages received from target practice may be compensated. There is no doubt that a person who stands on a rifle range is in a better position to prove from whose rifle the bullet came that injured him ; but the peaceful man who may be ploughing his field a mile or two away may be hurt without knowing by whom he is hurt ; so there is no possibility of the latter being able to claim damages if injured. Therefore, while I think it is proper for the government, as I said yesterday, to organize these rifle ranges, at the same time I think parliament should see that persons who may be wounded while on their own property

should not suffer without compensation being given.

Mr. MONK. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) seems to be a very wise one. He has recalled the case of Larose. It is a pity that this amendment cannot be made retroactive so as to give Larose the recourse from which he was debarred under the interpretation of the Exchequer Court judge and of the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, Larose was maimed for life. He is living to-day, but it is impossible for him to attend to his farm work in any way. I never could understand myself exactly upon what ground the Exchequer Court judgment was rendered. I understood the judge to hold that there was insufficient proof of the bullet having come from the rifle range ; but in law it seems to me that if Larose had established that the bullet came from a man practicing on the rifle range, and I think he did so, I do not understand how he was deprived of compensation. The government, taking into consideration all the circumstances, gave him an indemnity of $1,000, I think after the decision rendered in the Supreme Court. But it must be evident that that indemnity could not possibly satisfy Larose for the injury which maimed him for life.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him ? The department offered Larose $1,000 before he took his case into court at all, but he would not accept it. My hon. friend knows that, because he was in the House when that matter was discussed.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Militia is right, Larose was offered $1,000, but he was advised by his lawyer, Mr. Charbonneau, I think, now Judge Charbonneau, as well as by others, that he had a recourse, and that $1,000 was entirely insufficient, and therefore he refused the proffered indemnity. I must say that after the case was decided he accepted the offer of $1,000, but that sum scarcely paid all the immediate damage that he suffered from the accident, there was no compensation made him for the life-long injury he sustained. It seems to me that he made sufficient proof to create a presumption that the bullet which hit him came from the rifle range, and that therefore it was incumbent upon the department to establish that upon the day when he was wounded and bullets were raining all around in front of the range, the accident was not attributable to the men practising on the rifle range. At any rate I think the subgestion of the amendment of my hon. friend is a good one and that it ought to be adopted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice or the hon. Minister of Militia if there is no remedy now ? I understand there is a remedy under the present law.

Mr. BOURASSA. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was asking the legal authority.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Justice Taschereau is a legal authority.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is not the legal authority of this House.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am very happy to be able to agree with my hon. friend from Labelle for the first time, and I seize this opportunity. It is clear there is no remedy against the Crown unless it is expressly conferred by statute and all the court had to do was to ascertain whether the statute covered that particular injury or not, and it held that it did not. My hon. friend from Labelle asks us to frame a clause that will cover that point in case of future accident ? I think it is a wise suggestion, I would support it with the greatest pleasure and I think his amendment covers the point entirely.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. Minister of Justice should look carefully into the whole question and see that the amendment is framed properly to meet the case, provided there is no remedy at the present time. He should be careful that it goes on general principles. I do not like to commit myself to an amendment such as that which has been suggested.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have no right here to assume that there is a remedy when the Supreme Court has decided there is none.

Mr. TISDALE. There surely ought to be a remedy of some sort provided where a proper case is made out. I presume there will be no disagreement in regard to that. But the amendment must be very carefully considered, and not be adopted in such a shape that anybody who happens to get hurt has a ground for asking to be paid. It will have to have reference to the nature of the injury and it will have to be carefully guarded so that the Crown will not be obliged to prove a negative. The adoption of a statute subjecting the Crown to damages is contrary to the first principle underlying most of our legislation. When we propose in any particular case to go outside of that principle as between the Crown and the subject there should be a special reason for it, because this is a line of legislation that I would not care to take the responsibility of pushing any farther than is necessary to cover a particular case. The law officers of the Crown ought to be responsible for seeing that the amendment is drafted in such shape as will cover this case, provided the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is prepared to recommend that some provision should be made.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that in so far as government-owned rifle ranges

are concerned, some provision of this kind would be very proper, but the government is assisting rifle clubs all over the country by giving small sums of money to help them to put up targets on ground which they themselves own or control absolutely. It seems to me that it would not be right to make the government responsible for accidents occurring under these circumstances, and if the clause is so guarded as to meet that contingency, I have no objection to it.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have not read that amendment and it would be impossible to read it carefully at this time. I assume that the amendment will go to the Department of Justice to be recast and put in proper language.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The amendment was first drafted by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) who then brought it over to the Justice Department, and it was referred to an official of the Justice Department, the Deputy Minister. I had nothing to do with the drafting of the amendment myself, but the amendment in its present form was drafted by the Deputy Minister. The amendment was first prepared by the hon. member for Labelle and submitted to the Deputy Minister and he sent it back in the form in which we now have it, but as to whether or not the amendment goes farther than my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence thinks it ought to go, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. MACLEAN. Now you want the opinion of the Department of Militia and Defence on it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, when drafting a Bill I want to know what the party who has introduced the Bill has in his mind. My functions are limited to giving effect to the intention of the person introducing the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. As I understand the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence he is willing to assume the responsibility of having a proper clause inserted, whether this is such or not, in so far as rifle ranges which are under the supervision and control of the military authorities are concerned, but not in regard to private rifle ranges where individuals will surely be responsible for their negligence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is it.

Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. Minister of Justice agree with the proposition that private individuals who have these private rifle ranges are responsible under the general law for anything happening on account of what they have done ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no question about that. The only object of this amendment must be to meet the special exception which exists in regard to government ranges. Private ranges come under the operation of the present law.

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Mr. BOURASSA. I want to have the question made clear by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence as to what he understands by government ranges ? We know very well that rifle clubs are organized under the militia law, that rifles are supplied to them by the government, that the rifle clubs form part of the militia and that in case of an emergency they are called to the front just the same as other regiments. Therefore, I say that the government is as much responsible for the practice by rifle clubs as they are responsible for practice by militia corps. The hon. minister is perfectly right when he states that rifle ranges established by private individuals are not under government control. I am not prepared to say that this should apply to all rifle ranges, but when I expressed my view to that effect to the legal authorities I supposed that the legal authorities when they worded this amendment thought that when they spoke of a rifle range it meant a rifle range under the control of the Minister of Militia. We cannot legislate as to rifle ranges belonging to private individuals. We have nothing at all to do with those rifle ranges. I would like a distinction made between rifle ranges that are controlled by private individuals and those that are under government control. If all rifle ranges organized under the authority of the hon. Minister of Militia shall not be subject to this provision what would be the result ? Suppose the government, instead of buying a rifle range at Fraserville, for instance, should rent it, and then supply rifles to a rifle club, is the rifle club not organized on just the some footing as the rifle clubs who will engage in rifle practice at the Montreal range or at the Ottawa range which are owned by the government ? In that case this legislation should apply to all these ranges alike. I think I am not stating too much when I say that we cannot apply this amendment to anything except rifle ranges which are under government control because we cannot legislate in regard to other rifle ranges.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the committee will bear with me I will state what I think is the effect of this amendment. The clause as it now stands begins with these words :

> At or as near as possible to the headquarters of every regimental division there may be provided a rifle range with suitable butts, targets, and other necessary appliances.

If a rifle range is provided within the meaning of these words by the Minister of Militia, and an accident occurs, then the provisions of this amendment will be applicable to the accident that has occurred as a result of the providing of this rifle range. The range is to be provided by the government, and being provided by the government, it would be under government control and regulated, I presume, by departmental orders. In that event, the range being absolutely under the control of the government,

this amendment will make the government liable for the damages.

Mr. TISDALE. It would practically apply to all rifle ranges.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All that are provided by the government.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I wish further light on the proviso which reads :

> Provided that there shall be no claim to compensation where the death or personal injury was due to negligence on the part of the person killed or injured.

So far that is right.

> Or, where such person at the time of death or injury so sustained was at the rifle range for the purpose of taking part in the practice, &c.

It seems to me that if a person injured at a distance from the rifle range is to be compensated, very much more should a man be compensated who is taking part in that rifle practice, and who is performing his duty as a citizen in qualifying himself for the defence of his country. I do not think we would be opening the doors too wide if we were to include a provision which would enable the government to compensate any man injured while actually in practice, provided it be not due to his own carelessness.

Mr. TALBOT. As an illustration, I may mention that in the camp at Lévis last week, a man who was employed as a marker for my regiment was injured by a fragment of a bullet flying from a stone and cutting his wrist. In that case the injury was not serious, but had the fragment struck the man's eye he would have been deprived of his sight. In such a case, when a man is injured in the discharge of his duty, he should be sufficiently compensated.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is not that the risk of war ? If you followed that up you would have to make provision for every accident on the field of battle, and where is it to end ?

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. You pension those injured on the field of war.

Mr. DANIEL. Every military man who is wounded on active service is liable to compensation, and may I ask : Are men engaged on the rifle ranges considered as on active service ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is provided for.

Mr. DANIEL. I would take it that when a military man is wounded under these circumstances, he would come under the law which provides compensation for those on active service.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I doubt if the term 'active service' is wide enough to cover rifle practice on ranges. These injuries may occur out of camp altogther when men are practicing at the ranges. If the minister will assure us that the term 'active service' is broad enough to cover these cases I am satisfied, but I am not satisfied that a man who is simply about his every day avocation should be compensated by the government, and another man who gives up his time to learn something for the defence of his country should not be compensated.

Mr. DANIEL. I quite agree in that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is very likely that the Deputy Minister of Justice, in drafting this clause, was endeavouring to make the clause analogous to the general principle of the law, which embodies the doctrine of 'common employment.' The Deputy Minister of Justice, as a sound English lawyer, very likely had that in his mind when he was drafting this clause. But as the doctrine of common employment is a wholly irrational doctrine, and one which ought not be part of the law, we might very well adopt the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. A. T. Thompson) and strike out the limitation, which does not seem to be fair or reasonable.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We have rifle ranges which are absolutely owned by the government, ranges which are leased by the government and ranges which are used privately all over the country. The regular corps, the volunteer rifle companies and private individuals practice on these ranges. If these ranges were being used by citizens, unorganized and acting without authority, then if this amendment carried the government would be liable to give them compensation for injury. In my opinion, individuals who practice rifle shooting without being duly under military authority should not be entitled to compensation by the government. It is only in the case of rifle associations and the organized militia, acting under the direction and control of the government, that damages should be allowed.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Men actually enrolled in the militia or rifle clubs.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes; and practicing under the rules laid down. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. A. T. Thompson) is a sound one, and I certainly think that a marker or a rifleman who is discharging his duty ought to be compensated, provided he has not been negligent.

Mr. GOURLEY. Under this Bill no spectator could seek redress ?

Mr. TISDALE. He ought not to ; he has no business to be there.

Mr. GOURLEY. A shooting match generally attracts a number of people. I was on the rifle butts here recently watching the practice, and if I were shot I could claim no redress under this Bill. That, I think, is an outrage. If citizens are per-

mitted to go on the rifle ranges, it is very wrong that they should have no redress if they are injured.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If a spectator were injured by a man regularly enrolled I think he should be entitled to compensation, but if a spectator on a rifle range were injured by a person showing off a revolver on the back of the ground, he should have no claim for compensation.

Mr. GOURLEY. The injury I refer to is by one of the people engaged in practice at the target. In that case, it strikes me that if this Bill is to afford a remedy, it should afford a remedy to the innocent spectator. We are invited by the government to go and watch these public exhibitions, and if a remedy is to be provided for anybody, the innocent spectator who goes on the ground should be protected. Otherwise you are providing a remedy against an almost infinitesimal chance.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Speaking of the Montreal accident, the law requires that certain signals shall be set up, and that is supposed to indemnify the government for any accident that takes place.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Within the area.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that that accident occurred within the line of the fire, not at one side.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that in some unaccountable way the bullet went to the side of the butts.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On the plan laid down by the department, I think it was shown to be within the line of the fire. I will give an instance in my own experience. in our county we were firing, and the bullets glanced off to the lake. A fisherman came into town in the evening and reported that a number of the bullets had passed by his boat. I told him that it was absolutely impossible, because his boat was four miles away from the ranges. He assured me two of the bullets had struck his boat. The firing was done by a novice, who, instead of sighting over the lower bar had sighted over the upper bar. That man would have been justified in receiving some compensation in case of accident. The incident shows that one cannot be too careful in these matters.

Mr. GOURLEY. If the proposed amendment is to apply to accidents provided for in the previous part of section 68, the word 'any' should be made 'such'; otherwise the clause is ample enough to apply to any rifle range. I think the Minister of Justice will see at once the necessity of that change.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are a few general principles to be borne in mind in connection with this matter. The first is that generally speaking the Crown is absolutely free from any claim or damages. The principle has been departed from by an amendment to the Exchequer Court Act, which provides, speaking from memory, that the Crown is liable with respect to injuries done on a public work. That section has been differently construed in the courts, with the result that when an injury has occurred to an individual not at the time on a public work, there is no liability. The intention here is to extend the liability of the Crown to injuries suffered by individuals who are not on the rifle range, but to whom injury is caused by reason of something done on the range; and in order to protect the interests of the Crown it is provided that that provision shall not apply to an injury which may happen to a person who is on the range. The case of such a person may or may not be provided for under the Act as we have it now; but there is no intention to provide for that case.

Mr. TISDALE. I would suggest that the provision be limited to a range provided or authorized by the department.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When an expert draughtsman draws a clause like this, I must admit that I do not like to touch it without consulting him.

Mr. TISDALE. As the section reads now, I think it would be much wider than is intended. Suppose a club of private parties provide ranges for themselves and go shooting; if you do not qualify the clause, you take the responsibility of injuries from them and put it on the Crown. That is a case which I apprehend we do not intend to cover. Suppose men commence shooting on a range before it has been inspected and approved; the individual who has violated the law would be free, and the government would be made responsible.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that it would be a very great straining to make the government responsible for anything that might happen at these unauthorized ranges. But we might easily avoid any difficulty by making this provision applicable only to the rifle ranges provided for by section 68 and which are under the control of the government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If a government range is being used by men who are not regularly enrolled in the militia or members of any rifle association, acting under the statutes of Canada, and an accident happens, I do not think the government should be responsible.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why not?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Because these men practicing on that range do not belong to the militia or to any government rifle association.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend has in mind strangers coming to a rifle range—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not foreigners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would be quite right in using that word under certain circumstances.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Outsiders.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is better.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do not use that word 'foreigner.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I could point out to my friend in the Patent Act and dozens of Acts passed in this House the application of the word 'foreigner' to British subjects. In fact, it is the correct grammatical expression to use in certain circumstances. My hon. friend has in view the contingency that men not connected with the militia might use a rifle range and cause an accident, and he says that in such case the government should not be held liable. But a rifle range under the control of the government has to be regulated and controlled in some way, so that every passerby cannot make use of it. If my hon. friend has a piece of property, he does not allow every Tom, Dick and Harry to go in and use it at his sweet will. He controls his own property, and it would be the business of the government to control that rifle range in such a way that no one could use it except under certain regulations. I think there are guardians to these ranges.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But there are other ranges which are not the property of the government, but which are subsidized by the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do these come within the meaning of the section ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Would such a range come within the meaning of a rifle range as described in section 68 'at or near as possible to the headquarters of every regimental division, there may be provided a rifle range with suitable butts, targets and other necessary appliances.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That covers it exactly. Take the case in my county. The government gave us assistance to establish the butts, but ninety dollars out of every hundred came out of the pockets of the boys.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is your headquarters near the rifle range ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes. In rear of these ranges there is a line of fire, and that line gets wider the further back it goes. We have to rent land from the farmers and give them notice every time we are using the range. And immediately in rear of the butts, where a wagon road crosses the line of fire, we station a man who signals us whenever a team approaches. But supposing somebody, who does not know the rules should practice on that range and an accident happen, who would be responsible ? We cannot afford to keep a guardian on that range all the year round.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be easy to draw an amendment which would make the Act applicable to only one class of range.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But I want it to apply to both classes whenever the range is being used by an official body. In such cases the government should be responsible.

Mr. TISDALE. There are lots of rifle clubs which are not headquarter clubs at all. There are four or five in my county that have nothing to do with the militia but are rifle clubs coming under the Militia Act. I have had complaints come to me concerning these clubs under the impression that the Militia Departmnt had control of them. These clubs do the best they can, but as a rule they can only get short ranges, and if the government wish to encourage these clubs, they should put them under some control. But if you were to make the government responsible for anything that might happen at any of these ranges, that might have the result of making those using them more careless.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I can only say I should hope not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not unless they are taken over by the department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because you can see at once what the result will be. If institutions mentioned by my hon. friend engage in rifle shooting on what may be called private ranges, they take every precaution to prevent injury to others. But if you make the government responsible, there will be much less care exercised ; there will be much greater danger to the people and much greater expense to the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I see a way to meet the difficulty—by omitting the beginning of the paragraph and making this apply to rifle ranges of a certain description, as, 'Headquarters' ranges or other designation to be supplied by the Department of Militia.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. minister however, must not overlook this danger—and this is a matter rather for the Minister of Militia than for the Minister of Justice—if you are going to protect one class of legalized clubs and not others, you will kill the others. As I said in the commencement, this is a matter that requires very careful consideration. If the Minister of Justice is to prepare a proper provision on this subject, he must be seized of the facts ; he must know what sort of clubs are in existence and what sort of clubs the Minister of Militia intends to form. I do not see

how we are going to make a distinction between one kind and another unless we make it a general principle of law. I agree with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that his amendment is in the right direction, that his proviso must be embodied in the law. But we must not make it too extensive, and we must protect the Crown against the negligence of those for whose conduct it is not properly responsible.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It seems to me that certain words might be inserted which would make the section quite clear and ought to make it satisfactory. For instance, it might read :

His Majesty shall be liable to make compensation upon the death of any person, or for any injury to the person arising from the use of any rifle range for target practice carried on under the regulation of the department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. By this, it seems to me, the public will be assured that no practice will go on unless it is in accordance with the regulations laid down. In the case of every one of these clubs, there is some one who is responsible for carrying on the practice, and so the public will be protected against injury through the careless carrying on of rifle shooting.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the minister has hit the mark. There is only one point and it is this—supposing a body were acting under the regulations of the department, that does not necessarily mean that the range would be accepted, though, I presume, that would be provided for. Troops should not be limited to one particular range, whether provided by the government or provided by an association so long as it is a range in accordance with the regulations of the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I must confess that, speaking off-hand, and, necessarily, without full consideration, I would not absolutely agree to that. After all, if the government own a property and permit improper use to be made of it, and, as a result of that improper use, an accident occurs, why should the government be relieved, any more than a private individual ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister keep a man on every range ? You get back to the difficulty with respect to the smaller ranges. Surely you are not going to make a law which will be against the interest of the people outside the large cities. If the people of a district, after going down deep into their pockets to pay for a swell range at Toronto or Ottawa wish to go deeper and provide a range for their own district, why should the government assume responsibility for one and not for the other ? Let all the ranges be treated in the same way, so long as they are in accordance with the government's regulations, whether they are built by the people of Canada as a whole or are provided by the contributions of the boys themselves. Of course, you have to observe the proper precautions,—fly your danger flag, see that all is clear beyond and so on. Why should not a man injured on one of our smaller ranges be just as eligible for damages to be paid by the government as one who is poking around one of the swell ranges near the big cities ?

Mr. TISDALE. I understand that the hon. minister is not objecting to the idea of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) but that he wants to go a little further than that hon. gentleman. The Minister of Justice, I understand, suggested that the government should be responsible even if persons use the range without leave. He makes this suggestion as I understand, on the ground that the government should be, as an individual is, responsible. But, it seems to me, he is carrying the government's responsibility further than that of an individual is carried. I do not understand that an individual is responsible—unless the case is covered by a special statute—for what a person may do on his property without his consent. In this case, I understand, the minister is ready to make the government responsible, in relation to the ranges mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria, (Mr. Sam. Hughes) even for people who would be illegally and improperly upon them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The great rifle ranges in Canada are under the charge of caretakers, and everything is under lock and key. They are administered in the most careful way, and under such conditions that it is not to be supposed that injury can result to any one. It is only in the case of the smaller ranges that that could arise, and I am afraid that this legislation would have a very wide application.

Mr. BOURASSA. It is important to consider the interest of the militia ; but it is important also to consider the men who work on their own property and who earn their living without expense to or protection from the government. Assistance is given to rifle ranges for the benefit of the militia——

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. For the benefit of Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA. I agree with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) in saying that we should offer every regimental division the right and advantage of having a rifle range without being obliged to go to one of the great ranges near the large cities. I agree also that the protection given to the public and to the militiamen should apply to the small as well as to the large ranges. We should not be stopped by the idea that damages may be incurred by the Crown through the use of a small range any more than through the use of a large one. The farmers who live near a small

range have the same right to the protection of their lives as those who live near the large ranges. We spend millions every year on the militia. It may be for the benefit of the country. Some people say it is not so much for the benefit of the country as we are apt to think, but that is a question entirely aside and need not be discussed here. The point I want to make is that as the government, or parliament, provides rifle ranges for the militia and the rifle clubs, it is clearly the duty of the government to take such precautions relating to these rifle ranges, whether small or great, whether near Montreal or near Woodstock or anywhere else, so that they may not be used by any people other than those for whose use they are designed, endangering the lives of persons in the vicinity.

Let the government authorize the organization of these rifle ranges, but take proper precautions to see that they are not used to the damage of people who live in the vicinity. Therefore I think the amendment should remain as it is. I cannot consent to any change that would have the effect of leaving people who are residing near those ranges liable to injury or death without the right of compensation. Of course my amendment only applies to those ranges that are under the control of the government, and for which the government ought to be responsible when they are used improperly. Whether these ranges are the property of the government or are authorized or controlled by the government, the government should be held morally responsible for their use. Of course I could not consent to strike out the clause of negligence. As the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has said, it would be absurd not to make any reservation on account of negligence. But as respects injury to spectators, spectators have no business to be there, they are not in the position of people who live in the neighbourhood on their own property, they are not in the position of militiamen who go there to practice and perform their duty. Therefore there should be no compensation to spectators except such compensation as they have a right to ask for under the common law from a party that injures them. I wish to remind the hon. member for South Norfolk that spectators are in a different position from the class of people I want to protect. These latter are far away from the rifle ranges and are at work on their own property. Larose was ploughing on his land, and was not in a position to know who hurt him.

Mr. TISDALE. Nobody is objecting to such persons being protected.

Mr. BOURASSA. The spectator has no business to be there, therefore he must run his own risk. Besides, he has means of making evidence as to who injured him. But I am not adverse to the suggestion of the hon. member for Haldimand that this amendment should apply to militiamen, that matter I leave to the minister to settle with his own friends. But in respect to wounds or deaths arising from the use of the rifle ranges, whether under regulation or not, I cannot make any concession, and if forced upon me, I must protest in the name of peaceful persons who have a right to protection.

Mr. TALBOT. I do not know as I quite understand the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Suppose the case of a small range owned by a rifle club and an outsider goes there as a private individual, upon invitation it may be, and takes part in the practice. Does the member for Labelle mean to say that the government should be held responsible for the injury if it comes from a bullet fired by that private individual ?

Mr. BOURASSA. No. As the Minister of Justice explained, my amendment refers only to such rifle ranges as are organized under section 68, under which the government may provide a rifle range at the headquarters of every regimental division.

Mr. TALBOT. I am supposing the case of a private range such as was mentioned by the member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No. I had in mind a range accepted by the government, adopted and inspected by the government.

Mr. TALBOT. I assume it is under the control of the government. But suppose a case of negligence on the part of the department where the individual might go there of his own accord, a private individual who might go there as a marker, running his own risk. If he is injured or killed, does the member for Labelle mean to hold the government responsible ? I do not think that is right.

Mr. MONK. I think it is a question of control. I do not quite agree with the member for Labelle. What he intends, I presume, is to make applicable to the government the rules which apply to individuals, and from which the government are exempt under that judgment of the Supreme Court. If the government does not control a range, why should it be responsible for accidents that happen there ? If the government approves of a range and subsidizes it, but does not control it, is not in charge of it, if it is not government property, why should the government be liable for accidents happening on that range ? It seems to me the liability of the government should be restricted to those ranges which it controls, of which it is the proprietor, as it were. But to say that because the government has approved of a range and has even subsidized it, though the range is not under its immediate control, when the government has no keeper there and has no officers to su-

pervise it, why should the government be responsible in that case ?

Mr. BOURASSA. The amendment which I move refers only to ranges that are under the control of the government, because the government has a right to stop the general traffic around them, to close roads, and so forth. This will apply only to such ranges, and I think even the member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will agree with me that it should apply to everybody else, because if the government retains control over such ranges as are reached by my amendment——

Mr. MONK. Are these ranges referred to by the member for Victoria continually under the control of the government ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly, there is no dispute about that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know if we kill a cow the government is liable if the shooting is done at a regularly organized rifle range, and when we shoot a man, why should not the government be held responsible likewise ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I am beginning to understand the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle. I think he refers to the rifle ranges owned and controlled by the government, and that the liability of the government with respect to accidents arising from them would be the same as the liability of a private individual who owned and controlled a private property.

Mr. TISDALE. If we confined the effect of the amendment to that extent, very well, but unfortunately some of the suggestions made go a great deal further than that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is another matter respecting these rifle ranges which it is just as well to mention now. The county I have the honour to represent is a flat country, and it is absolutely impossible to get safe and satisfactory ranges there. Where you have a good big hill to fire into it is perfectly safe. But in a flat country where you have two or three miles of farm houses in the rear it is dangerous. I do not know more than two or three places in the whole county to which I refer where you will not have farm houses in line with the range fire. I am speaking of the vicinity of Lindsay, the headquarters of the regiment. I would suggest to the hon. minister, while I do not want to throw a damper on long range rifle shooting, the establishment at company headquarters of miniature rifle ranges where men could get all the necessary training in shooting. The men from Algoma at the Ottawa ranges, and the Parry Sound men at Niagara gave a perfectly marvellous performance in shooting. These men were accustomed to the sporting rifle and to shooting at 300 or 400 yards. At the long rifle ranges they carried everything before them. At company headquarters miniature rifle ranges of not less than 100 yards would give the men all the sport and training necessary to make them good shots. Every old rifle man knows that he learned his shooting in the olden days with the muzzle loading rifle using caps or candles. The main thing is to learn to sight the rifle and pull the trigger. You can learn that at the miniature range. You can take it into your back yard or into your barn and the boys can have lots of amusement. I suggest that the hon. minister should take this matter into his serious consideration.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I take it that this matter has been fairly well threshed out with the one exception of the point which I raised. This amendment reads as follows :

> His Majesty shall be liable to make compensation for the death of any person, or for any injury to the person caused by a bullet wound.

etc., and then it proceeds to give some exceptions to the cases in which His Majesty shall be obliged to make compensation. Among these exceptions we have the case of a man who goes upon the rifle range—

> For the purpose of taking part in, or in some official or other capacity in connection with the shooting.

Mr. TISDALE. Everybody agreed that that should be struck out.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I would suggest that we strike out of the proposed amendment these words : 'For the purpose of taking part in, or in some official or other capacity in connection with, or.' Then the amendment will read as follows :

> Provided that there shall be no claim to compensation where the death or personal injury was due to negligence on the part of the person killed or injured, or where such person, at the time the death or injury was sustained, was at the rifle range as a spectator of the shooting.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand the hon. minister is going to redraft the clause.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I understood we were going to pass this clause now. I do not want it passed as it is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We will allow it to stand for the present.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 69—shooting privileges—

Mr. TISDALE. What is the particular meaning of that section ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is to enable the government to acquire privileges without actually buying.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The word 'only' belongs to the words 'shooting privileges ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

On section 71,

The Governor in Council may make regulations for the management of existing rifle associations and clubs, and those hereafter formed ; for prescribing the constitution, objects and duties of such associations and clubs, and the conducting of their business and rifle meetings, and for furnishing rifles and ammunition for the training and practice of persons, whether they are, or are not, members of the militia ; and, in case of officers, whenever exercising any of the powers, functions, command or privileges of their military rank, the commanding officer for the time being and also the adjutant or acting adjutant shall at all times be subject to military law.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved an amendment to strike out the last five lines of the section.

Mr. TISDALE. What is the object of striking out these words ? That is the old law is it not ?

Sir FREDRICK BORDEN. These words are not in the old law.

Mr. TISDALE. Are these five lines added ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, they are new but they were thought to be undesirable.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 72,

In case of emergency the members of rifle associations and clubs shall become members of the militia and shall be under the direction and instructions of the district officer commanding ; and so long as the emergency exists, and until lawfully discharged all members of such associations and clubs shall remain members of the militia, and shall be subject to drill, training and discipline to the same extent as other members thereof.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved:

That the word 'command' be substituted for the words 'direction and instructions' in the third line.

Mr. TISDALE. What is the object of that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Members of the rifle associations are all under the obligation, at the time the associations are formed, that in a time of emergency they will be prepared to serve in the militia of this country, and we place them under the command of the District Officer of the District in order to utilize their services.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 74,

All cadet corps shall be subject to the authority and under the orders of the district officer commanding.

Mr. TISDALE. Does that mean that the General Officer Commanding could take them away from school ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He would have to act under the regulations which are carefully drawn in the public interest, and laid before parliament.

On section 77,

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move that the section be amended by adding the following as a sub-clause :

In time of war when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of His regular army.

Mr. BOURASSA. I regret that my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) is not here, because this is the clause under which he wished to restrict the power of the Canadian government. I may say that the clause in this Bill is a great improvement on the old one because it is more restrictive but at the same time it is not perfect. I agree with the minister that we should not restrict the power of the government in case of an emergency, but it seems to me that the control of parliament should come in at a certain period, so that the government cannot carry on war as long as they please without consulting parliament.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They cannot carry on war without money, and they would have to get money from parliament.

Mr. BOURASSA. Oh, we have seen the government carry on war for two months without money and without the authorization of parliament. There should be a provision that parliament would be called within a certain time limit.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The suggestion I made yesterday was that when the militia was embodied, parliament should be convened within ten days as is provided for in the English law.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before the section is carried I would like to know if the hon. minister is prepared to insert a clause providing that in case the government calls out the militia for war, parliament will be called ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would not undertake to do that without first consulting the Prime Minister.

Mr. BOURASSA. Would the minister, then, let this clause stand ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That question does not at all affect this clause.

Mr. BOURASSA. Parliament seems to be entirely disregarded in this matter. I am

ready to give large powers to the government for the defence of Canada, provided parliament is to have a word to say with regard to footing the bill and approving or disapproving of the action of the government.

Mr. TISDALE. The only power given to the government is to put the militia on active service. They cannot get any supplies without the action of parliament. That has always been the law, and I do not think it is different in any country in the world. In cases of emergency the militia may have to be called out immediately, but you cannot get parliament together in five minutes. Parliament must be called to vote the supplies, and if the supplies are not voted, what is the use of having a militia ? The power of the government to call out the militia suddenly is one of the greatest advantages to the country. Suppose a tremendous riot or something of that kind occurs, the government can call them all out for active service at once. If the propriety of the government's action is disputed, parliament can deal with it and may refuse to vote the supplies. That has always been the law.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is not replying to my argument at all. Yesterday I maintained that the power to call out the militia for active service in case of emergency without having to wait the necessary time to call parliament, should be left in the hands of the government. I agree with my hon. friend on that point ; but I say there should be a limitation to the arbitrary will of the government to wait for the sanction of parliament. When the hon. member for South Norfolk says that the government would not go on without parliamentary sanction, I reply that that was done five years ago. More than that, it was not even the active militia who were called out ; but a special military corps was organized, and money for the purpose was taken from the treasury of Canada without the consent of parliament. This went on for two months. In all the other British possessions where parliament was not in session, the governments refused to organize contingents without calling parliament. It was only in Canada that it was done. In England, where the sovereign has the right, on the advice of the government, to declare war, they immediately call parliament. They would not dare to spend a pound on armaments without calling parliament. I admit that an emergency might arise when the government should have the power to call out the militia immediately. I do not dispute that ; but suppose an occasion should arise on which Canada would be called upon to organize its militia and send a large portion of it outside of Canada, when in the judgment of a large number of the people and parliament of Canada it would be to the disadvantage of the country to have so large a number of troops sent out, parliament should be the final judge of that question, and the government should call parliament to deal with the matter. It might be that a weak government, not wishing to have public discussion on its action, would delay calling parliament together as long as possible, and would go on issuing money under warrants. It has been done for two months on one occasion, and why might it not be done for six months on another occasion ? A number of gentlemen who did not agree with me on the general principle of the Boer war, agreed with me that it was the duty of the government to summon parliament as early as possible after an emergency of this kind.

Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman will read the wording of the clause, he will see that the power of the government is very limited. They can only order the militia outside of Canada for the defence of Canada. They could not send it to a war like the Boer war. My hon. friend has a bogey that keeps him awake. He is so afraid that we shall become a military country that he is afraid to entrust the government, which he has never voted against, with this authority. If we are to have a militia force, we must have the means of putting it into the field in case of emergency.

Mr. BOURASSA. My hon. friend is putting in my mouth words which I never uttered. I said the very opposite.

Mr. TISDALE. I understood the hon. gentleman objected to giving the authority to the Governor in Council or to any one except parliament.

Mr. BOURASSA. Not at all. I said the opposite. I said I wanted the Governor in Council to keep that power ; but I wanted them to summon parliament as soon as possible to sanction their action. That is the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Victoria and by the hon. member for King's.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before we proceed to another clause, I wish to say that if there is to be a new clause making it obligatory on the government to call parliament within a fixed delay, after having made use of the power granted under clause 77, then I shall not propose any amendment. But if there be no such new clause, I wish to have it understood that I shall be at liberty to move some amendment to clause 77.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is agreed to.

Mr. MACLEAN. Am I to understand that clause 77, as it now stands, limits the Cana-

dian militia in their service outside of Canada to the defence of Canada ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not for the defence of the empire ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is this clause the same as the clause in the old Act ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not precisely.

Mr. MACLEAN. What was the clause under which the government sent out Canadian troops to South Africa ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They volunteered for service and were sent out as imperial troops under a special agreement with the imperial government, partly paid by the British and partly by this government, and the Militia Department organized those volunteers. They did not come under the Militia Act at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then the active militia of Canada, under this proposed Act, could not be sent outside this country by the government to take part in the defence of the empire, except under a special contract as in the case of the troops sent to South Africa.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume the hon. member for Labelle had no desire to be unfair to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) but he sought to leave the impression that the hon. member for King's objected to troops going outside of Canada or taking part in the defence of the empire. What my hon. friend from King's wanted was some limitation to be placed upon the power of the Governor in Council with regard to the sending out of troops. I am satisfied that my hon. friend is prepared to have the troops go anywhere within or outside the British empire for the defence of the empire, but before the militia would be called out in this country and placed at the disposal of the government, he wished parliament to be called together at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not wish to attribute anything to the hon. member for King's other than what he said. Here is what he said :

> Whether for the defence of Canada or not, the militia of Canada should not be sent out of Canada without the authority of parliament. There can be no emergency arise under which parliament cannot be called together ; war does not spring up in a day or night. If the country were in danger of war, it would be an easy matter to call parliament, and then parliament could decide if it is necessary to send our militia outside of Canada. It is a different matter altogether about permitting volunteers to serve in any portion of the empire.

That is the distinction which the minister has just made. Troops were enrolled specially to go and serve in South Africa, but what is meant by clause 77 is that our militia cannot be sent outside of Canada except for the defence of Canada. If, however, there should be an imperial war in which Canadians want to serve, there is nothing to prevent their enlisting into the imperial service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend from King's did not raise that point. He is perfectly in accord with the idea that troops should go outside this country. There is nothing to hinder their going as volunteers outside to fight for the British empire, but if the militia of Canada should be called out by the Canadian government and the imperial authorities should choose to send out a call in this country for volunteers to put down these gentlemen, the allegiance of our militia would be to the British empire rather than to any power in Canada.

Mr. GOURLEY. There is a distinct change in the Act, whether for good reason or bad. It is not a change of form or words, but a distinct change of public policy in connection with the militia, and therefore we should have the full and particular reasons for such a change. Canada is a part of the British empire, and the militia of this country is a part of the defensive force of the British empire, and ought to be used, in the case of emergency, in India, Australia, or Africa or wherever the necessity may arise.

The defence of Canada might be required to be fought out in Africa, and, to keep the militia in Canada, would be simply a betrayal of the empire ; for the empire might be beaten in Africa, or India, and Canada fall with the empire, without a blow being struck upon the soil of this Dominion. Any limitation of the power to send the militia abroad by a provision that this is to be done only in the case of emergency, weakens our power of defending Canada ; and, at this stage of imperial thought, and development, to have a narrow, and petty doctrine like this, engrafted upon the militia legislation of this Canada, is a reversal of the course of our national progress. When the public man of twenty-five or thirty years ago could engraft on the militia system of this country a broader and more generous policy, it strikes me that we should stand by the position they took, if we cannot improve it. I have under my hand the section of the Act of 1878. Comparing it with the present section, we can see that this is no meaningless change but, that there must have been design in the drafting. It is a

decided change of policy, and one of the most serious character. The section of the old Bill was in these terms :

> Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service, either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

So the militia could be called out wherever there was war, invasion or insurrection or danger of any of them—no matter where, the militia were bound to go. And, surely, that is wise. What is the use of putting the militia under the command of a general officer in time of war, unless he is able to order them to the point of danger, whether inside or outside of Canada. There is, a distinct change in this proposed section, which reads :

> 77. The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

We do not want the troops sent outside of Canada for the defence of Canada only, but, if necessary, for the defence of the empire, which may, or may not be, directly, the defence of Canada. The defence of India or of South Africa may be, ex necessitate, the defence of Canada. I must draw the attention of our friends opposite, and of hon. gentlemen on this side, to the extraordinary change of policy indicated by these words, incorporating a narrow doctrine that the Canadian militia and troops are to be used only in Canada for the defence of Canada—let the empire go to smash, but keep our troops at home. This is simply closing our eyes to the fact that the empire may be broken, and go to pieces without making necessary any direct defence of Canada, and yet, in that ruin, our interests will be completely sacrificed. We want the old section to stand, as it has stood on the statute-book for thirty years, that the militia are to be used wherever the necessities of the empire demand, whether in Canada or out of it. This is the most vital section in this Act ; the rest are merely subsidiary.

Mr. MACLEAN. Canada either is, or is not a part of the British empire. If the pact between us and the empire is to mean that the Canadian militia is only to be used for the defence of Canada, are we to expect, the army of England will be used to assist in the defence of Canada only to the extent that our forces shall go to their assistance ? That is how the arrangement works out as proposed in this section. Now, that is not an equitable arrangement and it is a decided change in the policy that has been accepted up to this time. To my mind, this is the most important thing that has happened yet in connection with the imperial relation—that this change should take place without any justification being given for it. I would like the minister to explain why this change in policy has taken place and what the object of it is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There has been no change in policy. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will take the trouble to look at former Militia Acts and the discussion on Militia Bills he will find that the intention always has been, whether expressed or not—in some of the Acts it has been distinctly expressed and in far more stringent terms than in the Bill now before the committee—that the militia of Canada or of the old provinces before the Dominion existed, should be only called upon to serve within the territory of those provinces or of the Dominion. That is the intention. What is the fact as to Great Britain ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) talks about the question of imperial defence. Is he aware that the British militia can only be called upon to serve on the soil of the British islands ? That is the law.

Mr. MACLEAN. But this provides also for our regular force.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is the idea in the organization of any militia force —it is a home force for home service. When the troops were sent from Canada to South Africa, as I have said, it was not considered that the Militia Act which is now in existence, and the important clause of which in this connection the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has quoted, was sufficient to justify the organization of a militia force to be sent to South Africa ; consequently, volunteers were called for and the force was organized purely as a voluntary service, and one in no way whatever connected with the militia law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That was an imperial force.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was a volunteer force.

Mr. GOURLEY. With the hon. minister's permission, I would ask him a question. If there is no change of policy will he allow the old section to stand ? It is far better worded than this new one.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It seems to me that we have made clear in this section exactly what is understood as the object of a militia force in every country. In the mother country and in every province of this Dominion prior to confederation, this has been the rule. We are always able to meet times of stress and emergency. If it becomes necessary to send troops to assist

the empire at distant points, we always have the means at hand of doing so. Parliament can be called and a special force organized, or the same thing can be repeated that was done before—volunteers can offer their services and those services can be availed of. I think it is very much better to leave the section as it is.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the matter is one, perhaps, of some importance. My own views rather coincide with those expressed by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley). The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) speaks of the English militia as a force whose services are confined to the British Islands. I think he must have forgotten that a number of militia regiments were sent out to South Africa as a part of the regular forces of Great Britain.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They volunteered for that service.

Mr. DANIEL. Possibly ; I will not say whether they did or not.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, I know.

Mr. DANIEL. They were sent, they went, anyway. Now, with regard to our militia force, it is the only military force we have, it is our regular army, we have no other army at all. In that respect the militia force of Canada occupies a position different from that of the old country, as distinguished from its regular standing army ; and in making regulations for our militia force, its command, where it should be sent, and so forth, I think we should remember that it is our regular army, part of it is a standing army. The permanent corps is the only force of militia which is on service constantly, and in that way it might be termed our standing force. But it is simply a militia and nothing else in the world ; and our other active militia is just as much a militia as that is, because, by order from the proper authority, any corps we have in Canada could be put on active and permanent service. I quite concur with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) in regard to the wording of the section of the old Act and the wording of this ; and unless the minister gives us some stronger reasons for the change than he has given, I think it would be better to let the old section stand instead of adopting this new one.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to emphasize the point made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel). The English people have a regular army which may be sent all over the world for the defence of the empire In the absence of that army, the country is destitute of defence except by the militia, and the militia may be brought in as a home force, when the whole regular army could be sent abroad for the defence of the empire. Consequently, there is no parallel whatever with our own case. If this government will undertake to raise a regular army, two or three thousand men, and be prepared to send them abroad for the defence of the empire, I will waive my objection to the militia leaving this country. But, as the member for St. John has pointed out, it is the only militia force we have, and by this section we say we will not lend the only force we have in Canada to the service of the empire. It strikes me that at this time of day, when the empire is so vital to us, when we have infinitely more to expect from the empire than the empire has to expect from us—because to-day, if it were not for the opportunities of foreign trade which the empire offers to Canada, we would be desolate indeed—we need especially to foster a good feeling, a feeling of mutual help throughout the empire, and we cannot foster that better than by making our militia force subject to be used in every part of the empire. I urge this upon the minister, because I am persuaded the minister will ruin the militia if he permits this feeling to get abroad that we have changed our policy. I have no doubt that somebody has had a subtle influence in making this change. There has been a deliberate change of policy in changing the language of these two sections, there is no doubt about that. I am too much accustomed to scanning closely this language not to see the distinctions that are made. Consequently, the minister is going to create a strong feeling throughout the country, and I do not wish to see our militia made the subject of political feeling. Let us stand by the militia all over the country. But I must say that when that section is read and understood, it will arouse a most uncanny kind of feeling all over Canada. It is not a proper section to be introduced into a Canadian statute, or a statute of any country belonging to the British empire, to say that our poor contribution to the empire shall not be used except within the boundaries of Canada, and the empire outside can go to smash. I do not like that ; it is a provision that deserves reprobation at the hands of this House of Commons. The old section is a splendid section, and I say let it stand.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would ask the minister if it is not the case that under the old section of the law as it now stands the militia of Canada could be used for the defence of the empire and sent out of this country for that purpose ? But under the proposed law that is strictly prohibited.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I am advised, and was advised at the time of the South African trouble, for instance, that under the law we could not do that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Could not do what ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That we could not send the militia to South Africa for service ; under the law we were not able to do so. The present law has been

changed, as I say, in conformity with that view, and in sympathy with the idea which, as I said, controls the militia of the mother country and the militia of every one of the colonies of the empire, where you will find precisely the same clause.

Mr. GOURLEY. All I can say is that the advice given to the Minister of Militia does not comport with the law as it stood at that time. The Minister of Militia refers to the old debates that took place when the Militia Act was passed. I am not bound by those debates. At that time men may have had a hard time to get this section passed, and language may have been used, as the Minister of Justice said yesterday, to conceal the thoughts that were in the minds of the people who were carrying this Act through. I say that under this clause the militia could be sent abroad at any time and anywhere that the emergencies of the empire required, and that is as it should be. I can easily understand that the strong and broad men who drew this Act, for it was drawn in the year after confederation, when the fathers of confederation, the big men of Canada, were here—I can easily understand that at that time these men desired to engraft that policy in the Act, and perhaps they were surrounded by little people who were not in sympathy with the measure, and consequently they may have used words to conceal their thoughts, and they were wise enough to know that if they got that section passed the power was vested in the Crown and government of Canada to send the militia anywhere. Not only so, but I say with all deference to the person who advised the Minister of Militia, that it was not legal advice, and if it were, I would have thought that the Minister of Justice would have taken the other horn of the dilemma. At the time of the South African war there was a doubt with reference to the power of this country to send our militia abroad. Let us wipe away that doubt, and let the government have power to send the militia abroad. Let us clear up the doubt on the other side, and make it clear that the militia of this country, upon which we have spent millions of dollars, may be used in the defence of the empire. Now, I ask the minister, if he wants his militia force to stand well with the country, to allow that old section to stand; then if you have not the power, if the Minister of Justice advises you that you have not the power, no harm will be done. But Ministers of Justice change, as archbishops change, and archbishops very often have different policies in their dioceses, and a Minister of Justice could be given a different advice to that given to the present Minister of Justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask what the provisions of the English Act are with regard to the summoning of parliament when the militia are called out for active service? Some reference has been made to that.

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When they are 'embodied,' that is the official term.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be of use for us to have the provision submitted to the committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In anticipation of the suggestion coming from the hon. leader of the opposition I may say that during the adjournment, I, myself, in the few moments at my disposal, attempted to find the provision, but since that I have asked one of the officials in my department to look into this matter and get the clause so as to assist us in deciding what action we ought to take.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the clause is contained in this book. Just wait a moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has called my attention to a provision in the Militia Act, 1882, of the parliament of Great Britain and Ireland being chapter 49 of the statutes 45-46 Victoria sections 18, 19:

(1.) In case of imminent national danger or of great emergency it shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council by proclamation (the occasion being first communicated to parliament, if parliament be then sitting, or declared in Council, and notified by the proclamation, if parliament be not sitting) to order the militia to be embodied.

I suppose that practically corresponds to calling out our entire militia force for active service.

(2.) It shall be lawful for Her Majesty by any such proclamation to order a Secretary of State from time to time to give, and when given to revoke or vary, such directions as may seem necessary or proper for embodying all or any part of the militia.

(3.) Every such proclamation and the directions given in pursuance thereof shall be obeyed as if enacted in this Act, and where such directions for the time being direct the embodiment of any part of the militia, every officer and man belonging to that part shall attend at the place and time fixed by those directions, and at and after that time shall be deemed to be embodied; and such officers and men are in this Act referred to as embodied, or as the embodied part or parts of the militia.

Then section 19 reads as follows:

Whenever Her Majesty orders the militia to be embodied, if parliament be then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of parliament within ten days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued for the same day.

Perhaps there are some considerations in connection with the section which we have

been debating that might make it desirable for the government to allow it to stand so as to consider that provision. There seems to be the same reason for the provision as there is in Great Britain. Of course we have a separate system from theirs. They have a large standing army; we have practically no standing army. Speaking offhand and without much consideration of the subject, I would think that while possibly we may not require a provision of that kind in respect to calling out the militia in this country, it would be desirable to have it in respect of calling out the militia for service outside of Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Or for war?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It could only be called out for service outside of Canada in case of war.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At the moment when my hon friend the leader of the opposition rose, I received a memorandum which gives me the different statutes under which this summons to parliament is issued.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be a later statute than that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, that is the consolidation. I find that formerly the period was 14 days during which parliament had to be summoned and that by the Consolidation Act of 1882 it was reduced to ten days. I think I should have an opportunity to look through the different Acts and see how far it may be necessary to adapt the provisions of the Militia Act of Great Britain to the Militia Act of Canada. We may be required to introduce a new clause. I think there is no reason why this clause should not go through with the understanding that a general clause which may be found proper to meet the difficulty shall be introduced into the Bill before it is finally disposed of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If this clause is proposed to be pressed at the present time, I desire to say I am not quite clear as to what the exact meaning of the proposed amendment is. It reads as follows:

> In time of war when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of his regular army who shall be senior in rank to the General Officer Commanding the militia.

There may be some doubt as to what is meant by the words 'serving conjointly with His Majesty's forces.' Does that phrase mean serving conjointly in Canada or serving conjointly in a general sense in the performance of duties connected with the defence of the empire?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It means in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think that possibly even if they were not serving conjointly in the sense in which the hon. Minister of Militia speaks, there might be power given to His Majesty to put an experienced officer in command in time of war.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the idea is simply this: Assuming for the sake of argument that Canada is assisting the mother country in a war somewhere else, outside of Canada, and not for the protection of Canada, when the Canadian troops would simply be going to assist the imperial army and there would be no question about the control of the commanding officer of the imperial army. But, a war might occur, an invasion might be attempted of Canada under which circumstances a large majority of the troops engaged would be Canadian troops. Still, there would be a certain proportion of imperial troops, and in view of the fact that imperial commanding officers have had greater experience it was thought proper that in a war in which Canada would be engaged and in which the imperial army would be assisting, the command should be placed in the hands of an imperial officer. That is the intention.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I am suggesting is that perhaps the power might be extended so as to apply to a case even where they are not serving conjointly. Suppose that we had in Canada 100 regular troops stationed at Halifax and that the Canadian militia was called out for active service to the extent of 10,000 or 15,000; according to the definition of the hon. minister it would be within the scope of this statute to appoint a general officer, but would not exactly the same reason prevail if you did not have any imperial troops in Canada?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have another clause under which an imperial officer can be appointed at any time. We are not giving up the authority to appoint a general officer to command.

Mr. TISDALE. You did not change that clause?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. TISDALE. I thought you were going to strike that out and substitute a council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is one of the results of my attendance at the defence committee when that question was discussed and it was agreed that this special clause would be desirable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we have power outside of this clause, what is the object of this amendment?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The object is that in the event of the militia serving with imperial troops we shall be under the

obligation to have an imperial officer commanding. Otherwise it would be open to the Canadian government to appoint an imperial officer, or a Canadian officer as they chose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the militia of Canada should be engaged in the defence of this country without the assistance of any imperial troops, it would be quite possible to appoint a general officer of experience to command the militia although no regular troops would be associated with them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apart from that there is the power conferred upon His Majesty when regular troops are engaged in this country conjointly with the Canadian militia, to appoint a general officer to command the whole force.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, from the imperial army.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does not the military council do away with the General Officer Commanding?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no. We could not do without the power to appoint a General Officer Commanding; that still remains in the Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The organ of the new war lord says:

> It is a fair prediction that ere the Minister of Militia has completed his list of reforms in that department, the practice of bringing General Officers Commanding from the British army to command the Canadian militia will be as dead as the family compact.

It is evidently the intention of the military boss of the administration that there should be no imperial officers brought to Canada.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is quite clear that the old law contemplated that in case of war the militia of Canada should become imperial troops and be under imperial officers. The whole purpose of the old law seems to be to make the militia of Canada serviceable to the empire at any point wherever their services were required. The minister says that this Bill introduces no change of policy, and if that is so why not retain the old law so that we may be sure of it?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the relationship that now exists between the Canadian militia and the imperial troops in time of war, be in the slightest altered by the passage of this Act?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not in the slightest.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is held by some good heads that there would be a difference in the relationship existing between the two.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. OSLER. What is the meaning of the words 'for the defence of Canada?'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Suppose that Canada were invaded it might be the very best means of defence to immediately send an army into foreign territory.

Mr. OSLER. Quite so, but is not the existing law better and more definite; which says:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada, at any time that it appears advisable to do so, by reason of war, &c.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think there is no question as to the right of the government to send troops anywhere for the defence of the empire. If Canada wished her troops to take part with the imperial troops anywhere else than in Canada for the immediate defence of the empire, that could be accomplished as was done in England during the South African war, when whole regiments of English militia enrolled only to serve in the British Isles, volunteered for service in South Africa.

Amendment agreed to.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 78—period of service in time of war—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to add the following words: 'provided however that the provisions of this section shall not apply to the Permanent Force.' When we were considering the Bill in committee some time ago, the hon. leader of the opposition called my attention to the fact that, as the Permanent Force is a part of the militia, there would likely be confusion in two or three clauses unless the Permanent Force were expressly referred to. This is one of the clauses.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister seems to take for granted that on all occasions on which the militia would require to be called out, they would finish their work in about eighteen months at the outside. It seems to me that the authorities should have a little longer hold on the soldiers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is the old law.

Mr. TISDALE. This is a fair provision, because it must be remembered that these men are volunteers. Under other provisions of the Act, in case men are needed, we can get as many as we want; but the idea is that those who volunteer first shall be compelled to serve only for one year, after which others may be substituted. It is all very well to talk about putting on regulations; but the great difficulty in this country, as in every other, is to get men to

volunteer, and we have to be careful in that respect. This has been the law for a long time.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 79—Army Act, &c., to apply to active service—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I propose to insert after the words 'United Kingdom' in the second line the words 'the King's regulations.' In the first draft of the Bill these words were omitted, but the officers in my department advised very strongly that we should continue to use the King's regulations, and I thought the reasons they gave were very strong. These regulations are the result of many years' experience.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think this is not the same as the old Act. I object most emphatically to placing the officers or men of the militia force of this country under any disability as citizens. This clause makes every officer and man of the militia subject to this superior officer, 'while upon or within any rifle range or any armoury.' Do the words, 'while in the uniform of his corps,' apply to all these clauses, or do they not ? A man might happen to be on a rifle range or in an armoury on civilian business.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That means in uniform.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If it does, all right; but we have to teach the officers and politicians of the country that the officers and men of our militia are not to be subjected to the militarism of Europe or the United States. I believe the United States' regular army system is the most tyrannical in the world. We all know what the military systems of Germany, France and Russia are, with respect to the tyrrany of officers. In England it is bad enough, but England in that respect is free and liberal compared with any other nation in the world. We do not want to engraft on the Canadian militia a system that will put any officer or man under any disability as a citizen. Why should any officer commanding a regiment or a company, when off duty, want to have the slightest control over any man under him ? If he cannot command the respect of his men without having this law at his back, he ought to get out of the force. Of course if he should be on duty or in uniform, the case would be different.

Mr. TISDALE. It is very doubtful if this clause would not apply even while the man was not on duty. We should have it well understood that a man has a right to say anything he pleases to an officer, provided he is not under him or on duty at the time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Once drill is over, the officer should not have any control over the men under military regulations. It is a disgrace that in Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto our militia officers are afraid to express an opinion. They will tell you, I am only a lieutenant in some tuppeny-ha'-penny regiment——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the permanent corps of course men cannot express their opinion, but there are officers in our volunteer regiments in the cities and towns who dare not call their souls their own, who dare not express an opinion even on the Militia Act, because they happen to be only a lieutenant or a captain.

Mr. LOGAN. A provisional lieutenant.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, the provisional fellows talk sometimes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not strike out the word 'also' and substitute the word 'or' ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Better add a subsection. I know that this has been used by senior officers to make the juniors believe they have control over them. A man who can command respectable men in no other way than this should not wear the uniform.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Will my hon. friend draft a clause ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what discipline are the men of the militia while on active service ? For instance, in the case of mutiny, what Act would apply ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Our own regulations supplemented by the imperial regulations wherever ours are found wanting.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not speaking of regulations, but of the Act. In the case I have mentioned, would the English Mutiny Act apply ? That Act is re-enacted from year to year. It is brought into force by this section.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Army Act is what it is called, and although it is re-enacted every year, that is only a form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a little more than a form, because parliament is at liberty not to re-enact it.

On section 83—provision for families of men killed, &c.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move that this be amended by inserting the words 'On active service' after the word 'killed.'

Mr. DANIEL. Are troops engaged at the rifle range counted as being on active service, drill or training, or on duty ? If a man is wounded while engaged on a rifle range, is he counted as being wounded as being on duty, or not ? For this brings up

the broad question we had before us in discussing section 68.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) will look at the interpretation clause—No. 2—he will find these expressions defined.

Mr. DANIEL. I infer that a man attending at a rifle range is not on duty ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. DANIEL. The interpretation clause defines 'on active service' as applying to those enrolled, enlisted, drafted or warned for service or duty during an emergency, or when he is on duty or when he has been warned for duty in aid of the civil power. That appears to me rather complicated.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose that an officer is taking a course of equitation and he is killed, is he counted as having been killed on duty ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It has been ruled that he is not. An officer in Halifax was killed under these circumstances. I always claimed that that officer was killed while on duty.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He was not at the school, but was drilling at his own house.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That does not make any difference. Drilling should not be confined to the school, but if men will take an interest and perfect themselves in drill at their own places—however, we need not discuss the question now.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). The case referred to is that of Major Maxwell. He was killed by being thrown from his horse. I always thought that something should have been done for his widow. It is well enough to say that the general regulations apply only thus or so, but the case was one in which something should have been done.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) brought up the case and my recollection is that we voted a gratuity.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I certainly did not notice any item of that kind in any estimates that were voted. I did not know the man or anything about him except what I learned of the circumstances of his death. As I understand the facts, he was attending the military school. Whether he was in barracks or not makes no difference ; he was under military law from the time he entered the school until he would have left it—until he did leave it, for he was in attendance at the time of his death. I have always felt that the claims of his family should have been recognized under the statute.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that 'drill or training or on duty' would cover such a case. It does not make any difference whether he gets his meals at barracks or at his own home. If he were on his way to the school his case would come within this section. Of course, if he were taking a ride for exercise that would be another matter. But if he were on his way to or from the school at the time the accident happened, I would think his representatives should have the benefit of this section,—just as a volunteer is held to be under orders from the time he starts for the annual drill until he returns to his home.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I looked into the case very carefully some years ago, but I am not certain whether I recall the facts accurately. I went into the case from a sympathetic point of view, because I was very anxious to take favourable action. My impression is that the report of the District Officer Commanding was that Major Maxwell did not come within the meaning of the section. He was mounting his horse to go for a ride but not to go to the school.

Mr. FOWLER. That is not the case I have in mind, but the case of one who was in attendance upon, including going to or returning from the school of equitation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That would be different.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 84—provision for men permanently disabled, &c., penalty for false certificate.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the words 'drill or training or on duty' be inserted after the words 'active service.'

Mr. DANIEL. I notice that, in the interpretation clause, the expression 'on duty' is not interpreted. I take it that it is utterly impossible for one to understand this law without some interpretation of these words. Upon such an interpretation depends the meaning of several sections that we have discussed this afternoon.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a well understood phrase in military parlance, and I am informed that in the King's regulations the explanation is given. I will look into it however, and if it is thought desirable we may add a phrase explaining it.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 86—Militia not to be quartered in convents.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would suggest that after the word 'females' we include 'and children.' You might come to a home where the man would be away on service, and it would be unfair to force soldiers on

his house when his wife might be left at home with children.

Section agreed to.

On section 87—requisitions for transport.

Mr. FOWLER. This only requires persons to place these things at the disposal of the department; I think it ought to give the department the right to take possession of them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Crown has that right.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some time ago I drew the minister's attention to the omission of the words 'horse and wagon' belonging to a farmer, as these things are likely to be called into requisition oftener than railways and steamships.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think section 88 would cover that.

Mr. FOWLER. My point is that the Governor in Council should have authority to take possession of all these things and use them and pay for them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This part of the Act is copied from the Imperial Statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty seems to be that section 88 goes a little beyond section 87. Section 88 provides that if they are lawfully required and are not furnished, there shall be a penalty imposed; but they must be lawfully required. The two sections do not appear to work exactly on the same lines.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 13 goes a little further, it practically authorizes taking possession. The last words of the first paragraph say:

And may also impress any horses, mules, oxen or other animals required for military purposes.

Mr. DANIEL. Section 13 is the one which I suggested to the minister as needing to include the words 'carts and wagons,' and he said he would take it into consideration at the third reading.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Every one knows that wagons and horses are the things that are most frequently commandeered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This does not seem to me to be exactly intended to meet the case provided for in section 13. Section 13 seems to give the government the right at once to take possession of articles without requiring them to be furnished; section 88 contemplates a requisition, and a failure to comply with the requisition. I hardly think section 13 is in the same line.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One, I think, refers to a case of emergency, and the other does not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very likely, but there is the same difficulty that has been pointed out already. Where no emergency exists and where you make a requisition, you are entitled to have that requisition complied with under a penalty upon the person refusing. But the reference to wagons and so forth is in that portion of the statute which provides a penalty; therefore probably section 88 would be inoperative in that regard, because 88 merely provides that any person lawfully required under this Act to do something and who does not do it, shall be subject to a penatly. Then you must look outside 88 for some provision in the statute requiring the person to whom the requisition is directed to provide wagons, carriages and so forth. I mean in so far as these are not enumerated in section 87 or in some other part of the Act as articles which may be lawfully requisitioned, you do not get very much benefit from section 88.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Section 88 might be required in the event of difficulty occurring as to transporting a company to the annual camp.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the Minister of Militia understands me. Section 88 provides a penalty, but it says the articles must have been lawfully requisitioned. Therefore we must find in the Act some power lawfully to requisition them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would require to be amended to cover that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved:

That the section be amended by inserting in the fourteenth line after the word 'vessel' the words 'wagon, carriage or pack animal.'

Mr. HAGGART. Are not all these things provided for under the English Army Act?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. You bring the English Army Act into effect and, if so why re-enact this?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is not under the Army Act. It is under the imperial statute governing the army and that is an entirely different thing from the Army Act.

Mr. HAGGART. You only have power to billet under the Army Act.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Section 93, stricken out.

Section 99—offences and penalties—claiming pay for drill not performed; returning men not duly enrolled; claiming for drill with another corps.

Mr. FOWLER. In the case of mounted corps it might happen that more horses would be claimed for than are really in camp. This section would not seem to include that offence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think a regulation could be made to cover that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In view of the proposal to largely increase the cavalry corps, if you are making that provision with regard to officers and men, it might be well to include horses.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Surely if an officer made a return representing a man to be present who was not present and received pay for him, it would be a distinct case of false representation, and he would be amenable under the Criminal Code.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. It is not only the case of a man who is not there, but the case of a man who is there and who is enrolled in another corps.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He cannot be present in two places at the same time unless he is an Irishman or a bird.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. But the regiments do not drill at the same time, and therefore he does not have to be an Irishman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Criminal Code would cover any misrepresentation as to the number of horses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, these suggestions might be very good arguments for striking out the words 'or claims pay for officers or men not present.' I do not think they are legitimate arguments for refusing to insert the word 'horses.' You should either depend on the criminal law, or if you do not depend on the criminal law, make a special provision here, which should be exhaustive. Is there in the Criminal Code any special punishment provided for false pretenses ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes. But there seems to be a provision here for making a man guilty of an indictable offence, but without providing any penalty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should imagine that these clauses were originally drafted before the Criminal Code was revised. It might be a useful thing to look over all the offences created by this Bill and see to what extent they are already covered by the Criminal Code. Otherwise, you may have confusion by making provision in this statute for matters already covered to a certain extent by the Crimianl Code or the English Army Act.

Section agreed to.

Sections from 100 to 107 agreed to.

On section 108—refusal to attend drill.

Mr. DANIEL. I have in my hand several suggestions sent me by an officer who has had a good deal of experience in the militia. He suggests that at the end of this section the following should be added :

> And the regimental orders of the corps properly issued and promulgated during the time of the annual drill or training shall be sufficient notice to such officers or men to attend.

There will be nothing otherwise in the Act to show what is sufficient notice.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes ; there is section 129, which says :

> Every order made by the commanding officer of any corps of the militia shall be held to be sufficiently notified to all persons whom it concerns, by insertion in some newspaper published in the regimental division in which such corps is situated, or, if there is no such newspaper, then by posting a copy thereof on the door of every place of public worship, or of some other public place, in each company division affected by such order.

Mr. DANIEL. It seems to me that is sufficient.

On section 112,

> Every person who unlawfully disposes of or removes any arms, accoutrements or other articles belonging to the Crown or corps, or who refuses to deliver them up when lawfully required, or has them in his possession, except for lawful cause, the proof of which shall lie upon him, shall incur a penalty of twenty dollars for each offence ; but nothing in this section shall prevent such offender from being indicted and punished for any greater offence, if the facts amount to such greater offence : and such offender may be arrested by order of the justice of the peace before whom the complaint is made, upon affidavit showing that there is reason to believe that such offender is about to leave Canada, carrying with him any such arms, accoutrements or articles.

Mr. DANIEL. My military friend suggests that at the end of that clause we should add the words :

> Or if he have neglected or refused to deliver or return such articles after being properly notified or required so to do.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The clause in the present Bill has been found to work admirably for some thirty or forty years.

Mr. DANIEL. The fact that these regulations have been in existence thirty or forty years without change is, I think, one of the reasons why my friend makes the suggestion he does.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I should be very glad if my hon. friend will send me a copy of the proposed amendment, as we might take it up, if necessary, on the third reading.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is covered by section 112.

On section 113—refusal to aid the civil power.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In copying this clause some words were omitted, and I simply wish to restore them, making the clause read the same as the clause of the existing Act. I move to insert, after the word 'penalty,' the words 'in an officer, not exceeding one hundred dollars, and if a man.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not object to the amendment. I presume that the other section referring to the troops called out to aid the civil power will come up to-morrow. I would call the minister's attention to one point now, so that he may think it over. I think it would be in harmony with the spirit of the times and with the wish of the people that there should be a clause providing that when the militia are called out to aid the civil power, the pay of the men shall be at least equal to that which it would be necessary to pay to special constables. These towns, rather than go to the expense of hiring special constables, call out the militia—the poor soldier has to serve them at 50 cents a day.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose we would have to fix the amount.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 116—procedure, recovery of penalties; imprisonment if not paid.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know that this is the same section as in the existing Act, but, I would draw the attention of the minister to a point which I asked him once before to consider. Is it fair-play to convict a man before one justice of a peace and upon the testimony of one witness?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not heard of any complaint. The whole thing is obsolete. I never heard of any of these sections being used, but, if it is to be in the law it should be in proper form. I am not a judge or a lawyer, but it seems to me that this section is not just.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The penalties are not very great, and, of course, in many cases of offences similar to this, one justice has jurisdiction. In some cases it requires two justices of the peace, or one judge having the jurisdiction of two justices. I do not see why these proceedings should not be taken before one justice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And only one witness?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. One witness is as good as a thousand if he is the proper sort.

Mr. DANIEL. Why not require that a man should be taken before the stipendiary magistrate?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There may be none in the locality.

Mr. DANIEL. But, suppose it is in a city where there is a stipendiary magistrate? Can the party complaining take the man before any justice of the peace he comes across?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Speaking for the province of Quebec, a justice of the peace can be used to take bail. The court is presided over by a stipendiary magistrate and, in his absence by his substitute. The ordinary justices do not attend though they have jurisdiction.

Mr. DANIEL. But this would allow one of these soldiers to be taken before a justice of the peace even in a town where there was a stipendiary magistrate.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would apply to any individual proceeded against under the law.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know whether the justices of the peace rank the same all over the country, but in some cases I should think this would be rather too great a risk.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it is sound in this case.

On section 119—procedure—where actions may be brought.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I drew the attention of the minister some months ago to the fact that he speaks of 'district' in Quebec and 'county' in the other provinces, but he pays no attention to the Northwest Territories where they have not counties. I think the term 'judicial district' would do.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would suggest that we add the words 'shall be held and tried in the judicial district where the Act complained of was done.' I will have this considered more fully, and if afterwards it is thought important to make any change we can have it amended.

On section 121—duty of jailor.

Mr. DANIEL. After the word 'commanding' in the fourth line my correspondent suggests that there should be added the words 'or the officer commanding the corps during annual drill or training or on active service. That is, in addition to the district officer commanding.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The words 'or any person authorized' cover that.

On section 126—general provisions—property of corps vested in commanding officer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved:

That the words 'commanding officer of the corps' be stricken out and that the words 'His Majesty' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 129—general provisions—notifying other orders.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved:

That the section be amended by inserting after the word 'militia' the words 'other than the Permanent Force'; by striking out the words 'on the door of every place of public worship' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'in every post office,' and by striking out the word 'of' before the word 'some' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'in.'

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 132 and 134 stricken out.

On section 135—Acts repealed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that the present militia law is only to be repealed so far as the land force of the militia is concerned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, I move to add these words:

In so far as the active and reserve militia—land force is concerned.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 79,—Active service—Army Act, &c., to apply to active service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister was good enough to ask me to suggest some amendments to this section, and I have suggested them with the assistance of the leader of the opposition who put them in legal form. These amendments make the section more clear.

Amendments agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I beg to add as subclause 2:

Officers and men of the permanent force and members of the permanent staff of the militia shall be at all times subject to military law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The members of the permanent force are subject to military law at all times. I do not like oppressive measures.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The staff of the militia is not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, but the minister does not want to try by court martial his deputy minister or his musketry instructor, or any other of the erratic members of his staff.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is afraid of this clause.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, I am not under pay. It does not concern me personally at all.

Section as amended agreed to.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 35—militia may be called out to suppress riot——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is the same as the old law, is it not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, exactly the same.

Section agreed to.

On section 36,

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the section be struck out and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

The district officer commanding, if he is present in the locality and able to act, or if he is not so present, or from sickness or other cause is unable to act, the senior officer of the active militia in any locality, shall call out the same or any portion thereof, as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, when thereunto required in writing by the chairman or custos of the quarter sessions of the peace, or by any three justices of the peace, of whom the warden, mayor or other head or acting head of the municipality or county in which such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated as aforesaid, shall be one, unless he has declined or is unable to act, which fact shall in that case be set forth in the requisition, and shall not be open to dispute by the officer upon whom the requisition is made: provided always that the permanent force, if, in the opinion of the officer upon whom the requisition is made, a sufficient number of that force is available, is to be employed upon this duty, before resort is had to other militia corps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This section was drafted by the Department of Justice, the officers of that department having carefully read the criticisms which were made here when this Bill was discussed in committee before.

Mr. DANIEL. I think this clause is a much better one than the old one. Wherever a permanent force is available, I think it should always be brought out, in case of riot or anticipated riot, in preference to the militia of the town. As we all know, the militia might be compelled to act against their own friends and companions. So that I think the provision is a very good one.

Mr. PUTTEE. When this question was discussed on a previous occasion, the general feeling seemed to be that some measures should be taken to prevent the militia being called out before the civil power was exhausted. Our experience in recent years has shown that the militia have been called out before the civil power has been taxed to its full extent. I would like to know whether the Minister of Militia thinks that there is in this clause sufficient safeguard against any such abuse. It was suggested that we should put upon the municipal authorities the duty of engaging special constables, and only calling on the militia when such precaution proved ineffective. Take the case down at Sydney, there is much dispute as to whether there was any necessity for bringing the militia to quell the labour troubles down there, and I believe the municipality has repudiated the action of the justices of the peace who sent the requisition for military aid.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot see very well what greater obstacle you can provide against the unnecessary calling out of the troops than compelling the municipality interested to pay the cost. When the municipalities have to pay, they will be very careful about calling out the militia.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is it not a fact that they generally refuse to pay ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. There are two points that occur to me in connection with this section. In the first line I would suggest that we substitute the word 'district' for the word 'locality,' because no one could tell what 'locality' means in this section.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is the present law.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. But we are trying to amend it. However, if the committee thinks that the language is clear enough, I shall not make a motion. But there is something at the end : 'provided always, that the permanent force is not available and in sufficient numbers for the purpose.' This could be construed to mean that, if in the opinion of the district officer commanding, the permanent force is not available in sufficient numbers, then the non-permanent militia should be called out. To my mind, what is intended is that the non-permanent militia should be called out to supplement the permanent force in case the later is not sufficient in numbers. In the discussion we had on this clause the general opinion was that the permanent force should be resorted to whenever possible.

Mr. WARD. I think the objection of the hon. member for Haldimand is well taken. We should make it perfectly clear that the permanent force is to be called out to the extent to which it is available, and that only in the event of that force being insufficient should we call on the militia, and then only call on the militia to supplement the permanent force. That evidently is the intention, but we should see that it is clearly expressed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It would be rather dangerous to make the law too stringent. It might be advisable, for instance, not to call out the Permanent Force, but to hold it in reserve for some other duty, and no one is in a better position to judge of the circumstances than the district or senior officer, who is on the spot. We must give him some discretion in the matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would suggest that we amend the clause by striking out the words 'in the opinion of the officer,' and substitute the words 'so far as it is available.' The clause would then read : 'Provided always, that the permanent force, so far as it is available, is to be employed upon this duty before calling on the militia.' My own opinion is that the militia should be called on first. I think that every locality should be taught to keep its own law and order. I believe in self-governing communities, and I do not believe in this system of calling in the militia from Quebec to go to Sydney or from Toronto to Sault Ste. Marie. That is one reason why I want the pay of the militia increased to that of special constables. That would teach the municipalities a lesson. I am told that the Sault disturbance could have been quelled by one good, sensible man acting in proper time, and nine out of ten of these disturbances, to quell which the troops are called out, could have been settled without having resort to that extreme measure.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Justice in connection with this clause. You will see that the district officer commanding, very properly, has no power to refuse a requisition that is made upon him. And the clause goes on to provide that the requisition shall be in writing by the chairman of the quarter sessions, or by any three justices of the peace, of whom the warden, mayor, or other head of the municipality shall be one ; and if the mayor, warden or other head refuses to act, then the requisition is to state such refusal, and one other justice of the peace has to take his place. You will see that the warden or mayor is the only one of these three who is responsible to the municipality as regards expenditure. It seems to me, therefore, it would be a proper thing to provide that, if the mayor refuses to sign this requisition the signature of two other justices of the peace—that is, four justices of the peace altogether—should be required. It would be necessary to make the section read something in this manner :

—or by any three justices of the peace of whom the warden, mayor or other head or acting head of the municipality or county in which such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated as aforesaid, shall be one, but, if he declines or is unable to act, then, by four justices of the peace.

It is pretty well understood that in many instances justices of the peace are too quick perhaps, to call upon the district officer commanding for assistance before the resources of the municipality are exhausted. That is the experience. Certainly, it was the experience in Valleyfield, I think it was the experience three years ago in British Columbia, and I doubt if it is not the experience in Sydney at the present time. This amendment gives a little more protection to the municipality which after all must foot the bill.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 36 A—form of requisition provided for in section 36.

Mr. DANIEL. I see that the subsection allows this form to be varied, but to what extent it may be varied does not appear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To any extent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the case with all blanks in statutes. They are intended for the purpose of guiding the magistrate, and then he must act within the spirit of the section.

Mr. DANIEL. This form says at the end :

> These are therefore to require you to call out the active militia present in or such portion thereof as you consider necessary for the purpose of suppressing (or preventing, or dealing with) such riot or disturbance.

The idea of the Bill is that the permanent force shall be called out in preference to the ordinary active militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The permanent force is a part of the active militia.

Mr. DANIEL. I am aware of that, but the permanent force is to be called upon first, and that permanent force must necessarily be stationed in the locality where it is expected a riot may take place. I am thinking of course of my own constituency. There we have some active militia, a regiment of artillery and one of infantry, and we have no permanent force at all. There is a company of infantry at Fredericton, and it would be easy to have that company in the city of St. John in a couple of hours after the order was sent. But I cannot see that this requisition, unless it is changed a good deal, would be suitable for such a case as that. 'These are therefore to require you to call out the active militia at present in'—they are in the locality.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the district.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The permanent force is a part of the active militia, and when requisition is made upon the district officer commanding he must consult the statute under which he is to act, and the statute says that the part of the militia which is first to be called upon is the permanent force. He has to read the statute in order to ascertain what his powers are, and he will find that the permanent force are first to be called upon, if they are available in sufficient number.

Mr. DANIEL. At all events, these words do not make any reference to the permanent force.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The permanent force is a part of the active militia, and the active militia includes the permanent force.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the present moment a Quebec permanent corps are in Sydney, Cape Breton, some hundreds of miles away.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention that in case the permanent force are called out they are to be paid for by the government or by the municipality ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. By the municipality.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should their cost be a fine upon the municipality ? It may not be the fault of the municipality that this riot occurs, and I think they should be paid out of the general revenue of the country.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I think if that were so, every time a person got disorderly in the streets the permanent corps would be sent for.

Mr. WARD. Would it not be better to alter that requisition in this way :

> These are therefore to require you to call out the active militia in the district.

Instead of saying as at present in any particular place.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then that would mean that we have no permanent corps.

Mr. WARD. If there are any permanent corps in the district, then they would be available in accordance with the terms of section 36.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But if there are not ?

Mr. WARD. The active militia covers both, it seems to me.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me a serious matter that the town of Sydney should have to bear the expense of taking the permanent force from Quebec to Sydney.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They deposited the money in the bank before the force started, $10,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I saw somewhere that the town of Sydney had notified the militia authorities that they would not pay a cent of this.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They did not. Before we allowed the troops to start the money was put in the bank.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the government cannot be too emphatic in impressing upon these municipalities that they must preserve law and order in their own community. I object to the ratepayers of Victoria county being called upon to pay one dollar of the cost of sending the permanent force to suppress riots in any part of Canada.

Mr. GILMOUR. When the militia are called out by three magistrates, I do not see why the municipalities should have to

pay the cost. I think whenever a riot occurs and it becomes necessary to call out the militia—and they can only be called out by three magistrates—the government ought to be in some measure responsible for their expense. The militia are a government force, and it is unfair to compel the municipality to pay the expenses of the militia so called out. The magistrates are responsible to the town, or perhaps responsible to the county, they are competent judges of the necessity of outside aid, and I do not think it is fair that a little municipality should be called upon to pay the entire expense.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Why should the Dominion treasury be made liable ?

Mr. GILMOUR. Because the militia are under the control of the Dominion government, under the control of the Minister of Militia as a member of the government, and if they are to go at all, they should go at the expense of the Dominion government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Each province or subdivision of a province is responsible for maintaining law and order, and it is only in extraordinary occasions, cases of emergency, that this power should be exercised by the local authorities in calling upon the central power for aid. I agree with the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) absolutely, that municipalities should be discouraged as far as possible from exercising a power which is only meant to be available in an emergency. We should not offer too many invitations or too many facilities for having recourse to that power. I may point out that at the present time, the militia are being used to perform police duty in suppressing a street row in the city of London. I object emphatically to any ratepayer of Victoria county, or of any other county in the Dominion of Canada, being called upon to pay police expenses, even though the Dominion troops are being used, or to pay one farthing of the expenses of suppressing a riot.

Mr. FOWLER. It is the law abiding citizens in all cases who have to pay the cost of suppressing disturbances on the part of the citizens who are not law abiding. It seems to me that if the people of this country pay taxes to support this permanent force, they have a right to their services to suppress serious local riots.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Not as a police force.

Mr. FOWLER. To maintain law and order within the boundaries of Canada as well as to resist invasion. You have authority to call upon this force in case of emergency. Here is an emergency ; by this very Act you define an emergency to be a riot and insurrection beyond the power of the local police force to suppress. It does seem to me that in case the permanent force are called out the expenses should not be saddled upon the municipality.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is only when a local disturbance becomes a riot and the law of the country is set at defiance that the federal authority is called in. Therefore it is when the local police in the country break down that the militia come in. Under the general idea that the government must preserve law and order in the country when the authority of the local municipality breaks down this government should pay for the suppression of any disturbance. But unfortunately this was settled at a time when the province of Ontario was settling everything on a very narrow basis. If the province of Nova Scotia wanted a wharf they required that we should pay half the cost of it.

An hon. MEMBER. We pay all the cost now.

Mr. GOURLEY. I agree with my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) because he struck the proper key and stated a sound principle both in morals and equity when he said that if the law makes it legal for the municipality, or some officials in the municipality, to call out the militia the charge should be upon the country as a whole, because the public law of the land is evoked and the local authority is in abeyance.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When this matter was introduced first I took the ground that the militia force should not be called out for police purposes to put down a riot in a scrub town in which the municipality do not know how to preserve law and order.

Mr. GOURLEY. I object to my hon. friend referring in so disagreeable a manner to Lindsay.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We are a law abiding people there and do not require to call out the militia to keep us in order. I repeat most emphatically that no militiaman ought to be called out to do police duty at 50 cents a day to be insulted and spat upon especially when he is not in a position to arrest a man for disorderly conduct. The law should be so amended that if these men are called out they should be called out as policemen, given $2.50 a day and have the power to step out of the ranks and arrest a man if he is disorderly. I want to convert my hon. friend here. Nine out of ten of these riots are caused through some action on the part of local people, nine out of ten of these riots are caused by the residents becoming disorderly, they are the people who encourage a riot and I say that no one outside of the municipality should be called upon to pay a farthing of the expense of putting down a riot in that municipality.

Mr. FOWLER. The difficulty is that under the law two or three magistrates who are not responsible to the municipality can put a large expense upon the municipality.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is the municipality's own fault.

Mr. FOWLER. How is it the municipality's own fault? They have no control over the magistrates. My hon. friend says that it is the fault of the municipality. Not at all. If you give the power to the municipal council who are responsible to the people, then it might be all right to make the municipality pay for it, but you allow irresponsible persons, and magistrates are not always responsible persons, to perform this duty and saddle the municipality with the cost.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). The municipal council in Sydney is composed of as able men as those composing any municipal council in this Dominion. The citizens of Sydney are as orderly as those of any city in the Dominion. A company has been formed there and a foreign element has been brought into the place.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not Highland Scotch ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They are not Scotch. The Scotch know how to behave themselves in whatever part of the world they are placed. Even amongst savages they know how to behave themselves. But, that is outside of the question altogether. Here you have a body of regulars down at Quebec. They are doing nothing. They have nothing to do because the cities of Quebec are orderly in every respect, and these regulars are sent down to Sydney to preserve order there. If their travelling expenses in going down and coming home are paid that is as much as could be expected by the municipality of Sydney.

Mr. INGRAM. Those who are instrumental in the first instance in having the soldiers called out may have been the original cause of all the friction. A foreign element is brought in by parties who are engaged in carrying on a work. They are brought in to serve these parties own interests in the first instance and because these men object to their being handled to the liking of the company, friction arises, the militia are called out and the country has to pay for it. If the militia are called out let the municipality pay for them and when the municipality knows that they are responsible for the cost of bringing the militia in they will remove the cause of friction. I would be very sorry to support a proposition that the country as a whole should pay the expenses in connection with a matter of this kind. I think the hon. minister is quite right when he makes the law read as he proposes to do.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. The main object of the permanent force is defined in section 30 of this Bill when it says :

The permanent force shall furnish schools of instruction for the militia, and provide instructors therefor ;—

The hon. member for Victoria, Nova Scotia (Mr. Ross)——

Mr. FOWLER. Read the rest of it.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. It has other functions, but I said this was the main one.

—and it shall also be available, at all times, for general service.

The general service referred to there is something more serious than putting down riots. When any hon. member of this House says that this corps is idling all the time and that it might as well be employed for the suppression of rioting, I think he entirely overlooks the fact that it is doing important work in instructing the balance of the force, and that this is the principal reason for its existence. It does seem to me that if this force which has been established mainly for the instruction of the balance, or the larger part of the force is removed from its instructional duties, that balance of the force is therefore losing its teaching in consequence, and it is only right that the government should receive pay from the municipality. It does seem absurd, I think, to charge this to the whole of Canada.

Mr. WARD. It does not seem that the hon. minister has answered the objection of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel). I would like to have him state whether it is not possible to alter this requisition so as to make it more conformable with section 36. It seems to me that some slight change was made there. There seems to be a portion that cannot be very well altered, but if the hon. minister would alter that provision so as to refer to the active militia in the district, I think it would answer the objection of my hon. friend from St. John.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The language used is that which exists in the present law. It has been found to work very well and I suppose it was followed by the draftsman who prepared this clause. One hesitates to depart from a phrase or from language which has been used for many years and which is found to work well.

Mr. WARD. But the hon. minister must not forget that section 36 has been altered and it is only to make this requisition conform with the alteration that my hon. friend from St. John proposes the change.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If you insert the word 'district,' the permanent force could not go to the city of Halifax to suppress a

riot, because there is no permanent force in Nova Scotia. It is better to allow these elastic words to be used ; you have to trust to the discretion and good judgment of somebody, and it is better to leave that to the discretion of the district officer commanding.

Mr. WARD. The whole Dominion is divided into military districts, and there is a permanent corps in each district.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WARD. Even so, I do not see what objection there can be, because the words 'active militia' do not refer to the permanent corps if there is no permanent corps in that district. I am sure the Minister of Justice could suggest a wording of the clause that would meet the case.

Mr. DANIEL. The substitution of the word 'locality' does not make it any better. It would be preferable to alter the wording of that sentence entirely.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot see any objection to that word 'district.'

Mr. FOWLER. Instead of allowing the militia to be called out by three magistrates, why not say that it shall be done by a majority of the municipal council ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That might take too long.

Mr. MACLEAN. They might refuse to make a quorum.

Mr. GOURLEY. When the original Act provided that three magistrates might call out the militia, we had no county or municipal councils in the greater part of the Dominion. At that time the magistrates were members of the sessions, and they had the authority that is now vested in municipal bodies. In moulding our Act to-day, we should give recognition to the representative institutions as we find them ; and, as the magistrates have ceased to have any civil authority, we should substitute for the three magistrates of the old law the mayor and two or three municipal councillors, who can just as readily be gotten at as three magistrates.

Mr. FOWLER. Apparently the sentiment of this committee is against the indiscriminate employment of the militia to aid the civil power ; and, that being so, it seems to me that it would be better to have the municipal council called together, or that a majority of the municipal council should sign the requisition to call out the militia. If you allow it to be done by three magistrates who are not responsible in any way to the people, the militia could very easily be called out when the occasion was not serious enough to demand it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My own opinion is that the militia should not be called out for this purpose at all. Instead of ordering the boys out and paying them 50 cents a day, let the municipal authorities swear them in as special constables and pay them $1.50 or $2 a day. When the militiaman stands there with his uniform and his rifle, every pup in the town can spit on him and he dare not leave the ranks, whereas if he were a special constable he could take that fellow by the scruff of the neck and put him in the lock-up. The muncipal authorities ought to be taught the idea of providing for the peace and order of the municipalities, and pay for it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Although I am not a militiaman, I will venture to say a word on this question. The suggestion has been made that the militia should only be called out by a majority of the municipal council, but I would point out that in many districts of the province of British Columbia there are no municipalities, and consequently the militia could not be called out at all under such a law. For instance, on the Skeena river, where a strike is feared, there are no municipalities, and so the justices of the peace must be the authority to take action in such a contingency. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that the machinery for calling out the militia should not be made too easily available, and further, that when the militia is called out in aid of the civil power, the municipalities should be made to understand that they must pay for it. If the government were to pay the militia every time they were called out for such duty, then the militia would be at the beck and call of every person in the country, but if the municipality is obliged to pay it is a very great safeguard. Let me say that I am very strongly opposed to the militia being called out to suppress riots in towns where the members of the militia force themselves reside, because sometimes they are called upon to act against their personal friends, and that is a condition that should be avoided if possible. I repeat that in the province of British Columbia, where there are no municipalities, the power to call out the militia must be in the hands of the justices of the peace.

Mr. GOURLEY. The more we discuss this matter the more apparent it becomes that the body representative of the people who pay the cost should have the authority to say when the militia shall be called out. In provinces where municipal councils are incorporated you could say that the mayor and three of the town council—I do not think a majority of the council is necessary—should have the power to call the militia out, and as these gentlemen know they have to pay the cost they will be rather chary about exercising the power except in case of great stress. I think that would solve the whole difficulty. If you leave it to three magistrates, a big company like the Steel Company at Sydney could easily pick up three magistrates and get them to call out

the militia, whether it was right to do so or not. I am not speaking of magistrates as a whole, but a company like the Steel Company might have three or four magistrates in its employ; whereas if it had to go to the city or town council, which had to pay the bill, it would meet with a different order of things. I deprecate the calling out of the militia on all occasions, and I think that would be the better plan to adopt.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Let me say to my hon. friend that although this law has been in force for forty years, there has never been a case in my knowledge—and I have looked over the cases carefully—where it has been abused. The law has worked well for forty years, and I think before that in the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and why not leave it alone? I might point out one case on the other side, the case of Valleyfield, where the mayor absolutely refused to act. Will any one say that it was not necessary on that occasion to take the action that was taken? I think not; and yet under the proposal of my hon. friend, it would be impossible to get the aid of the militia in similar conditions. The law has worked well; why not leave it alone?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In the case of Valleyfield, could not the civil authorities have sworn in enough special constables to have preserved order without calling out the militia, if they had not found it easy to do so?

Mr. GILMOUR. What is the meaning of the word 'municipality' as used in this section? We have a county municipality, which embraces incorporated villages, townships and towns, each and every one of which is a municipality. Would you seek to recover pay from an incorporated village, or from the county? I am inclined to think it would be from the county as the language stands here.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be from the particular municipality directly charged with the maintenance of peace within the district where the riot occurs. These occurrences never take place in the country parts. This legislation is designed to meet actual cases that arise, not imaginary cases that have not arisen and are not likely to arise. Outside of the case at Valleyfield, no such emergency has arisen in the province of Quebec outside of a town or city, and I am sure the same thing would apply to Ontario.

Mr. GILMOUR. But in the event of your endeavouring to recover from the municipality the cost of the militia being called out, would it not be as well to define what is meant by the municipality—whether it is meant to be the county or one of the local municipalities, such as the village, town or township?

Mr. GOURLEY.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has not a city, a town or a village a separate municipal existence from a county in Ontario?

Mr. GILMOUR. Not entirely. Cities have, towns may not have, villages and townships do not have. They have to pay their statute taxes to the counties, and they are controlled in that measure by the counties.

Mr. FOWLER. It strikes me that you are violating the principle of no taxation without representation when you allow these magistrates to call out the militia. I am surprised that the hon. member for Labelle, who is a stickler for constitutional liberty, has not seen this point, and come to the assistance of those who are fighting for constitutional principles.

Mr. BOURASSA. My hon. friend is doing it better than I could.

Mr. DANIEL. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) stated that in the district which he represents it was necessary that the law should be retained as it is—why? Because there are no municipalities there. In that case, if the three magistrates called out the troops, who is to pay for them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I like to proceed on the principle that it is a good thing to deal with one thing at a time. We shall be called on to deal with the question my hon. friend raises when he comes to sections 39 and 40.

Mr. DANIEL. In the case of the Valleyfield riots, has anybody paid for the militia other than the government?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The municipality has been sued, and we got a judgment against it.

Mr. PUTTEE. After the views which have been expressed by a number of members of the committee, I think they will see the reasonableness of the suggestion I made a few minutes ago. What we have done is to provide that a requisition to call out the militia must be signed by three persons, two justices of the peace and the mayor of the town; if the mayor refuses, his refusal is to be noted, and another justice of the peace may take his place. The mayor is the only one who represents the people who are to pay the cost, and if he refuses, the requisition should be signed by at least two more justices of the peace. It seems to me that this is a reasonable compromise proposition, and one that should be accepted. I remember the case at Valleyfield, to which I gave a great deal of attention at the time, and in my opinion that is one of the exceptions where the power was abused. The mayor of Valleyfield refused to sign the requisition, and three justices of the peace called out the militia over his head. The whole people were scandalized. There was

a strike on at the time, and everybody connected with the strike decided that they would do no work until the militia were withdrawn, and they had to be withdrawn before a settlement could be effected. There was no fear of any disturbance which local constables could not control. Because a large company in a small district can control enough justices of the peace to secure a requisition if it is in its interest to do so, it seems to me that if the mayor refuses to sign, it should be necessary to have four justices of the peace, and not three.

Section agreed to.

Section 37 agreed to.

On section 38—duty of officers and men who shall be special constables.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there not in this a contradiction of terms ? You make the militia special constables and at the same time they are only to act as a military body under orders of their superior officer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They will act as a military body, but shall have the jurisdiction of special constables.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the absurdity of the whole business. No man can step out of the ranks to arrest anybody. After the Riot Act is read, all these men can do is shoot or bayonet.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They can arrest.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In practice they never arrest. If the crowd do not disperse they charge with the bayonet or shoot.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I know of my own knowledge where a sergeant and two men were detailed to make an arrest, and they did it very well.

On section 39—aid of the civil power, payment by municipality, &c.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If this Bill is not going out of the committee to-night, this clause ought to be recast to provide for the difficulties suggested with respect to the unorganized parts of territories where there are no municipalities.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I would ask the Minister of Militia whether this dollar a day pay would apply to men on the permanent force as well as to those in the non-permanent force when acting on this duty?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It should.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Decidedly it should. It is a most miserable duty to perform and ought to be paid for.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think it should be distinctly understood that when the permanent corps are on this very offensive duty, this dollar a day should be paid, viz., the excess of the pay they get as soldiers up to a dollar a day.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 41,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 41 as it appears in the Bill is to be struck out and the following inserted instead :

41. There may be appointed an officer who shall hold rank not below that of colonel in the militia or in His Majesty's regular army, who may be, subject to the regulations and under the direction of the minister, charged with the military command of the militia, and such officer shall have the rank of major-general in the militia and shall be paid at such rate, not exceeding $6,000 per annum, as may be prescribed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some time ago, I gave the Minister of Militia notice that I proposed asking him to agree to the amendment of this section. I propose to add this to the qualifications :

Who shall have the military education, training and experience of an imperial major-general.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Who is to judge of the degree of training and experience ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has to pass an examination in the imperial service.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You would require an imperial service commission ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Every Canadian officer to-day can get an imperial service commission if he chooses. A number of them already hold such commissions, and have passed examinations in the imperial service for lieutenant-colonel. There is nothing to prevent a Canadian militia officer going over and passing his examination.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that is a matter that should be covered by the regulations. There is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend says, but I think the regulations would cover it. They would certainly demand a certain standard of education and experience for an officer holding that position; I should certainly require it. But that is an unusual thing to put in a statute. I do not think that it is to be found in any statute. I have read most of the militia laws of the colonies of the empire and the British militia law, and I have never seen a provision of that kind in any of them. The regulations have the force of law, and they have to be laid upon the table of the House. This law cannot come into force until there are regulations. I think if the hon. member for Victoria would consent to leave that to the government, he will find the regulations satisfactory ; if they are not, he will have his opportunity at a later date.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want it distinctly understood that there shall be no separation between the imperial military policy and the colonial military policy ; in other words, that while we undoubtedly have Canadians who, if they had the proper training, are

fit, not only to take command of the Canadian militia, but to take command of the imperial forces, still we must require men of experience and training, and we cannot get them unless we give our officers a chance to go over there or somewhere else and acquire practice. A number of our young officers have already the certificate of lieutenant-colonel, they have gone over and passed their examination, and passed very successfully, some of them, I believe. But I do not think that even a lieutenant-colonel's training would be sufficient to guarantee that a man should be placed in command of the militia of the Dominion of Canada. On the distinct assurance of the minister that he will give this his serious consideration, and that when the regulations are brought down, if they are not satisfactory, we will have the privilege of holding a field day over them, I will let this clause pass.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Referring to this same section 41, there is subsection 2 in the Bill, as originally brought down, which was overlooked in the amendment. Subsection 2 reads as follows :—

In the event of a vacancy in the office of General Officer Commanding, or in the absence of that officer from Canada, the command of the militia shall devolve upon the next senior combatant officer on the Head-Quarters Staff.

I propose to change that so that it shall read as follows :

In the event of no General Officer Commanding being appointed, or in the absence of that officer from Canada, the Governor General in Council may detail an officer of the Headquarter Staff to assume the command and military discipline of the militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is rather a beautiful sentence to put in a statute. What does the Minister of Justice think of that sort of Bill drafting ?

Mr. GOURLEY. There is nothing wrong with that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps this form would be preferable to the other. I beg to move that the following clause be inserted :

In the event of a vacancy in the office of General Officer Commanding or in the absence of that officer from Canada, the Governor General in Council may detail an officer of the Headquarters Staff who shall be charged with the military command of the militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I thought that the control of the militia under a section of this Bill rested with the Governor General alone.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Somebody must act under him. He will not go out and take care of the militia himself. He must appoint somebody to take his place.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not object to the amendment especially but I might as well discuss the point which I am about to mention here. I may illustrate what I mean by taking England as an example. I want to know if it is the intention of the hon. minister to bring about an interchange in the headquarters staff along these lines. At the present time the headquarters staff are fixtures.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, they only hold office for five years.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There never was a change in any of them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In England after a man spends a few years on the headquarters staff he is sent out to his regiment, or brigade, or division in order to get sharpened up in his duties in the service. In other words, being office men for a term of years, they get rusty in their work. Is it the hon. minister's intention to carry out that system ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, already we have passed a regulation limiting the term to five years. That was passed three years ago. I would be inclined to follow the English rule limiting it to four years, and before an officer could return to the headquarters staff again, make it necessary that he should serve a year in some of the districts or in England in the way of exchange. Not only that, but I propose in the regulations to require after a certain number of years that every officer on the Headquarters Staff shall have passed through the English Staff College. An arrangement has been made whereby two officers of the militia of Canada are permitted to attend the Staff College every year, and it is very obvious that at the end of four or five years we shall have a considerable number of officers, if advantage is taken of this opportunity, possessing the qualifications which are considered essential to the performance of staff duties of this kind.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there any intention, having regard to the fact that there will be an interchange of officers, to bring about a gradual infusion of the two forces ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am glad of that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is one of the things that was discussed at the meeting of the defence committee which I had the honour of attending, and it was agreed that so soon as Canadian officers were technically qualified by active service or by being graduates of the Staff College, an exchange would take place. It was agreed that if an imperial officer were re-

quired in this country, or if we saw fit to ask for an imperial officer for instance to take charge of the Royal Military College, we should get a *quid pro quo*, we should have the privilege of sending the same number of officers over to serve in the imperial army.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Of course the minister has the full authority of his government with that regard.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That being the case I shall not take up time drawing attention to some interesting pictures in the Montreal 'Herald.' There is an editorial in that paper which I am sorry to have to place on the records of the House, but it will show the absurdity of the minister of war. The organ of the Minister of Agriculture who is the minister of war at times, and superintendent general of the whole business says :

The Canadian militiaman is eager to learn something of actual use during his short time of learning, and in his search for that he is apt to neglect the niceties of military etiquette to such an extent that British officers are horrified at his lackness in saluting according to the regulations of the drill book.

We are told that the Minister of Agriculture is most punctilious in his own department. I do not know how low he makes the civil servants bow to him, but they certainly must approach him in fear and trembling. They require to stand some distance from him, especially if they happen to be bigger than he, and pay him all due homage. In one of these pictures the Minister of Militia is standing in front with his hat off showing that beautiful profile which we all admire so much, and a little to the right we find the Minister of Agriculture, or war, with his hat doffed returning a salute. In the next picture the Minister of Agriculture is standing in an easier position chatting with some officers. I shall not read the whole article as the minister has promised to carry out these interchanges with the imperial service. I assume that the Minister of Militia is taking up his position again, and that he has sent the Minister of Agriculture to look after the hens and the eggs. I am informed that it has appeared in the newspapers that amongst the officers this gentleman was instrumental in forcing on the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons, two of them are no credit to anybody. One of them came into the Laprairie camp with a pair of gaiters and a little spur screwed into the heel of the gaiter so that he could not ride, and he had two swords, one on his right and one on his left and one splendid black eye. He remained in camp long enough to make an exhibition of himself and then he was returned home. I may be wrong but I understand that these are the facts. Another of the Minister of Agriculture's officers for some offence was brought before the civil authorities and fined $20 or some other large sum for a breach of the civil law. These are two of the men that the Minister of Agriculture held up the Scottish Light Dragoons to appoint, and as a result of which we have lost the best General Officer Commanding that ever stood on Canadian soil. One of his officers came into camp with a sword on each side, a little spur fastened into a heel of a pair of gaiters and a black eye ; the other was not very long in camp before he was hauled up before the police court and fined $20.

On section 41.

There may be appointed an officer who shall hold rank not below that of colonel in the militia or in His Majesty's regular army, who may be, subject to the regulations and under the direction of the minister, charged with the military command of the militia. and such officer shall have the rank of major-general in the militia, and shall be paid at such rate, not exceeding $6,000 per annum, as may be prescribed.

Section agreed to.

On section 41 (a).

There may be appointed an officer who shall hold rank not below that of colonel in the militia or in His Majesty's regular army, who may be, subject to the regulations and under the direction of the minister, charged with the military inspection of the militia, and such officer shall be paid at such rate, not exceeding $6,000 per annum, as may be prescribed.

Section agreed to.

On section 41 (b).

41(b). The duties and authority of each of the officers respectively referred to in the two next preceding sections shall be defined by the Governor in Council.

Section agreed to.

Section 42—appointment of adjutant general.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I gave the Minister of Militia notice that these officers must be of the highest qualification.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the very highest qualification.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And it is the minister's intention to retain an imperial officer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not wish to seem extravagant but every military man knows that an officer occupying one of those positions in the permanent corps or at the headquarters staff is called upon to do a great deal of entertaining and that he has besides to provide a very expensive uniform. It is impossible for such an officer to get along without entertaining, and as it is now, he must do it out of his own pocket.

They have to entertain to a greater extent than other deputy ministers and in my opinion they are underpaid. There is not a day of their lives that these officers do not meet officers from other parts of the country whom they have to entertain. I do not think the minister need be a bit afraid to pay them higher salaries.

Section 43 agreed to.

On section 43a—appointment of master general of the ordnance.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is the same office as is held now by the inspector general.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 44,

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the section be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof :

The Governor in Council may establish a General Staff, Headquarters Staff, and District Staff, and may appoint a chief of the General Staff and such officers to the respective staffs as may be deemed necessary, and shall define their duties and authority.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6 (a).

The Governor in Council may appoint a Militia Council to advise the minister on all matters relating to the militia, which may be referred to the Council by the minister. The composition, procedure and powers of the council shall be as prescribed.

Mr. WARD. What does that mean ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is proposed to adopt the system which has been adopted in England, as a result of the report of the commission which is known as the Esher Commission, composed of Lord Esher, Admiral Sir John Fisher and General Clarke. The council, which is called the Army Council in England, we propose to call the Militia Council. In England the Secretary of State for War is the chairman.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Formerly the English militia were not under the Secretary of State for War, but were under the Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For the last ten years it has been under the Secretary of State for War. On the Army Council there are four military members called, respectively, the first military member, the second military member, the third military member and the fourth military member. The first military member has charge of military policy in all its branches, war staff duties, intelligence, mobilization, plans of operations, training, military history, war regulations ; he is chief of the general staff. The second military member will be the adjutant-general, and will have charge of recruiting, pay, discipline, awards and peace regulations. The third military member will be the quartermaster-general ; he will have charge of supplies, clothing, remounts and transports. The fourth military member will be the master general of ordnance, and will have charge of armaments and fortifications. Then there will be a civil member, the deputy minister, I presume, and another civil member, the financial secretary, the chief financial officer of the department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who is that officer in England ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The financial secretary is a permanent officer. The parliamentary Under Secretary is the first civil member.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is not the permanent Under Secretary ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the permanent Under Secretary is the secretary of the commission. In England there is no deputy minister, and the financial officer of the department corresponds to our deputy minister. We are not in a position to follow the English system exactly ; but the Minister of Militia as chairman, and the four military members will correspond exactly with the similar members on the English board. The chief staff officer——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is no chief staff officer now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, but we propose to have one, and I am taking a vote for that purpose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the duties of our quartermaster-general correspond with those of the English quartermaster-general ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To a large extent. It is difficult for me to explain, in as great detail as I would like to do, the scheme, because we have not yet been able to get the regulations. I do not know that they are yet completed. Sir Edward Ward, with whom I have been in correspondence, very kindly offered to send them to me as soon as they were published ; but in the meantime I can only give such information as I have been able to get from reports which I have read in the newspapers, and correspondence which I have had with some eminent military authorities there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that the chief staff officer will largely have control of the militia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Operations, intelligence, and so on.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would he be interfered with by any of the civil officers ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. Each man has his own department to himself. But they will discuss matters as a council, the Minister of Militia being in the chair, and having the advantage of these officers face to face in his presence discussing all important matters affecting the welfare of the militia. Perhaps I am too enthusiastic, but it seems to me that the adoption of this system will be the dawn of better days for the militia. I believe it must result in the different branches of the militia being in very much better touch with each other than ever before. It will result in the minister at least having the opportunity of becoming acquainted with every branch of his department, and it will result in continuity in the service which we have never had in this country. Each conclusion at which this council may arrive will be a matter of record, so that each minister will have the opportunity of seeing in writing the results of the conferences which took place previous to his coming, and the reasons underlying the different policies adopted from time to time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In Britain I have every reason to believe that this committee or council will work well. The matter was agitated for a long time, and there was a series of very able articles in the London 'Times,' written by its editor, Mr. Amery, who wrote a history of the South African troubles. Mr. Amery educated the public along these lines very thoroughly, and I am satisfied that the scheme will work well there. I do not see any reason why a similar scheme should not work well here, provided the council be composed of men of independence of character. Of course, it will be said that men can be had in Canada equally as independent as you can find in England, but we must not shut our eyes to the fact that many of the officers occupying the highest positions in England are men of wealth and in a better position to talk straight to the government than would be the officers employed in the civil service here. One reason I have urged against any officer of a Dominion force being under the Army Act is that it prevents his giving that free expression to his views which we should encourage in our men. While I occupied the position of command in my regiment I always encouraged every officer under me to give expression to his views, even when they were critical of my own policy, but talk in confidence to members of the force and they will tell you that they dare not say a word. I say to the minister, wipe away all these restrictions, wipe away this Army Act in so far as it applies to our men, and let our officers approach him like men and give both him and the public the benefit of their views. I had a long letter sent me from Kingston the other day complaining of some officer in the military college for having expressed sympathy with Russia, and asking me to bring the matter up in the House. Why, I commend that officer. He was not talking to his cadets, but was on his holidays, and he had a perfect right to express his opinion on the Russian and Japanese war. And to say that because he happens to side with Russia we should drive him out of the position of professor in the military college is utterly absurd. So long as he does not talk this sort of thing to his cadets, no one can have anything to say to him. He has a perfect right to express his own opinions outside the college, just as any man should have connected with the militia. The minister need not be afraid to trust the officers of the permanent force. He will do the country a service if he will wipe out from the statute-book all these restrictive resolutions, and tell the officers of the permanent force that they are at liberty to express their views on any question. If he will only encourage the members of the council to be independent and fearless, he will benefit the service, but if they are to be only time-servers the service will suffer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Under the King's regulations the utmost possible independence will be given each member of the council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has brought the headquarters staff under the Army Act. Go around and talk to these gentlemen, and they will tell you they dare not say a word. I would rather encourage them to come out like free men and do away with the dark-ages tyranny of Germany, France, the United States and other countries.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The question of military rank is to be allowed to remain in abeyance, and the members of the council will practically be in the position of Lords of the Admiralty, so that the highest possible freedom will be given them.

On section 68,

His Majesty shall be liable for compensation for injury to persons and for damage to property arising from the use of any rifle range under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence for target practice, carried on under regulations prescribed by this Act, provided that there shall be no claim for compensation for any injury due to negligence on the part of the person injured, or if such person, at the time the injury was sustained, was at the rifle range as a spectator of shooting, or in the case of injury to property where such injury was due to negligence on the part of the owner of the property.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The only criticism I would make upon this proposed section is with regard to the part referring to spectators. I do not see why a spectator injured by militiamen should not be compensated.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He would have his remedy under the civil law.

Mr. DANIEL. I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that the section does not provide for those who are using the range and receive injury.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, that is provided for.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no objection to have any new draft made of my proposal, though, I must say, I do not think it exactly complimentary to the Department of Justice that the Department of Militia should re-draft a clause which was prepared under the direction of the Department of Justice, without consulting the legal officers of the government. I still maintain the point I made this morning. These rifle ranges are organized by the government for the benefit of the militia or for the benefit of the country, according to the point of view you may take. They are managed under government regulation. The government allows people to go there—not only militiamen, or members of rifle clubs, but others—and practise shooting as long and as often as they like; and the people who have properties alongside these ranges and who have certainly as much right to be on their own private property as these people have to be on the government property are liable to injury or death. Yet, because the people whose shooting causes the injury or death are not there under government regulation, the government will not hold itself responsible to give compensation. If the amendment is accepted as it has been re-drafted without the advice of the legal advisers of the government, the result will be that compensation will accrue only when injury is caused by shooting that is practised under government regulation. If, then, the government does not take the proper care to prevent people from being injured, there may be injuries for which there is no compensation. I have no objection to accept the amendment of the Minister of Militia, provided another clause is added which will make it imperative that the minister shall prevent shooting at the rifle ranges by others than those who shoot under the government regulation. Otherwise I cannot accept it. If my protest is not listened to, it will show what care the government have for those peaceful people who may be killed or injured on property alongside the rifle ranges. I think we pay enough for the militia that compensation should be provided for the case of people, possibly poor farmers, who are killed or injured as a result of this rifle practice. I am sorry to see that the militiamen seem to have adopted the habit of laughing at the farmers. Well, it may be that the farmers may resent their laughter as well as their bullets.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) takes that seriously. What is it that the hon. gentleman wants that is not already covered by the amendment that is proposed by the Minister of Militia? Is the government to put a caretaker on each range to prevent pigeon shooters——

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, if necessary.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all. It would be perfectly absurd for the government to attempt to keep a man on every rifle range. And, in any case, why should the government be responsible for shooting by persons who have no right to be on the ranges?

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Mere trespassers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes; why should the government be responsible for injury done by such men, any more than it should be responsible for the accidental shooting of a man while out deer hunting?

Mr. MONK. I do not see how this amendment of the minister covers such a case as that of Larose. I do not think it does cover it. In that case, I have reason to believe, the men were practising not under government regulation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I do not think so. It seems to me that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is right. We ought to give full protection, and this section does not give it. The ranges have been removed from my constituency, but I am as much interested in the constituency where they now are. I do not think this amendment covers the cases at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a very important question, and I think that perhaps, the committee would do well to take time to consider the purport of the amendment proposed. I think, for my part, that there is something in the observation of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). We have erected these ranges—very properly so. They are made use of by the militia—very properly so. But we know that the modern rifle is a very dangerous instrument, and that great precaution should govern the use of it. The spirit of the amendment is that if the militia are practising rifle shooting and any casualty arises or any damage to property is occasioned, the government should be responsible. That is one of the responsibilities, I think, that the government should assume. But I understand that there are parties who go to shoot on these ranges quite irrespective of the militia. There may be a few of such men who go there and practice, which is a desirable thing in itself. But one hon. gentleman says that in such cases the government will not be responsible. I agree with him. But I say it is too serious a matter, and human life is too valuable, for anybody to be allowed to go on these ranges to shoot except under government regulations. If five or six young men want to go on the rifle range and shoot, it is quite pro-

per that they should do so ; but they should carry on their shooting under regulations of the government, and, if any casualty takes place, the government should be responsible.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is exactly the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand there is some difference of opinion as to whether the amendment which is proposed is sufficient to cover these contingencies. Under these circumstances, and as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) has done a good day's work, I would suggest that he should move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and the Department of Justice should be asked to look into this matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To draw an amendment, we must know what it is desired to effect by the amendment. If you create a rifle range and attract the public there for the purpose of practising rifle shooting, and the people do go there and use the rifle ranges in such a way as to cause injury to persons in the neighbourhood, I fail to see why there should not be responsibility upon the people who first established and who own the ranges. I do not see why we should stop half way. It seems to me it should be either one thing or the other—either do not allow the rifle ranges to exist, or, if you allow them to exist, control them so that the public cannot be injured as a result of the use made of them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) knows the nature of these things. He possibly has in mind a range like that down here at Rockcliffe. But nine-tenths of the rifle ranges in the country are vastly different from that. Going upon them you would not know that you were on a rifle range, unless you saw the flag flying or came across a little mound that the people had prepared at their own expense, with government assistance. Ranges are established by people at their own expense, with a little government assistance, and when these are taken over by the government they are just as much government ranges as any of these fancy ranges down here. When a man is injured in rifle shooting in one of these ranges, should not he be just as well treated as when he is injured in one of these headquarter ranges ? The men who were shooting on the Montreal range were city volunteers ; they had their flag flying, and they were practising.

Mr. MONK. We do not know whether they were practising under the regulations.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They had their flag flying, they had their markers there. They did not need to be in uniform at all, in fact they should not be in uniform. But this accident happened, and undoubtedly the man was entitled to consideration, and I am surprised he did not get it. The reason was that some lawyer in Montreal advised him not to take the offer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government was not responsible for it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I remember well where a regiment was out rifle shooting, and by accident they shot a cow which was peacefully grazing on the hills a mile or two in the rear, and the government had to pay for that cow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Supreme Court said the government was not bound to pay in the Montreal case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On a technicality, the lawyers befuddled the case. There is a certain danger limit in the rear of all these rifle ranges, and if a man goes there knowing that he is in danger, he should run his own risk, and I do not think he is entitled to compensation if he gets hurt.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think we might change slightly the amendment moved this afternoon by the hon. member for Labelle, to section 68. Where it reads, 'arising from the use of any rifle range,' why not put in the words 'Under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence for target practice ?'

Mr. GOURLEY. In order to make that section of any value you must have a clause defining what is meant by a rifle range under the control of the government. You would simply defeat every man who brought his action, from the fact that this rifle range was not a rifle range in the meaning of the law.

Mr. DANIEL. It appears to me it will be necessary to make it a criminal offence for a person who is unauthorized to use one of these rifle ranges ; otherwise I do not see how you can deal in a just and equitable way. As I understand this amendment, it will make the government liable for compensation to any one who receives injury from a rifle shot fired from the rifle range, whether the range has been authorized by the government or not. But there is nothing to allow the government to inflict a penalty on any one who shoots over that range without permission or authority. I do not see that you can proceed against the person who uses that range without authority, and I presume there are regulations forbidding any one to use a rifle range except those who are authorized by the regulations to do so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think we had better adopt the suggestion of the Prime Minister and let this matter stand over. Some members are absent who would like to discuss it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was anxious to get it settled.

Mr. GOURLEY. I sympathize with the Minister of Justice. I know that these gentlemen are after a remedy, and I sympathize with their object; but legally a remedy is no good unless you define it within strict terms; otherwise you will entrap the suitor to bring an action, and you will defeat it by a technical objection. The headquarters of the rifle ranges dealt with in this Act are the headquarters of rifle ranges only; you must have a section describing what a government range is, headquarters or no headquarters. That amendment as it stands now would not be worth a straw to anybody.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the minister if rifle clubs have a right to use those ranges?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Rifle clubs organized under the Act.

Mr. INGRAM. There are a number now who receive free ammunition, I understand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They get assistance towards the construction of ranges.

Mr. GOURLEY. Are injuries inflicted upon these rifle ranges, as well as injuries inflicted upon headquarters' rifle ranges provided for in this particular amendment?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are included if the shooting goes on under the regulations.

Mr. INGRAM. Does section 75 still stand in the Bill, providing that the cadet corps should be furnished with arms, ammunition and equipment under the conditions prescribed?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, that is there.

Mr. INGRAM. Take our high school cadet corps for instance. They use what is called gallery ammunition and the department have been selling this ammunition to these cadet corps for $3 a thousand. I understand that recently an order has been issued cancelling that arrangement and that the department will not now sell it to them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Unfortunately we do not have it to sell. The quantity of that ammunition is dependent on the number of empty shells which are returned to the factory and we are not able to get anything like one quarter of the quantity we require.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister will see that the department is charging these corps $3 a thousand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It costs $5 a thousand.

Mr. INGRAM. I think a good many were under the impression that the department made a small profit even at that price.

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, this ammunition costs $5 a thousand and we were selling it for $3.

Mr. INGRAM. The rifle clubs are composed of men of all ages, men who are getting certain advantages from the Department of Militia and who will never be called upon to serve their country in the militia force. They are getting certain privileges that the boys who will be men in the course of a very few years are debarred from now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are able under this law to give them ammunition if we choose.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman furnish the cadet corps that belong to the high schools with free ammunition?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I should think it would be a very desirable thing to do, but I would not like to state off-hand that it will be done.

Mr. INGRAM. We have some efficient cadet corps which are a credit to the districts to which they belong and I think the department should encourage them in this way. I think that in this appeal I will have the sympathy of the hon. member for Labelle who is strongly in favour of the boys becoming better shots.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister promised to take two or three little suggestions into his consideration to-day. I spoke of the drill and pay of the cadets corps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will consider that although I think that to pay young men in schools and colleges might not be desirable.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I refer to those who are permitted to go to camp. Paragraph (c) of section 73 of the Bill reads:

> The minister may authorize senior cadet corps, or any portion thereof, to be attached to any portion of the active militia for the purposes of drill and training.

I presume that means training in the camps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No it does not; it means that they may be attached to a regiment but not in camp.

Mr. INGRAM. I am advised that the cadet corps are looking forward with a great deal of pleasure to being permitted to attend the camp even for one day. The cadet corps even in my own district are looking forward, as other cadet corps are in No. 1 military district, to being able to attend the camp at London for at least one day.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is eleven o'clock.

Mr. INGRAM. We have a notice to appear at a committee at 9.30 to-morrow morning. Does the right hon. gentleman expect that we can come here at eleven o'clock in the morning, remain here performing our duties until eleven o'clock at night and be here again at 9.30 to-morrow morning ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That seems reasonable.

Motion withdrawn.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 13, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

POST OFFICE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 153) further to amend the Post Office Act. He said : This Bill covers a number of details that will be more thoroughly understood when it is printed and in the hands of members. Section 6, I may mention, extends the time for letter-carriers to avail themselves of the privilege granted by a previous Act to come in under the new system of payment instead of the old system. Another section 10, makes provision for an allowance to letter-carriers for transportation in cities. There are no radical changes introduced. The other provisions will be better understood when the Bill is before the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

REVISED STATUTES—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 154) to amend chapter 61 of the Statutes of 1903 respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said : The object of this Bill is to correct two clerical errors that occurred in the Act passed last session with respect to the revision of the Statutes. In sections 4 and 11 the revised roll is spoken of as the last amended roll, and as there is only one roll this is likely to lead to confusion. There can be only one roll as respecting the Statutes, and this is to avoid any possible confusion respecting the use of this word in the Statutes.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you mean by the change to say that it shall not be the last revised roll ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the original statutes it is called the last roll ; in the amended statutes it is called the amended roll, and there cannot be an amended roll under the Revised Statutes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS ON SURVEYS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What action, if any, has been taken by the Department of Labour or the Government to deport the aliens brought in under contract to work on the surveys of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?

2. What action, if any, has been taken to prosecute the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway who have pleaded guilty or been proved guilty of violation of the Alien Labour law ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General.

1. The Department of Labour has from time to time received some communications from His Honour, Judge Winchester, reporting certain employees or officials in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific as liable to deportation, and these reports have been tranmitted to the Department of Justice to be acted upon, and I think they have been acted upon.

Mr. CLARKE. What action has been taken on them ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Justice will explain that. In answer to question 2, the law does not provide for the government prosecuting in such cases as are referred to in this question.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). So far as I am concerned, my action has consisted in signing warrants authoring the deportation of those persons reported upon by Judge Winchester.

Mr. MACLEAN. How many of these were issued ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say exactly, six or seven.

Mr. CLARKE. Were they minor officials ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They were persons holding important positions, I think divisional engineers and persons who were in charge of surveys. I do not remember exactly their positions, but they were all persons of importance.

Mr. CLARKE. They were brainy enough to get out before the warrants were served ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was not very anxious to cause their arrest provided they were willing to leave the country.

SALE OF TIMBER BERTHS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. What timber berths have been disposed of in the Duck Mountains, in townships 32 and 33, ranges 27, 28 and 29, during the past year ?
2. When were they put up for sale ; where advertised; and the amount received for same?
3. What are the names of the purchasers.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior) :

1. One timber berth only has been disposed of in the Duck Mountains in townships 32 and 33, ranges 27, 28 and 29 during the past year. During that period a large number of permits have been issued in favour of settlers to cut timber for their own use on their land, and a permit was issued in favour of the municipality of Swan River to cut a considerable quantity of timber for municipal purposes.

2. The advertisement inviting competition for the berth in question, which is No. 1148, was dated the 9th of February last, and a copy thereof was inserted in 'The Dauphin Press,' published at Dauphin, and a copy was sent to the postmaster at Dauphin, with a request that it be posted in a conspicuous place in his office. In addition to this a number of the printed copies were sent to the Crown Timber Agent at Winnipeg, for distribution among such persons as he might think were interested in timber matters. Printed copies of the advertisement were also sent to the several individuals and companies interested in timber matters, who have had their names placed upon the mailing list of the department. The amount of the bonus paid for this berth was $1,010.

3. The successful tenderer was Mr. Alexander Keiller, of Swan River, Manitoba.

THE DREDGE 'RICHELIEU.'

Mr. MONK asked :

1. How long has the dredge 'Richelieu' been lying at the wharf at Sabrevois ?
2. What is the cost of maintenance per day of the said dredge ?
3. What is the wage-bill per day of said dredge ?
4. How many men are employed aboard of the said dredge ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (acting Minter of Public Works) :

1. The dredge 'Richelieu' was detained at Sabrevois during sixteen working days, in order to complete repairs and painting.
2. About $25 per day while working.
3. $13 per day.
4. Ten, including tugmen and scowmen.

PAYMENT TO THE C. ROSS CO., OTTAWA.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. For what materials or work was the sum of $2,300.24 paid to the C. Ross Company, of Ottawa, as described in the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June 30, 1903, on page V—105 ?
2. On what portion of the Parliament Buildings was the said amount expended, and by whose order was the expenditure made ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (acting Minter of Public Works) :

1. For furniture, carpets, rugs, curtains, drapery, upholstering, linen, bedding, &c., &c.
2. Purchased for the House of Commons, mostly for the Speaker's apartments, by the authority of the Minister of Public Works.

WORKSHOPS ON CORNWALL AND WILLIAMSBURG CANALS.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the government built the workshops for serving the Cornwall and Williamsburg canals, referred to in Mr. Schreiber's letter and statement on page 33 of Vol. 1 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June 30 last ?
2. If so, are the shops completed, and if so, when ?
3. How many men are employed, and are they employed the year round ?
4. Are these shops operated by electricity ? If so, to what extent, and when was it turned on ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The workshops are not yet built, but tenders are being invited for the work.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SURVEYS.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the government placed surveying parties between Moncton and Winnipeg, to explore, survey and locate the line between these points ?
2. If so, when, how many parties, and how many men are engaged ?
3. If not, why not ?
4. Has the govenment taken the survey of the eastern division out of the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company ?
5. If so, when ? If not, why not ?
6. Has the amount to be paid or allowed to the company, in respect of surveys, been settled or agreed upon ? If so, what is the amount ?
7. In any case, what is the amount claimed by this company?

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

1. The government have not placed surveying parties between Moncton and Winnipeg to explore, survey and locate the line between these points.
2. Number one answers this question.

3. Because arrangements are not yet ripe for so doing.
4. No.
5. Number four answers this question.
6. No.
7. Not aware of any claim having been made.

THE CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the government allowed Mr. F. W. Holt, Cattle-guard Commissioner, for his services anything by way of extra allowance ?
2. Has the government finally determined not to allow Mr. Holt anything by way of extra remuneration ?
3. In claiming extra remuneration, and in support of his claim, Mr. Holt, in a letter of January 7, 1904, to Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., says : ' When the tests were completed, we had not then found a thoroughly satisfactory guard, &c., &c. It then became my duty to find out the reason. The only way to do this was to study the structure of the animal, as a piece of mechanism. This has been done, as to his anatomy, by the veterinarian as a surgeon ; but I have been unable to find an idea expressed as to his capacity as a machine, other than in his ordinary walk, in emergency motions, as in passing a cattle-guard. And it was from this point of view that I have had to treat it. In making this search, I have found there is very little literature available to the general reader, &c.' Has the government, in considering the question of extra compensation referred to, taken into account the claims of Mr. Holt as an expert in the matter above set out ?
4. Did the services of George Robertson, Esq., as commissioner, from August 16, 1892, to February 13, 1903, 181 days, include a Sunday service as such commissioner ?
5. Was Mr. Robertson paid for his services for said 181 days at the rate of $5 per day and his expenses, Sundays included ?

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

1. Mr. Holt has been allowed the salary upon which he was engaged with reasonable travelling and living expenses when absent from home.
2. The government see no reason to grant him extra remuneration beyond the sum per day agreed upon when he was employed.
3. Mr. Holt was engineer and as such the rate of his salary was agreed with him when engaging him. Not aware that he was an expert in cattle-guard construction.
4. Mr. Robertson was paid $5 per day for days he actually worked, which did not include Sundays, and reasonable travelling and living expenses when absent from home.

FLOUR STANDARDS.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. When were the flour standards last set ?
2. Is it the intention of the department to have them set this year ?
3. If not, why not ?

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

1. On June 3rd, 1903.
2. There would seem to be no necessity for further standards until a new crop comes in.
3. Answered by No. 2.

SPEED OF MAIL STEAMSHIPS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What was the average speed per hour made during the year 1903 by steamships carrying British and Canadian mails from ports in the United Kingdom to Canadian ports ; and from Canadian ports to ports in the United Kingdom, respectively ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The average speed made during the year 1903 was as follows :

West bound—
Summer—Moville to Rimouski, 12·7 knots per hour.
Winter—Moville to Halifax, 9·9 knots per hour.
East bound—
Summer—Rimouski to Moville, 13·2 knots per hour.
Winter—Halifax to Moville, 11·6 knots per hour.

DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. What amount of duty, excise and customs, was paid on tobacco in the years ending June 30th, 1903 and 1904.
2. What part of these duties was due to the increased duty imposed by the tariff of 1897.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Excise duty, year ended June 30th, 1903, $4,883,552.59. The amount for 1904 cannot be given, as returns from outlying divisions are not yet all received at department.
2. From excise $1,513,968.28, made up as follows : From foreign raw leaf tobacco, $1,249,569.17 ; from additional duty on cigarettes made from foreign raw leaf, $264,399.11.

DEATH OF MR. JOHN McINTOSH, M.P.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The press has already informed the members of this House that it has been our misfortune to lose one of our colleagues, in the person of Mr. John McIntosh, member for the city of Sherbrooke. Mr. McIntosh has been carried away after a severe illness which had lasted for many years ; in fact, when Mr. McIntosh entered this House, some four years ago, he was already suffering from the illness which finally caused

his death, and at that time, as I am personally aware, it was only his strong attachment to his party and his long and well-deserved popularity in the city of Sherbrooke, which induced him—nay, rather compelled him—to accept the candidature and become a member of this House. Under such circumstances, it was not possible for Mr. McIntosh, as a member of this House, to give us the full measure of his abilities or to enable us to judge what sort of man he was. I do not believe that even to his friends on the other side of the House the real man was fully known. Perhaps in this sense I was more privileged than many of his political friends, because for a great many years it was my personal privilege to know him—I will not say intimately—but, at all events, sufficiently, I think, to be counted as among Mr. McIntosh's friends. It will be eighteen years next fall since I first met Mr McIntosh. I then met him during a contest in the eastern townships, which was bitterly fought—if that expression is not too strong—between the two parties in the province of Quebec. I had then the privilege of meeting Mr. McIntosh many and many a time, and then and there I formed the highest possible estimate of his character. At that time, I may say without exaggeration, he was a perfect type of manhood, physical manhood, and manhood in every sense of the word. Nor am I at all exaggerating when I say that I do not think I ever met a more honourable man. It is with all my heart that I associate myself with the mourning of his friends and of his family.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thank the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) very much for the very appropriate and kindly words which he has uttered in regard to Mr. McIntosh. The lamented death of that gentleman has caused many regrets, not only on this side of the House, but, I am sure, on the other side as well. Mr. McIntosh had filled many important public positions in this country, and it is true, as the Prime Minister has said, that we have not seen him at his best in parliament, owing to the suffering which he continually endured from the fatal disease which eventually carried him off in the prime of life. His entry into this parliament was, I believe, induced by the most absolutely unselfish and patriotic motives. He came here against his will at a time when he felt that the interests of his country and of his party demanded that he should do so. Since his entry into parliament I have always found him a faithful colleague and a true and unselfish friend. I believe that the public life of Canada has not produced any better or higher type of public man than that which John McIntosh exemplified. He endured his illness with characteristic fortitude and with true Christian resignation. It is only a day or two since I received a letter from him, in which he spoke in the most calm and philosophical manner of the sufferings he was enduring and of the prospect of a release. I am sure that we can extend to his family and to his friends the sincere condolence and sympathy of every member of this House without exception.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as an old colleague of Mr. McIntosh in the Quebec government, I may be permitted to add my humble testimony to the eloquent tributes which have just been pronounced by my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, and the hon. leader of the opposition, upon the passing of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, one of the most esteemed members of this House. His death, although not quite unexpected, still came as a shock, not only to his friends on this side of the House, but, I am sure, to the members on the other side as well.

Mr. McIntosh was first returned to the legislature of the province of Quebec in 1886. In 1890 he came back before his constituents, and owing to his popularity, victory did not desert him, although the Conservative party were then struggling under very trying circumstances. As a matter of fact, Mr. Mercier had so endeared himself to the hearts of the people that it was no easy task for his opponents to secure a favourable verdict. But as Mr. McIntosh had won the confidence and the esteem not only of the people of Sherbrooke, but of every class of the community in the eastern townships, he succeeded in overcoming those difficulties. In 1892, Mr. de Boucherville having been entrusted with the responsibility of forming a cabinet, Mr. McIntosh was invited to enter the administration; and later on, when the Taillon government succeeded that of Mr. de Boucherville, our late lamented colleague was again asked to become a member of the administration. In the various positions which he has filled, whether as a member of the Quebec legislature or as a member of the government of that province, it may truly be said that his never-tiring industry and his ideal devotion to the common weal never faltered. He was also chosen as a representative of our province at the great Chicago fair, and there also he discharged his duties in such a manner as to elicit universal praise. The many regrets caused by the lamented death of Mr. McIntosh are not circumscribed to the eastern townships, but I am warranted in saying that they are shared by the whole province of Quebec.

I join heartily in the kind words uttered by my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister and by the hon. leader of the opposition, and I voice the feelings of sorrow caused on both sides of the House by the death of so highly esteemed a colleague.

Mr. RUFUS H. POPE. May I be permitted to add a word to what has been so eloquently said by the leader of the govern-

ment, and by the leader of the opposition, on this sad occasion. The late Mr. McIntosh entered public life as the representative of the county which I now have the honour to represent in this House. I knew him personally for many years, and I can say that he was an honest and noble-hearted man, who possessed to a remarkable degree the confidence of all nationalities and of all political parties in the eastern townships. Beloved by those who knew him most intimately and respected by all in that section of the country, his public and private life will long be remembered as worthy of emulation by those who follow him.

POST OFFICE MATTERS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to a letter I received this morning from the Frankville post office, in the county of Leeds, and a portion of which letter is as follows :—

> You told me not to stamp letters addressed to you in Ottawa. I must say that our postmaster refused to send them without stamps and offered to bet me any amount that there was no law to bear me out in any such thing. Please give me the plain facts.

I imagine this is a newly-appointed postmaster, and I would like to know from the Postmaster General whether postmasters are instructed not to receive unstamped communications addressed to members of parliament in Ottawa ? I understand the law to be, that all communications addressed to members while the House is in session are carried through the mails free of postage. This postmaster has absolutely refused to obey the law, and I wish to know from the Postmaster General what justification he has.

Sir WILLLIAM MULOCK. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) questions me for the purpose of determining who should win this bet, or whether it is to know if that postmaster is discharging his duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was no bet ; the postmaster offered to bet, but my constituent very properly would not bet with him.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was no one to take the postmaster up. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has correctly stated the law on the subject,—is that the envelope in your hand ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes ; addressed to 'Geo. Taylor, M.P., Ottawa' ; and he had to put a two-cent stamp on it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, if my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) makes a requisition we will have the two cents refunded along with that small item for express charges referred to last year. I will see that the postmaster in question, if a new man, be instructed in his duties so that my hon. friend will not suffer any more.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN. I received a post office order from Joilette, P.Q., yesterday and I notice that it is printed entirely in the English language. I have always seen these forms in both English and French, and of course in a county like Joliette as well as in other parts of Quebec it is a very serious inconvenience to the people who wish to send post office orders and who may not understand the English language. Has there been any change made, and if so, why are these forms not printed in the French language ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is the first I have heard of such a matter, and I think there can be no such change. It may be that there has been a mistake on the part of the postmaster in handing out an English form to a French-speaking citizen. I presume that in some of the offices where the patrons speak both languages it is necessary to supply the postmaster with forms printed in each language, and through inadvertence the postmaster likely issued the wrong form. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) may rest assured that the department has in no way authorized a departure from the proper procedure which would insure that an English form should be given to an English patron of the post office, and a French form to a French patron. I will attend to the matter.

SCHOOL OF MUSKETRY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have received a communication to the effect that the young men who have come here to learn musketry are being taxed for the maintenance of clubs, for the maintenance of an extra mess, and for extra furnishings generally. I am also informed that privates are called upon to act as servants to officers, and that these young men who are brought from the farms to learn musketry are subjected to prison discipline. They cannot leave the camp grounds unless they get a pass and they must be in at a certain hour in the evening or they are disciplined. I am told that a number of officers and men were informed that they need not bring extra clothing or bedding, but that they had to purchase them here at considerable expense. I do not know whether or not the officer in charge of the musketry school is responsible for this. This officer goes on to say that he thinks the country pays the Cartwright family dearly enough without having the men who come to take the musketry course taxed by this extra expense. I do not think the people of this country want the young gentlemen, privates or officers who come here, to be subject to prison rule. I do not believe that a young man who comes here and chances to be a

private, should give up one hour of his time to act as servant to any officer, nor do I think that the country should pay these men to act as officers' servants. I direct the attention of the minister to these grievances which I believe are founded on fact, and which should be stopped at once. I do not ask him to give any answer to-day, as I have not had time to give him notice that I would bring it up.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This school of musketry has been in operation for a couple of years, and this is the first time I have heard any complaint. I was not aware that the system in force this year differed from that of previous years. I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) saw fit to make the reference he did to the Cartwright family. I scarcely see what that has to do with it, and I am sure that my hon. friend himself would be the last man to say or to insinuate that any charges that may be imposed on officers attending the school could go into the pocket of as honourable a gentleman as Col. Robert Cartwright is known to be. I am sorry that he made that gratuitous slip. I am very glad, however, that he has called my attention to the fact, and I will make inquiry and be prepared to make a statement on the subject.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My remarks did not directly or indirectly lead to the inference that one dollar or one farthing of this money went into the pocket of Col. Cartwright, and the minister must have known that. But if the Cartwright family have to be provided for at the public expense, it will have to be done without taxing the officers on the ranges. The minister must not run away with the notion that we are going to bow down to the Cartwright family or any other family in this country.

DISMISSAL OF LORD DUNDONALD—LETTER OF W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to remind the right hon. First Minister that a week ago I brought to the atention of the House a communication which had been addressed to the London 'Times' by Mr. W. T. R. Preston, Canadian Immigration Agent in London. The Minister of the Interior said that his attention had only been drawn to the matter that morning. I said that I would take the liberty of bringing it up again for the purpose of asking for some information as to the policy of the government in regard to members of the civil service addressing communications to the public press. The questions I asked last week were :

Is it within the line of Mr. Preston's duty to write such communications and have them published ? Do the government approve of his action ? If they do not approve of it, have they disapproved of it ; and what means have they taken to express their disapproval ? Has any communication passed between the government and Lord Strathcona about this matter ?

I understood from the Minister of the Interior that it would be quite acceptable to him if I drew his attention to the matter at a subsequent date, and I take the liberty of doing so now.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). The matter to which my hon. friend alludes has received the attention of the government, and as a result it has been determined to despatch a letter to Mr. Preston, which I expect will be sent to-day, intimating to him that in the view of the government the letter he has written is entirely contrary to his duty as an official of the government, and reprimanding him for having written the letter.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he would lay a copy of the letter on the Table ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the use made of the press gallery by some journalists. In the 'Mail and Empire' of yesterday, containing a report sent from this gallery of the discussion on the Militia Bill, I find the following :—

House Discusses the Militia Bill—Mr. Bourassa in Evidence—Objects to Command being Declared Vested in the King—Displays Militarism Bogey.

Ottawa, July 11.—The Militia Bill was before the House of Commons to-day, and good progress was made in committee. There was a great deal of heated discussion as a result of Mr. Bourassa's opinions on various points proposed. He objected to the command-in-chief being declared to be vested in the King. Instead of this, he wanted an amendment declaring it vested in the Governor in Council. This amendment was forced to a vote, and no one supported Mr. Bourassa.

I never make much effort to gain, I will not say the eulogy, but even the fairness of the Tory press, especially in regard to anything I may say outside of the House ; but as a member of the House, I protest against the use which is made of the privilege granted to journalists who take reports of the debates in this House, in order to send out falsehoods as accurate reports. The House knows very well that this is the exact opposite of what I contended, and of that amendment which I brought before the House. The purpose of that amendment was, on the contrary, to insist on the principle that the command-in-chief of the militia is vested in the King, but that the exercise of that command belongs to the Cana-

dian government. Most of the other newspapers of Canada reported it correctly, but the 'Mail and Empire' took occasion to make such an attack on the amendment and to report the discussion in such a way as to enable that newspaper and the Tory organization of Ontario, I suppose, to say that the member for Labelle wants to cut all ties which unite this country with the United Kingdom. I do not at all mind this accusation, but as a member of the House of Commons, when it is a question of the privilege belonging to the press by virtue of the goodwill of this House, I have not only a right, but I consider it a duty to protest against this kind of reporting being done in the press gallery of this House.

THE MILITIA AT SYDNEY.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL. I would like to ask the government if they will, with as little delay as possible, place on the Table of the House all correspondence relating to the recent placing of militia and regulars in the town of Sydney ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no objection.

SUPPLY—THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion is put, I would like to bring to the attention of the House some matters referred to in the Auditor General's report for the present year, more especially his suggestion that amendments submitted by him for the consideration of parliament some two or three years ago should be taken into consideration and dealt with without further delay. There is no doubt whatever that the powers and the position of the Auditor General are of great importance to the people of this country. He is the officer of parliament more especially, and it is for members of parliament on both sides of the House, irrespective of party, to consider fairly and impartially any suggestions made by him as to desirable amendments of the Audit Act, for the purpose of enabling him more thoroughly to safeguard the interests of the country and more effectively to protect the public treasury. Whatever opinion may be entertained as to Mr. McDougall's reasonableness or unreasonableness in regard to certain matters which have been before parliament in the past, I think every one will credit him with the desire and intention of performing his duty fearlessly and impartially. He was appointed by the government of Mr. Mackenzie in 1877 or 1878. When the succeeding administration of Sir John A. Macdonald came into power, he was of course retained in office, and I believe that so far as Sir John A. Macdonald as Prime Minister of this country had the power to support Mr. McDougall in the performance of his duties, he was always found ready to do so, and was always prompt to recognize his work, his courage and his fidelity as a public officer. Since the present administration came into power there seems to have been more friction between Mr. McDougall and the public departments than formerly prevailed. It is in the very nature of things that some friction should prevail between the Auditor and those departments of the government which he is called upon to check.

I do not at all place out of sight the fact that under preceding administrations Mr. McDougall was occasionally over-ruled and that a certain amount of friction may sometimes have been occasioned by his attitude with regard to certain public expenditure. I have not studied the history of the past so as to know to what extent that did prevail, but no doubt it did prevail to some extent. Since the present administration came into power, that friction seems to have increased, and it has reached its culmination at present, when the Auditor General has, after having given warning on more than one occasion tendered his resignation on the ground that his usefulness as a public officer is gone. He gives two reasons why his usefulness has gone. One is that he is very frequently overruled by the Treasury Board, and the next is that he does not consider the Consolidated Revenue Act in its present condition sufficient for the purposes of his department. The subject was brought up by him, I think in 1899, and in his report dated the 9th of March, 1904, he uses this language :

> The following rather lengthy correspondence is introduced in this place because it illustrates the practical importance of several amendments that this office has been asking for some years to have made to the Audit Act.
>
> The amendments to provide : 1st. That no contract with the government be made after the work is completed ; 2nd. That in contracts given without tenders, or where tenders have been called for and the lowest tender has not been accepted, the proper officer of the department be required to certify that the prices are fair and just ; 3rd. That in all cases the technical officer on whose expert knowledge the department relied when making the contract, be required to supply the fullest information to the Auditor General and all other government officials who have the duty of dealing with contracts.

Further on in the same report he says :—

> The magnitude and number of the transactions going through this office are now so increased that I feel parliament should seriously consider also the amendment of the Audit Act along the other lines suggested in a former report, to enable this office to cope with the expansion of the business of the country. I feel so strongly on this point that

if parliament does not see its way to bring the matter up this session, I shall at the end of the session ask to be superannuated.

Mr. McDougall is an officer of parliament. We are obliged, I think, to look at his recommendations to parliament as those of an impartial officer who has no end to serve other than to perform his duty. Therefore, the Auditor General's suggestions should commend themselves to parliament for consideration and for such action as may seem wise along the lines suggested.

There was a motion earlier in the session by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), which pointed out the advisability of having the whole question referred to a committee of the House for inquiry and report. That motion was not acceded to by the government, and I now propose to make some suggestions as to certain matters which I think ought to be dealt with at once; and in making these suggestions, I shall conclude with a motion pointing out in general terms the necessity of making some amendments to the Act. And because my motion must necessarily be couched in general terms, I shall take occasion to indicate the matters in respect of which I think the Audit Act might profitably be amended.

In the first place, let me say that the Auditor General has dealt in his report with the so-called Davis contract for the lighting of the Cornwall canal. I do not propose at this moment to deal with that question as I shall deal with it later on when the House is in committee, and when there will be better opportunity of discussing it. But let me call attention to one or two sentences which the Auditor General has used with regard to that contract, In a letter of the 7th July, 1902, Mr. McDougall uses this language in addressing the Secretary of the Treasury Board:

> Then I may call your attention to the rather singular fact that there were two arrangements in connection with the matter. The first was made eleven days before the election of June 23, 1896, and the second twenty-nine days before that of November 7, 1900.

There is a suggestion in that which has been interpreted in a certain way by a portion of the public press, and I desire to point out that the Auditor General has not been quite so accurate in his dates as possibly he might have been expected to be. I am not saying this by way of reproach, but desire to call attention to the actual dates in order that any misapprehension which has been disseminated by the press should be removed. Let me say that in the documents brought down there is an agreement of the 25th of June, 1896, made between the government and Mr. Davis, in which reference is made to certain Orders in Council, dated respectively 18th of February, 1896, and 12th of June, 1896. In order that the true position may be laid before the country, I shall read those Orders in Council. I did not obtain them until yesterday, although I made application more than a week ago. But Mr. Schreiber informed me that on account of the pressing engagements of the clerical staff of the Railways and Canals Department, he could not possibly hand them to me until Monday morning. The first Order in Council is as follows:—

> On a memorandum dated 8th February, 1896, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that authority be given to lease to Mr. Michael P. Davis of Ottawa, Ontario, a certain lot of land belonging to the Cornwall canal containing by admeasurement 4·88 acres. be the same more or less, and more particularly described as follows:—
>
> All that piece or parcel of land being part of lot No. 1 at the lower end of Sheik's Island, in the township of Cornwall, in the county of Stormont and province of Ontario;
>
> Commencing at a point 123 feet in a southeasterly direction from the centre line of the entrance channel to the regulating weir and at right angles thereto and in line with the extreme lower end of the side walls of the weir; thence southeasterly on a prolongation of the last course 530 feet, more or less, to the water's edge of the River St. Lawrence; thence northerly following the water's edge to a line parallel to and seventy feet distant from the centre line of the roadway on the lower Sheik's Island Dam; thence westerly along said parallel line 240 feet more or less to its intersection with a line parallel to and 125 feet distant from the centre line of the entrance channel to the regulating weir; thence southerly along said parallel line 490 feet more or less to the post planted at the southwesterly angle of the land described; containing by admeasurement 4·88 acres, be the same more or less, and as shown on the sketch plan hereunto annexed, coloured red:—together with so much of the surplus water, if any on Lock No. 20 level, Cornwall canal, as the Minister of Railways and Canals may deem advisable, after navigation and existing mills and mill sites hereinafter to be leased are supplied, the lessee also to have the privilege of using at a weir to be hereafter constructed by him the water flowing into the said canal from Hoople's creek, the said lot of land and the said surplus water and flow of water from Hoople's Creek to be held for the erection of an electric plant and the operation of the machinery therein for the term of twenty one years from and after the first day of July, 1896, and ended on the 1st day of July, 1917, and thereafter for a term of twenty-one years renewable, at a rental of one thousand dollars per annum payable in advance upon the 2nd day of January and the 1st day of July in each year, dating from the first day of July, 1896, the rent for the first two years not being charged. The lessee to supply electric power for the working of all the locks on the Cornwall canal at sixty-three dollars per horse power per annum, and also electric direct current arc light of not less than 2,000 candle power at thirty cents per light per night, as set forth in the indenture of lease hereto, annexed—
>
> The minister further recommends that the said lease of land, surplus water and flow of water, be upon the terms and conditions set forth in the indenture of lease hereunto annexed, which is hereby submitted for approval, and

that he, the minister be authorized to execute the same on behalf of Her Majesty.

The committee submit the above recommendations for Your Excellency's approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The next Order in Council is one bearing date of 12th of June, 1896, and is as follows:

On a memorandum dated 22nd May, 1896, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that under date the 12th May inst., the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals has furnished an amended plan and description of the parcel of land, 4·88 acres in extent at the Lower Sheik's island dam on the Cornwall Canal Reserve, authority for the leasing of which to Mr. M. P. Davis was given by Order in Council of the 18th of February last, which also approved of the draft of the proposed lease.

The minister recommends that the plan and description hereto attached be substituted for the plan and description attached to or embodied in the said Order in Council, and that the draft of lease approved thereby be amended to the effect of such substitution.

The committee submit the same for your Excellency's approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

What I desire to draw to the attention of the House and the country is this: If dates are of importance in considering this contract, it is especially of importance to note that the Order in Council upon which that agreement was made bears date of 18th February, and not of 12th June. The only effect of the additional Order in Council of June 12th is to provide a new plan and description of the lease which had been approved as far back as 22nd February; and it is further to be noted that the new Order in Council of 12th June was made upon a memorandum dated 22nd May, from the Minister of Railways and Canals. Therefore, the Order in Council upon which this agreement was made is of date 18th February, 1896, except in so far as the description was slightly amended upon a memorandum dated 22nd May, 1896, confirmed by Order in Council of 12th June, 1896.

Now, the one difficulty which the Auditor General has experienced, as he tells us, in dealing with matters touching public contracts and affecting the expenditure of public money, is that he has no power, where overruled by the Treasury Board to prevent the expenditure of money even though the circumstances attending the making or modification of the contract and the payment of the money are such as, in his opinion, should demand the fullest possible investigation. And the criticisms which have been made upon the report which he has presented to parliament and the country point to the possibility that the two political parties may be so concerned in a matter of public expenditure that neither the one nor the other would press for an investigation by parliament. Now, it is better, when suggestions of that kind are made, either impliedly by the Auditor General or openly in the public press, that some power should be given to the Auditor General or some other officer by means of which that investigation can certainly be instituted and carried on without regard to the interests that might be affected. It is for that reason that I am suggesting to the government to approve of a Bill, a copy of which I have already handed to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This Bill I suggest not as one which is to be followed ipsissimis verbis, but as one setting forth a principle, an idea, which, I think, might be safely acted upon by the government, and which would tend to produce in the minds of the people greater confidence in the powers of the Auditor General and in the safeguarding of the public treasury. I will read the draft Bill to which I have referred and make a few comments on it as I proceed:

An Act to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, and the Acts in amendment thereof.

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. The Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, as amended by 51 Victoria, chapter 7, 54-55 Victoria, chapter 16, and 57-58 Victoria, chapter 19, is hereby further amended, by adding thereto the following as section 58 (a) immediately after section 58.

58 (a) (1) In case any contract involving the expenditure of public money has been entered into or modified, or in case any public moneys are about to be paid or have been paid under the order of the Treasury Board after refusal by the Auditor General to certify to a cheque therefor, and in case the Auditor General is of opinion that the making or modification of such a contract, or the payment or proposed payment of such moneys was not, or is not in the public interest and that the circumstances attending the same require investigation, he may file with the registrar of the Exchequer Court of Canada a petition addressed to the judge of the said court praying that the making or modification of such contract, or the payment or proposed payment of such moneys and all circumstances relating to, connected with or attending the same may be investigated by the said judge who shall thereupon proceed to investigate the same with all convenient speed, first giving due notice of the time and place of such investigation to the Attorney General of Canada and to all other persons interested. Every person so notified shall be at liberty to attend and be heard upon such investigation. The Auditor General shall attend and may be represented by counsel upon such investigation. The said judge at the conclusion thereof shall file his report upon the matters aforesaid with the Auditor General and the same shall be included in the next annual report of the Auditor General and laid before the House of Commons for such action thereon as parliament may deem necessary.

That is a provision which should be acted upon by the Auditor General only under very grave circumstances. It is a very large power to give him, but it is a power which, perhaps, might be given him with safety. If he is of opinion that a public contract has been entered into, or—what is more important—has been modified in the interest altogether of the contracting parties, not in the interest of the public, or if he believes that the payment of public moneys has been made, or is about to be made, under such circumstances as demand careful investigation, then he is at liberty under such grave conditions to file his petition with the judge of the Exchequer Court and have that investigation which he deems necessary, irrespective altogether of the action which either political party or both parties may take in parliament with regard to the matter. The second subsection of this proposed section, is as follows :

(2) Upon the filing of such petition by the Auditor General notice thereof shall forthwith be given to the Minister of Finance by the registrar of the said court and except with the written consent and approval of the Auditor General no payment under any such contract so made or modified or under any such order of the Treasury Board shall thereafter be made until after the conclusion of such investigation and until thirty days after the report of the judge shall have been laid before Parliament.

Provided always that whenever it shall appear to the judge that the exigency of public interest requires that some part or the whole of such a payment shall be made before the conclusion of the investigation or before the expiration of the said period of thirty days, the judge may authorize such payment in whole or in part, and the same may be made accordingly.

That is a very important provision, and it should be acted upon of course by the Auditor General only under grave circumstances, and where he thought the facts were sufficiently serious to justify him in so doing. It would enable him to stay the payment under such contract or modified contract, or under any overruling of the Treasury Board, until the matter had been thoroughly investigated before a judge of the Exchequer Court, and until his report had been laid before parliament for action. It is a very important step, I admit, to pass legislation of that kind ; although I must call the attention of the House to the modification which has been embodied in the draft I submit. It is that the judge of the Exchequer Court shall always have power, under such conditions where in his opinion the exigency of the public service demands it, to permit the payments to proceed, even although the Auditor General still withholds his consent. Now I admit fully that we must look at this question from every standpoint, and while I think the principle which I am contending for in this clause is a correct one, I have an open mind as to the means by which and the limitations under which that principle shall be carried out. On the one hand, we have to consider the safe-guarding of the treasury and the protection of the public interest ; on the other hand, we are not to put arbitrary power into the hands of any one man, even an Auditor General, which will prevent men who enter into contracts with the government from receiving from banking and other financial institutions that credit which they have been receiving in the past, and which is absolutely necessary if there is to be that competition in the performance of public works which is eminently desirable in the public interest. There is an idea in that section which may require to be modified. but there is an idea which I think might safely be embodied in some such language as that which I have suggested. The third sub-paragraph is as follows :

3. No payment under an order of the Treasury Board authorizing the issue of a cheque which the Auditor General has refused to certify shall be made until ten days after such order has been made and a copy thereof, with the accompanying reasons, delivered to the Auditor General by the secretary of the said board.

The idea is that after the Treasury Board has overruled a refusal of the Auditor General to certify a cheque for expenditure out of the consolidated revenue fund, the Auditor General shall have a certain period within which he shall determine whether it is desirable for him to undertake such an investigation as that which has been provided for in the first subsection of section 1 which I have drafted. Then my draft Bill proceeds as follows :

4 The judge may examine any person on oath or affirmation on any matter pertinent to such investigation, and may cause a subpœna to be issued from the Exchequer Court commanding any person therein named to appear before him and to testify to all matters within his knowledge relative to the matter under investigation, and to bring with him and produce any document, paper or other thing which he has in his possession relative to the matter under investigation and reasonable travelling expenses shall be tendered to any witness so subpœnaed at the time of service.

5. If for any reason the judge deems it advisable he may issue a commission for the purposes of such investigation in like manner and with the like powers as are set forth in section 57 of the 'Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act,' with regard to examinations by the Auditor General, and the provisions of sections 57 and 58 of the said Act shall apply to such investigation and to the persons summoned for the purposes thereof.

6. The judge shall in all matters relating to such investigation have all the powers and authority of the Court of Exchequer with regard to matters within the jurisdiction of said court.

7. The procedure and rules of the Exchequer Court so far as applicable shall apply

to such investigation and the judge of the said court may from time to time make, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, such further or other general rules with regard to such investigations as he may deem necessary.

8. The provisions of the preceding seven subsections of this section shall apply to all contracts, payments and matters referred to, or reported upon by the Auditor General in his report for the fiscal year ending 30th day of June, 1903.

I have inserted that special provision because of the suggestion of the Auditor General to which I have already referred, a suggestion to which I called the attention of the House. He is mistaken as to the dates. This contract was entered into, as he says, eleven days, but upon an Order in Council made some four months before the general election of 1896, and the auxiliary contract, if I may so term it, was entered into also shortly before the general election of 1900. There is a suggestion in that which, as I have already said, has been the subject of some criticism, and for that reason I propose to make the provisions to which I have already referred apply not only to the future but also to all matters which are reported upon or dealt with by the Auditor General in his report for the year 1903. That provision gives ample power to thoroughly investigate the Davis contract.

I will now read section 2 of the proposed Bill :

2. Section 32, subsection 1 of the said Act as amended by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 7, section 5, is further amended by adding thereto the following as subclause (d) immediately after subclause (c) thereof :—

(d.) The members of the Treasury Board shall furnish reasons for their decision, which reasons shall form part of or be attached to the written order of the board.

I do not think that this is an unreasonable requirement on the part of the Auditor General ; indeed it is necessary for his guidance in the future. If he has so misconceived his powers or duties as auditor as to refuse the payment of public moneys under circumstances which call for the intervention of the Treasury Board, then it is right, not only for the information of the public, but also for his own guidance and his own consideration in the future, that the reasons which have impelled the Treasury Board to overrule him in that regard should be stated to him and reported by him to Parliament.

The third section of my draft Bill is as follows :

3. Section 48 of the said Act as amended by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 7, section 10, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

(48.) In reporting as hereinbefore directed for the information of the House of Commons, the result of the examination of the appropriation accounts, the Auditor General shall call attention to every one in which cheques have been issued without his certificate—or in which a grant has been exceeded—or in which money received by a department from other sources than the grants for the year to which the account relates has not been applied or accounted for according to the directions of parliament—or in which a sum charged against a grant is not supported by proof of payment—or in which a payment so charged did not occur within the period of the account, or was for any other reason, not properly chargeable against the grant, or was in any way irregular,—

So far the statute proceeds exactly as it is at the present time. What I am reading further is new. My proposed amendment continues as follows :

—or in which a sum charged against a grant for capital account was expended wholly or in part for a purpose properly chargeable to revenue account, or in which by reason of the generality of the appropriation, or otherwise, he has been unable to properly check or control the expenditure, or to confine it to what he believes to have been the object of the House of Commons in making the grant.

It seems to me that these are matters in respect to which the Auditor General should report to parliament, because they are matters of importance, and it is well that parliament should be informed as to irregularities or defects of that kind.

The fourth section of the Bill which I have drafted is as follows :

Section 21 of the said Act as amended by 51 Victoria, chapter 7, section 1, is further amended by striking out the words 'four thousand' and substituting therefor the words.

I have left a blank here so as to suggest an increase in the salary of the Auditor General. His salary at the present time I believe is $4,000, and it has continued at that sum for a long period of time. As deputy ministers and others have had their salaries increased within recent years, and as the cost of living has undoubtedly increased during that period, and as the Auditor General is an old and a faithful public servant, it seems to me it would not be out of place at the present time to give him some further consideration in the way of a salary, and it is for that purpose I have drawn section 4 of the Bill in its present form, leaving of course for the consideration of the government and of parliament what should be the increase to his salary.

Before sitting down I would like to say a few words about the suggested Audit Act which was submitted to parliament with the report of the Auditor General some three or four years ago. In the first place the Auditor General suggests that his title should be changed to 'The Controller and Auditor General of Canada.' That is not a matter perhaps of very great importance and for my part I see no reason why the title

should not be so changed; it is more of form than of substance.

The first important change that I observe in the suggested Audit Act proposed by the Auditor General is that in section 24 he suggests an omission which gives to him, uncontrolled by the Treasury Board, the power to make orders and rules for the conduct of the internal business of his office. For my own part I would regard that as a reasonable request. I think we might safely trust to the Auditor General the power to make rules for the internal business of his office.

The next matter of importance, if it is of importance, is his suggestion that the account to which all public moneys, from whatever source of revenue derived are paid in, should be called 'the Canadian Exchequer Account,' instead of the 'account of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General.' In regard to this the Auditor General expresses his views as follows :

> It is important that the public should understand clearly that the money is not in any way the money of the government until after it has been provided by parliament.

Therefore the Auditor General suggests that the account, instead of being called 'the account of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General,' should be called 'the Canadian Exchequer Account,' and in that change he says we will be following the example of the Imperial Audit Act. That however I do not regard as of so much importance as the amendment which he suggests with regard to section 30.

Section 30 is altered very much in the form which he has suggested. The most important amendment it seems to me which he has proposed is that he desires credits to be issued in favour of the deputy head, an accountant of a department, or to two officers, clerks or other persons, connected with the office or service charged. As I understand it the credit here referred to might be spoken of as the petty cash service of each department. Of course very large sums actually are paid out of that account but relatively speaking, it is, as it were, the petty cash service of each department. A credit is made at the request of the Auditor General, by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General in favour of each department and out of that credit moneys are paid for certain public services and in the end the moneys so paid out of that credit are audited and checked by the Auditor General. He suggests that these credits should be made to the deputy and the accountant of each department, or to at least two officers of the department and I think that would be a desirable amendment.

He makes a further suggestion which is also of importance. He suggests that :

> No such credit shall issue in favour of any officers or other persons in excess of (the) appropriations authorized (and assigned as above, or when, in using previous credits, the applicants have disobeyed an Act of parliament or other valid regulations).

He suggests also :

> These credits shall be used only for such class or classes of payments as the Controller and Auditor General may direct.

And further :

> If the Controller and Auditor General notify one of the persons in whose names a credit has been issued, that such credit is not to be used for any specified purpose, such credit shall not be used for such purpose, but for any payment to be made for such purpose a cheque on the Canada Exchequer Account shall be applied for.

I understand the reason for his proposal is this : Under the present Act where the Auditor General has made a credit which is available for the use of a public department, he may afterwards find that under some contract, or under some modified contract, a payment is proposed which he feels he could not sanction, and he may go to the officers of the department possessing that credit and express his views in that regard. But they are entirely at liberty to disregard his views ; they may continue to make payments of which he expressly disapproves out of these credits, leaving him only the opportunity of criticising after the payments have been made instead of objecting and withholding the payments, as he otherwise might do. I would be inclined to think that the two suggestions on this line are well worthy of consideration by this House, and I do not see that the administration of public affairs would be in any way hampered by complying with the desire of the Auditor General in this respect.

I frankly and fully admit that in dealing with the suggestions of the Auditor General we must have in mind always the fact that there is ministerial responsibility for public expenditure and we must also bear in mind the fact that we must not so hamper the administration of public affairs that it cannot be carried on efficiently; but, subject to those two qualifications, it seems to me that we ought to place in the hands of the Auditor General all possible safeguards for the protection of the public interest and the public money.

I may say very frankly that I would not be inclined to assent to some of the suggestions which the Auditor General has made as to section 33 without further explanation and a better understanding of how they could be fairly and properly carried out having regard to the considerations which I have mentioned, but there are two suggestions with regard to section 33 which I think might well be taken into consideration by the government. One of these suggestions is :

If an official of any department, dealing with a claim against the government, knows that the claimant is indebted to the government, whether the indebtedness is of record in the department or not, he shall take no part in the payment of the claim against the government, except to the extent that the amount due by the government exceeds that due to it.

The principle of this proposed amendment seems to be a very proper one, although possibly the language of the Auditor General might require modification in order to carry out his idea.

Another suggestion made by the Auditor General is in reference to section 37 :

The Controller and Auditor General may require the production of any public document connected with any expenditure which is before him for examination.

At present I do not see that there can possibly be any objection to his having that power ; in fact it would seem to me that in the public interest he ought to have that power. Some of these suggestions that he has made with regard to section 33 would seem to me to interfere with the theory of ministerial responsibility and with the efficiency of the public administration and would rather place the Auditor General in the position of a Court of Appeal from the administration in respect to matters which must be absolutely entrusted to them under our system of responsible government. Therefore, without more fully understanding what exactly is meant or required by the Auditor General in making these propositions, I would not be inclined to support him with regard to them.

Another suggestion which he has made which seems to be worthy of consideration is in reference to section 47. Section 47 is as follows :

If, during the progress of the examination by the Controller and Auditor General hereinbefore directed, any objection arises to any item to be introduced into the appropriation account of any grant, such objections shall, notwithstanding such account has not been rendered to him, be immediately communicated to the department concerned ; and if the objections are not answered to his satisfaction by such department——

The statute at present continues as follows :

—they shall be referred by him to the Treasury Board, and the Treasury Board shall determine in what manner the items in question shall be entered in the annual appropriation account.

The Auditor General's suggestion is that it should read as follows instead of the language which I have just read :

And if the objections are not answered to his satisfaction by such department he shall disallow the item, or make such change as appears to him proper.

I would be inclined to think that the suggestion of the Auditor General in this regard is a wise one and that there is no good reason in the public interest why that suggestion should not be acted upon.

I think these are all the suggestions of the Auditor General that I find necessary to call attention to at present. It seems to me that the subject is worthy the immediate consideration of the government. I regret that the government did not see fit, at an earlier stage of the session to submit the whole question to this House for the purpose of enabling us to give to it that consideration which we cannot give to it now, and which would probably have been productive of better results than we may hope for at this late period. For the purpose of bringing the matter before the House, and not in any way as a motion of want of confidence in the government, but in order that a discussion may arise on the whole subject, I beg to move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the main motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :—

In the opinion of this House the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act should be so extended as to confer upon the Auditor General powers ample in every respect to protect the public interest and to safeguard the public treasury.

That resolution must necessarily be general, because I cannot very well introduce the provisions of an Act of parliament into a resolution. I have submitted to the House my views in regard to the amendments which ought to be made, and whether they are made or not they are at least entitled to the earnest and careful consideration of this House before they should be disregarded.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The leader of the opposition has moved an amendment which expresses an abstract opinion, and which perhaps would have had no very definite meaning, if my hon. friend had not in his remarks associated with his motion certain proposed amendments to the Audit Act. It is therefore our duty to deal with the amendment in which he proposes to express the opinion of the House ; that the consolidated Revenue and Audit Act should be so extended as to confer upon the Auditor General powers ample in every respect to protect the public interest and safeguard the public treasury. From my own point of view I am unable to vote for that motion inasmuch as it implies that the existing powers are not sufficient for the purpose. I differ entirely from the Auditor General, I differ entirely from my hon. friend if he agrees with the Auditor General, when he implies that the powers of the Audit Act are not at this moment ample and sufficient for the protection of the public treasury. The principles un-

derlying the Audit Act were established long years ago under certain conditions, and the conditions existing now are precisely the same as they were then. The volume of business has increased, but that simply means that you have to give to the Auditor General a large staff to do his work. There are no new principles; no new difficulties, nothing has occurred in the administration of the Audit Act under the present government that has not occurred frequently under the administration of all other governments. Therefore, the suggestion that some need has arisen for a new provision in the Audit Act, is a proposition to which I am unable to give my assent. I do not quite understand what the leader of the opposition meant when he said that he regretted that the government had not seen fit at an earlier stage of the session to submit this whole matter to the House. In what manner could we have submitted this matter to the whole House?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I referred to the motion for a committee to investigate the whole question of the Audit Act.

Mr. FIELDING. That motion was made by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and the leader of the opposition regrets that it was not acceded to by the government. I think he might have added that that motion was not acceded to by the opposition, because I think I am correct in stating that when the time came to divide the House on that motion there were not a dozen members present on the opposition side, and several of these had remained for the purpose of voting against the motion. The motion was not even pressed to a division, so that when my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) complained that it was not acceded to by the government he hardly puts the case fairly. The motion to which he refers was practically condemned by both sides of the House as something, if not uncalled for, certainly as something that did not commend itself to the judgment of the House. There is no difficulty about the Auditor General having the most full and ample power to investigate. From the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) one might assume that there was some difficulty in regard to the Auditor General's power to make inquiry. There is absolutely none. Under the Audit Act at present, the Auditor General is properly vested with large powers; unlimited powers to investigate everything in connection with the public accounts. He has unlimited power to audit; he has even the power to obstruct, which was never the intention of the Audit Act at all. There is no lack of power to the Auditor General in the Audit Act, and if our friend the Auditor General wants more power, it is not that he may audit the public accounts, but that he may deal with matters which the Audit Act never contemplated as coming within the proper sphere of the Auditor General's duty. I join with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in giving credit to the Auditor General for what he believes to be a faithful discharge of his duties. The nature of the Auditor General's business makes him critical; hypercritical, suspicious, sensitive. He is somewhat like a police officer in a court of law whose zeal for conviction is so strong that the judges look upon his evidence with a degree of doubt and always discount it a little. The Auditor General, by the very nature of his business falls into an atmosphere of suspicion, and he sometimes sees difficulties where none exist. I do not say that as against Mr. McDougall, but I say it as a condition which is likely to arise out of the very nature of his work; and so very often we have the Auditor General raising questions which are not questions of audit, but which are questions of public policy. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has associated with his motion suggestions as to certain amendments to the Audit Act. I have never had the pleasure of seeing them or hearing them until they were read in the House to-day, and it would not be wise for anybody to reach conclusive opinions from a very hasty knowledge of a matter of such importance. I do not anticipate that at this stage of the session we would be able to give that subject the grave consideration which it ought to receive if we were to undertake to deal with it. My hon. friend has remarked that the Auditor General, is in a particular manner the servant of parliament. That is true, and that indicates that in a particular manner every member of parliament perhaps has a little larger responsibility in dealing with the affairs of the Auditor General, than in dealing with the affairs of the ordinary government official. The leader of the opposition has reminded us that as far back as 1899 the Auditor General began to make complaints as to the need of amendments to the Audit Act, and he has read from a more recent report several changes which the Auditor General desires. My hon. friends opposite have therefore had the Auditor General's views before them for three or four years, and I am bound to believe that if they thought there was any good ground for complaint and any real need of amendments to the Audit Act in the public interest, they would have brought them forward before this, and not waited until the last stages of this session to come forward with an abstract motion simply stating that we need larger powers for the Auditor General. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has established any case for a change, but certainly before we could undertake to make the change which he has suggested, the House

would have to very carefully consider its position. Without following my hon. friend closely through the proposed amendments which he read, one fact comes out straight and clear, and that is that the control of the expenditure of public money is to be taken from the people's parliament and given to the judge of the Exchequer Court. That is the essence of the whole proceeding, that is the foundation of the proposed Bill.

It was Sir John Macdonald who on one occasion said that among the many rights which the parliament of Canada possessed was the right to do wrong, and it was better that parliament should exercise its right to do wrong than that other people should deny parliamentary rights. The principles of parliamentary government are such that we are bound to believe that the people through their representatives will deal with every grievance ; and the attempt to get behind the people's representatives, to create some other tribunal, to take the place of parliament, especially in matters of money, and to give that body power independent of the government and parliament to deal with these matters, is a step in the wrong direction ; and we on this side of the House are not prepared to take it. We have no reason to suppose that treasury boards and governments under either party are likely to be composed otherwise than of honourable men. It is not necessary for the purpose of our discussion to assume that on one side or on the other there would not be a desire to protect the public interest. We are bound to assume that men placed in the high position of ministers of the parliament of Canada, though they differ in their political stripe from men across the House, will in the main be honest and conscientious in their desire to protect the public interests ; and any assumption that on the part of the government or the Treasury Board, and still more by collusion and bargain with hon. gentlemen opposite, there is to be suppression of truth and justice and violation of the public interests, is something that we say this parliament could not assent to, but is something that hon. members on both sides should resent, whether it comes from the Auditor General or anybody else.

On the general questions involved I do not wish to say any more ; but I would like to say a word or two in regard to what is called the Davis contract, to which my hon. friend has referred in the course of his remarks. I will deal with it only generally, because I have not charged my mind with the details. There is a very erroneous impression conveyed to the public as to the action of the Auditor General on that subject. The claim of Mr. Davis arose out of a series of contracts, one beginning in 1896. Some point is made of a difference of a few days in dates in 1896. I do not suppose a few days are more important in 1896 than they are in 1900, and we need not dwell on that. A claim was made by Mr. Davis for moneys alleged to be due under his contract. That claim came before the department. The department reported that the money was due, and applied for a cheque. The Auditor General objected, and then the matter came before the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board inquired into it, and the view they took was this, that whether the contract to which that claim referred was or was not an improvident contract, the claim was one which probably had a foundation of law. We called upon our proper officers to advise us whether or not it was a lawful claim. We were advised that the money was due. Whether or not the contract was wisely made, whether the prices were high or low, whether the quantity of power to be taken was greater or less than it was prudent to take —all these were legitimate questions to debate at a certain stage, but not at that stage, because we were advised that the money was due. The Treasury Board therefore decided that they were bound, under the advice given them, to overrule the objection of the Auditor General, and that that account, up to the date to which it referred, if it was one which could be collected by process of law, was an account which we were bound to pay. But there was a clause in the original contract made by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) in 1896, that the government might acquire possession of all these works of Mr. Davis. In that clause there was an opportunity for a remedy if the contract was found to be an improvident one ; and the Treasury Board took the view that though we would be obliged to pay Mr. Davis's claim up to the date to which he had rendered his account, whether we should continue to do so thereafter was a proper matter for inquiry. That was the position of the matter then. The Treasury Board were not called on to decide whether or not it was an improvident contract. What they were called on to consider was whether or not Mr. Davis's claim was legally and properly due ; and, after legal advice, the accuracy of which has never been questioned, we decided that the claim would have to be paid. Thereupon the Treasury Board passed a minute overruling the Auditor General and deciding to pay the claim. Before that minute came into effect, before any action was taken upon it, some conversation occurred between some of my colleagues and the Auditor General regarding that claim. Just from whom the suggestion first came I do not know, but the outcome of that conversation was that it was thought better to hold the matter open for a time, and enter into negotiations with Mr. Davis to see if another contract could be made which would be more satisfactory to

the Auditor General ; and at the request of the Auditor General in writing, that minute of the Treasury Board was cancelled, and was to be treated as null and void and as no part of the public record. Why the Auditor General, after that minute of the Treasury Board was nullified by agreement made it a subject of discussion and comment in his report I have never been able to ascertain. After the cancellation, negotiations were entered into with Mr. Davis—perhaps he came to the conclusion that the government might obtain relief by buying out the works—and an amended contract was made. Not a dollar has ever been paid in any other way. The claim of Mr. Davis was, if I remember correctly, $40,000 or $50,000, and the Auditor General arranged that a payment should be made on account, and a considerable payment was made. The view of the Treasury Board was, not that that contract should stand for ever, but that so much money as was due should be paid ; but that the question of further proceedings under that contract was one that should be considered—that in some way or other a change might be brought about—that the question of an amendment to the contract should remain open for further negotiations. Subsequently an amended contract was made and approved, and agreed to by the Auditor General. I was at that time temporarily acting as Minister of Railways, and was called on to sign the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman say that it was agreed to by the Auditor General ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, assented to by the Auditor General ; I say that decidedly. The papers came before me as acting Minister of Railways, but in the light of what had happened, I said I would not sign the contract until I was aware that it was approved by the Auditor General. He did approve of it, and the contract was signed. As I have said, the Auditor General agreed that the minute of the Treasury Board should be cancelled and treated as null and void, and I have never been able to ascertain why, after having agreed to that, he dragged it into his report and made it the subject of comment. That is the whole history of the Davis contract so far as it has come under my observation .

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken referred to the attendance in this House when I moved to have this matter submitted to a committee. He said that there were then present not more than eight or ten members on this side. I am not aware that the hon. minister himself (Mr. Fielding) was in the House on the occasion referred to. I am informed he was not, but if he were, he certainly took no part in the discussion. One would have expected that in a matter so closely affecting his department, the hon. minister would have given us the benefit of his experience and have explained how it came to pass that he so frequently has had to come in conflict with the Auditor General. He however had nothing to say. He remained as silent as the sphinx ; and now that he has at last delivered himself, one is not surprised that he should have remained so long silent. Let me point out to him that he is not quite correct in his recollection of what took place. The motion I had the honour to move was declared lost upon division, as recorded in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FIELDING. There was no division.

Mr. LENNOX. And I do not at all agree with the hon. gentleman in his estimate of the number who were in the House. But what we all must recollect is that we had just closed what might be regarded as the railway session of this House. We had just concluded our labours on the Transcontinental Railway question and were wearied out with long sittings. And further we were on the eve of having submitted to us that important deliverance which the Finance Minister gives us once a year, the budget speech. So that it was not at all surprising that at half-past two o'clock in the morning the attendance in the House should have been rather slim. But if the hon. minister flatters himself that I have not the support of hon. members on this side, let me assure him that he is entirely mistaken, and allow me to assure the House that if it were practicable at this stage, this side of the House would favour the adoption of the motion I had the honour to introduce and have this whole matter referred to a select committee, as I suggested, to be chosen by the right hon. the leader of the government without regard to politics.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. LENNOX. When the House rose, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to some remarks made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). That hon. gentleman was concerned about the point that when I was speaking on this important question there was not a large representation on this side of the House. That, perhaps, having regard to the importance of the question then debated, was unfortunate. But I might point out that it was still more unfortunate that the Minister of Finance, who is particularly charged with responsibilities in these matters and who, above all other members of the cabinet, should be the one possessed of a competent and adequate knowledge of the working of the Audit Act, the gentleman to whom, above all others, we should look

for the originating of ideas of importance in regard to this Act, was not present when the matter was formerly discussed. It is still more significant and important, it is still more remarkable, that that hon. gentleman has not found it possible to be present now when the House reassembles. As to the hon. gentleman's suggestion that this matter had been long delayed, if it affords a reason for reference to that matter at all, affords only the reason that it is much more important and much more the duty of the government now to take the matter in hand for the very reason that it is late and because already the delay has been too long. Justice delayed is equal to injustice ; and I venture to say, having full regard to my responsibility as a member of this House, that great injustice has been done to the people of this country by the fact that for so long the government has neglected its duty to introduce an amendment of the Audit Act upon some such lines, or to some such extent as that advocated by the Auditor General. The Auditor General has had more than a quarter of a century experience of such matters. Not only was he originally appointed by the friends of the present administration, but, for eighteen years while the Conservative party were in power, they never ceased to laud him, a position in strange contrast to the position of the Minister of Finance to-day, for he speaks of the Auditor General as a gentleman who necessarily brings to the duties of his position an attitude of suspicion—one would not wonder at that at all, it is natural enough, considering the facts and the circumstances,—and he finds it impossible to describe the Auditor General except by likening him to a detective. This may be very nice, and may seem quite appropriate to a gentleman like the Finance Minister, but I venture to say the people of the country will look upon his utterances and upon the attitude of the whole government with suspicion, when they reflect that for eighteen years the present administration and their friends in the House and upon the hustings could not find language sufficiently eulogistic in which to describe the Auditor General, but the moment that gentleman gets in their way, the moment he stands between them and the people, the moment he stands by the treasury of the country, and asserts the powers which parliament intended to clothe him with when the Act was introduced by a Liberal administration in 1878, the moment he takes the position of standing by the will of the people as against the will of the administration and they find they can go no further except by the removal of the Auditor General—that moment they begin to make it so inconvenient for him that he cannot stay ; he must get out. Nor is this an isolated instance. It is different in degree and different in some of its features from the position taken in reference to the hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Tarte), it is somewhat different from the position taken by the government in regard to the former Minister of Railways, (Mr. Blair) ; it differs in some features from the attitude of the government in regard to Lord Dundonald :—but they are all of the same general class, and indicate the same determination that when any public official or member of the cabinet stands in the way of these gentlemen, when they cannot march on at their own sweet will, that public official or the member of the cabinet who stands in their way must go. Now, the Minister of Finance ought to be here this afternoon. He ought to be here and take his medicine. Because when an hon. gentleman is charged with the duties which have been committed to him for so many years, and who has excelled only in one line, and that is in congratulating himself every year that he has done so exceedingly well, and when it comes down to business in dealing with this question of adequately safeguarding the people's interest, that hon. gentleman ought to be here. It is too much the habit of the administration, I think, to shift responsibility from one member of the cabinet to another. Too often do we see this farming out of responsibility, so that when we call one of the ministers to task, we find that somebody else acts as his sponsor. If it is the Minister of Railways, who is called to task, then it is the Minister of Justice who replies. I need not multiply instances, for we find it constantly occurring that when a department is under fire some one else must stand up and answer for the minister who is properly responsible for that department. So, I suppose some one other than the Finance Minister, some one who knows nothing about the matter in a practical sense, will be expected to answer the arguments advanced by the opposition this afternoon. If the government likes to take that position, of course, it must do so. It is not a strong example of the true workings of the principles of responsible government, though it is the only exemplification we have here. Though the hon. Minister of Finance has found it convenient to be away, I am glad that the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his place. I hope that the Finance Minister having argued this matter upon a different basis from that on which it was argued the other night, the rest of the cabinet will assume responsibility for the words of the Minister of Finance and take the same position as he did. But, at all events, we have heard the hon. gentlemen opposite applaud the Minister of Finance this morning and will see what they think of the statements of that hon. gentleman when they are critically examined. The minister of Finance tells us that he will vote against this resolution, and he gives his reasons. What are the reasons given by the hon. gentleman ? The

first is that the adoption of such a resolution would imply a defect in the Act. Could folly further go? Why, this same hon. gentleman introduced an amendment to the Act last session, which, in the face of the country and in the face of the opposition he dare not put through. Now, that was either right or it was wrong. If it was right, the Act is defective to-day; if the Act is not defective, the Bill introduced by the Finance Minister last session had no justification. On one or other horn of the dilemma, the minister must ride, and so must those who support and applaud him. But the Minister of Finance was inconsistent even during his remarks. He said he would take the matter into consideration, but he would have to vote down the resolution. That little inconsistency, however, is hardly worth referring to. But the minister says the Act is satisfactory. And yet there is not one suggestion or objection of the Auditor General during the whole time these hon. gentlemen have been in power that has not been overridden. I am not going to be dragged into a discussion of the details of the Davis contract at this stage, because we are going to have that up in the right way. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) would like very much to let the government down easy by dealing in a general way with the Davis contract and diverting public attention from the matter which is at issue, namely whether we shall have an Act that will more adequately protect the public interest than the present Act: whether we shall have some amendments which time has shown are absolutely necessary in the public interest.

The hon. gentleman says that another reason for voting against these resolutions is that no new conditions have arisen. Well, he must have been sleeping for a quarter of a century. When this Act was introduced more than a quarter of century ago, the hon. gentleman who introduced it, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), pointed out that it was not required until then because the revenue and expenditure had been small, but that the expenditure had increased to about $40,000,000 a year, and therefore an Audit Act had become necessary. As time went on the expenditure increased, and these hon. gentlemen pointed out from year to year the vastly increased responsibilities of the Auditor General until now we come to an entirely new condition of things. Down to 1888 we had been enlarging the scope of the Auditor General's power, and in that year we had it announced by Sir Charles Tupper, and concurred in by members on both sides of the House, that what was originally intended had been reached, namely, that the Auditor General then had control of every branch of the public service, and of every branch of the financial affairs of the country. That was agreed to at that time as a proper condition of affairs.

What have we been doing since then? We have been gradually encroaching upon the domain of the Auditor General, and the Minister of Finance is among those who would have shorn him to a very large extent of those powers, which he fortunately possesses at the present time. Now we find that the government attempted last year to rob the Auditor General of some necessary powers that he possessed, even going to the extent by that Bill of allowing the librarian to overrule the Auditor General if occasion should arise. I say that we now find this condition of things, we find it denied that the Auditor General has any power over the expenditure of this House, that this is to be regulated by the Committee on Internal Economy; we find that the Auditor General, instead of having his powers what they were, is gradually, so far as the government can do it, having his powers circumscribed. And we are confronted by this important new condition of things,—and this is what is alarming the country at the present time, that the government has committed itself to an enormous expenditure which is to be controlled by the administration to a degree that no other large expenditure has been controlled by an administration in the history of Canada. We have the whole eastern section of the Transcontinental Railway controlled directly by the administration and placed in the hands of three or four nominees of the Crown. 'Nominees of the Crown' is a euphemism. It means that this whole expenditure is to be controlled by three or four men who have been political supporters and henchmen of the government, and who will be more emphatically henchmen of the government after they get their appointments. Then surely it is time that we had every safeguard applied which can be applied for the regulation of this very important branch of the public service.

Now, I referred to the Minister of Finance and to his suspicious attitude with regard to the Auditor General. I think it comes very badly indeed from the Minister of Finance to open out upon the Auditor General in the way he did to-day, to show the animus he did; pointing out, as he did, that in his view because the Auditor General has ventured to assert himself in opposition to the departments, he therefore cannot be tolerated any longer. That is the sum and substance of what the hon. gentleman said. Yet, in 1886, Sir Richard Cartwright was the first to move to increase the salary of the Auditor General, who was then watching over the acts of the Conservative administration; and in 1888, when Sir Charles Tupper introduced an Act to increase the salary of the Auditor General, every member of the present administration who was then in the House, and all the prominent men of the Liberal party at the time, Mr. Mills, Mr. Weldon, Mr. Edgar and the right hon. leader of the

present government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), joined heartily with Sir Charles Tupper in his description of the merits of the Auditor General, and of the important duties that he was discharging. Now, I think it would be a dignified and manly attitude for the present government and the Minister of Finance in particular, to speak and act on the lines that Sir Charles Tupper adopted at that time. Let me therefore refer to the language Sir Charles Tupper then used :

> During the last year, as his office steadily progressed, the government have delegated to him the power of auditing the receipts of the Dominion. In fact, it may be said, that at this moment every cent received or paid out on account of the Dominion of Canada is subject to the review and audit of the Auditor General.

Then Sir Charles Tupper points out, in a very decided contrast to the attitude of the present Minister of Finance, that this official was keeping track of the Conservative government and was opposing them, and yet he was prepared in a generous and statesmanlike way to applaud the Auditor General.

> The accounts of the election held in 1887 were reviewed by him, and claims on that head reduced by some $26,000 ; similarly on the franchise accounts, claims have been reduced by some $61,000.

That, I guarantee, was applauded by the opposition of that day. And Cir Charles continues :

> It would be impossible for members on either side of this House to overrate the careful and painstaking ability of that officer or his conscientious devotion to the duties of the most important office which he discharges. He is in every sense of the word an officer of parliament. Although he has felt it occasionally to be his duty to differ with members of the administration, and with the conduct of the affairs of the public departments in carrying out the details of his office, I have no hesitation in saying that he has discharged his duties in such a way as to win the confidence and hearty approval of every member of the government, as I am sure he has earned it of every member of both sides of the House.

That is what I expect of statesmen ; that is the generous statement I would expect at all events from the men who selected the present Auditor General, who put him in office and who applauded him on every occasion, inside and outside of the House, for eighteen years and not—I was going to say contemptible, but that would not be parliamentary—and not the very doubtful position taken by the Minister of Finance today in regard to that official. Now the hon. gentleman complains of the attitude of the Auditor General ; he does not think it is what it ought to be. Well, the public, I venture to say, will think it is pretty nearly what it ought to be. Hon. gentlemen are fond of pointing out that upon legal questions the Auditor General is sometimes not correct. That may be so, but I venture to say that any one who reads the overruling cases in the Auditor General's Report and marks the language employed by the officials of the department which is attacked—and it is very often upon the Railway Department that the attack is made, and therefore I would particularly mention the language of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals—the correspondence which passes between the Auditor General and the department—would be surprised at the moderate attitude maintained by the Auditor General throughout these discussions. Sneers and insults mark the progress of the correspondence almost from end to end, and it seems to be the rule that the moment the Auditor General raises a question, that moment he is confronted by every official in the department which is attacked. Talk of suspicion ! Why it is suspicion from end to end by the department with slurs intervening. I venture to say that when this whole matter is ventilated as it will be, I hope, during this session of parliament, the people will be amazed at the moderate attitude, at the self-denying attitude, adopted and maintained by the Auditor General in the face of the most enormous provocation from time to time.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. LENNOX. If it depended upon the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to carry anything it would not be carried very far. The hon. gentleman says it is too late to deal with this question. Well if it is too late whose fault is it that it is too late ? We asked at the earliest possible moment in the session to have this Audit Act taken up. We presented it without regard to politics. I made a distinct point in the motion I made and in urging that motion that it would not be regarded as in any way a political question. I am sure that I spoke in a line which gave the government every reason to take it that I was sincere in saying that I did not regard it as a political matter, and yet, although we can have commissions by the score, we can have no committee for this matter. Perhaps I made a mistake, perhaps I should have asked for a commission. A commission would have involved, perhaps, the appointment of political friends ; it would probably have involved the payment of money out of the public treasury. There might then have been good enough reasons for the appointment of a commission, but I asked for a committee of the House, unpaid, devoting their services to the country, men on both sides of politics. No committee could be granted, although we have the Chinese Commission, the British Columbia Labour Commission, the Miners' Yukon Commission, the Elevator Commission in Manitoba, the School Question Commission in Manitoba, the Cattle-Guards' Commission, the Rail-

way Commission, the Transportation Commission, the Crow's Nest Pass Commission, the commission to inquire into the Garneau charges, the West Elgin Commission, the Treadgold Commission, and scores of other commissions. Yet when it comes to a question of the people's money, when it comes to a practical question, to a business question for a business government, then there is no time to go on with it. There is time enough for railways. We can have almost the whole of last session devoted to one railway company and a large portion of this session to the same company. I brought this matter up at the earliest possible moment after the railway business had been disposed of and yet we are told by the Minister of Finance to-day that there is not time to go on with the matter. Then the hon. gentleman has the bravery—we will call it that, because I do not want to call it any unpleasant word—he has the bravery to say: Oh, you gentlemen slept on your rights. He says that this proposal of the Auditor General was put in the form of a proposed Bill three or four sessions ago, and that the hon. gentlemen on this side have not brought it up until now. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that if it had not been that the House was engrossed last session with railway legislation, that the whole progress of the affairs of this country was blocked by reason of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, I would have introduced this matter last session. Probably a score of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House know that I had this same Bill before me last session and contemplated moving it if there had been any reasonable probability of getting the government to consider the ordinary every day wants of the people of Canada, instead of engrossing the attention of parliament with railway matters and affairs of that kind. Of course if the government want to take the attitude that they are going to act merely for the great corporations and that the time of parliament is to be reserved for that purpose, then the hon. gentleman is perfectly consistent in saying that it is too late to-day, when the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) introduces these proposed amendments to the Audit Act. Let me tell the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that while he touched only upon the fringe of the questions proposed to be dealt with by the leader of the opposition, he need not imagine that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are going to be led away from the issue by his reference to the Davis contract. There will be time enough for them to face that matter within a very short time; we are coming to the discussion of that matter, I understand, as soon as we get into Committee of Supply, but for the present we do not propose that the Minister of Finance or other members of the government or their supporters shall evade the issue now presented to them, and

that is why, having regard to the enormously increased expenditure which the government is contemplating, the new conditions that have arisen and the difficulties which time has shown to exist in the Act, we intend to force them to state whether they are prepared to deny the reasonable measures of justice which have been suggested by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) or whether they are prepared to take the matter into consideration and pass it through at this session of the House. I put no confidence in the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that we cannot dispose of this question at this session. Why, two or three hours, half a day at all events, carefully devoted to the consideration of this question will, if not make a perfect Act—I suppose we cannot expect that—at least improve the Act upon the lines suggested by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) or upon lines which would commend themselves to the consideration of the House. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, when he refers to the Davis contract that although we are not going to pursue it at present, although we will leave that for its proper time and not allow the government to fall easy by having it disposed of piecemeal, he is entirely away from the fact when he states that the Treasury Board always intended to modify that contract.

Any one who reads the correspondence sent between the department and the Auditor General will see that every line of it is a denial of there being any foundation for the charges made by the Auditor General, and that, far from intending to take this matter up at any future time the government absolutely denied there was the faintest grounds for an investigation of any kind. There is another emphatic reason why we should not allow the Minister of Finance to draw us away from a discussion of this amendment. The Davis contract is not by a score the only case of gross scandal which rises out of the action of the government in this matter of overruling the Auditor General. Although the Davis contract deals with larger figures —I am not going to let these gentlemen on the other side make so much noise, and I will name them if they do not keep order—although the Davis contract is the more recent, it is not by any means the most glaring case of injustice to the Auditor General, and, through the Auditor General, of injustice to the people of this country. The Corry & Laverdure contract was hedged about with the most emphatic statements that no extras would be allowed unless they were determined upon previously by a written requisition at stated prices by the chief engineer. And yet, by an overruling of the Auditor General which cannot be sustained by any reasonable intendment of the law, we have paid to these contractors $125,000 more than Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer would certify for. The view taken by the Auditor

General in that case was that the duties of the chief engineer could not be delegated, and that under the statute the certificate of the engineer must be given. On both these points Mr. Newcombe, in the end, just as the matter was being closed up, decided that the Auditor General was absolutely right, but yet the Treasury Board overruled the Auditor General, with the result that there was paid out $96,000 more than the engineer would certify for. But that is not all. The Minister of Finance says that the Audit Act is perfect, and because we imply that it is not perfect, he says he will vote against the amendment. Let me call the attention of the committee to the fact that three days before the House closed last year the Minister of Finance was the instrument by which, after giving that $96,000 to Corry & Laverdure, more than they were entitled—if I were not in parliament I would properly describe it, but when I get to the hustings in Ontario I shall call it a clear steal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, you can shout if you like. I say that notwithstanding the opinion of the Justice Department on the two points referred to, Corry & Laverdure got $96,000 more than they were entitled to, and at the close of last session, in apparently innocent and harmless words, the Minister of Finance told us that this firm was entitled to $28,901 more by way of interest, because of the delay in the payment of the principal amount. He did not suggest to the House that there was a dispute over this matter, nor that the chief engineer, whose judgment was to be taken on the contract, was unable to certify that one dollar of this money had been earned. Take the Faran's Point canal contract. This is another case which I suppose the Minister of Finance, if not the First Minister, will be prepared to sustain as a just and equitable overruling of the Auditor General by the Treasury Board. They made the Farren's Point canal contract one of the most cast-iron contracts that could be made, and naturally one would think that the government should be applauded for framing such a contract. But there is a wheel within a wheel. They made that cast-iron contract, because none but friends of the government could tender under it. There were to be no extras; the contractors did everything on their own risk, and independent contractors could not apply, but a favourite of the government puts in his oar and says: I will take the contract, and I will engineer the extras afterwards. Under the contract the government could stop the work whenever they liked; the government need not let the contractor work until they liked, but this mattered not to the contractor who was a friend of the government. That is the end of the hard and fast contract business so far as the country is concerned, but after that comes the hard and fast run by the contractor as to how much he shall make out of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Hon. gentlemen may say 'oh,' but they may talk until they are blue in the face, and they cannot convince the electors that there was not something wrong about this. Under the contract the contractor was not allowed to put in a claim for extras, but he did put in a claim for extras for steam shovels amounting to $5,000 or $6,000. And what happened? The government engineer and the government officials joined one and all in saying that that extra must be paid. To sum up, the result was that the government actually paid more for these steam shovels, which stood idle, than they would have paid if the steam shovels had been fully equipped and at work from day to day. And yet the employees of the government, the high officials of the government, the engineer of the government, the resident engineers of the government, vied with each other in saying that it was all right. Why? You ask me why; I don't know, you will have to find out. Another illustration. There was in all a claim for $70,000. It was said that the department did not know whether the foundation would be of wood, or stone or of cement, but they presumed it would be of cement. The contractor bought 2,000 barrels of cement. He did not use it. A wooden foundation was put in, and he was allowed profit on that. What else did the government allow him, for no reason that I can find out, but I suspect for some good and cogent reason, if you could get at the bottom of it. They allowed him on 2,000 barrels of cement $1 a barrel for the profit that he would have made if he had used it. That only made $2,000 of prospective profits, although the contract said there were to be no prospective profits. Then they allowed him $1.25 a barrel for the loss upon the cement, although it is certified in the engineer's report that he sold it to a neighbouring contractor for the price he paid for it. $2.25 a barrel extra was allowed on these 2,000 barrels of cement. That is not all. He was allowed for delay of the steam shovel; he was allowed for putting down tracts, for piers, and for unwatering. Let me sum all this up by saying that $70,000 was paid to this contractor for items just such as I have referred to. I think I shall not do any more than my duty if I bring all the details of this matter before this House before we go home. We are in a hurry to go home; we are in a hurry to have an election; we are in a hurry to beat these men, as I believe we shall beat them when we have an election; but I believe it is my duty to stay here and fight out this matter on these lines, if it should take all summer.

Let me refer to the question of responsible government raised by the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister rushes in, as some people do, where it is dangerous to rush in—you know the adage; and I have noticed that he is always ready to rush in on a constitutional question or a question of law. I do not dispute the great ability of the Finance Minister on matters which appertain to his own department; but I always do feel amused when he begins to deal with constitutional questions and questions of law. However, it does not do us as much harm as it does himself. Though he is concerned about the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition, he only refers to one feature of that proposal. With all the varied knowledge that the Minister of Finance possesses by reason of his close association with this question, he can only pick out one point raised by the hon. leader of the opposition to suggest that there is any difficulty in the way. Let me assure the hon. gentleman that if any question involving an infringement of constitutional rights, or any diminution of the powers and responsibilities of responsibile government, were involved, the hon. gentleman might be assured, from the history of the past, that no men would be more alive or more astute in opposing the proposed change than the members of the opposition in this House. There is no such question involved. The leader of the opposition proposes that there shall be a safeguard for the people's money; in other words, that you shall not get the responsibility fixed only after the money has gone into the pocket of the contractor, and from the pocket of the contractor part of it has gone God knows where. What the aim of the leader of the opposition is, is this, that in a case of sufficient magnitude, and involving a question of very grave doubt as to the right of the department to take the position which they are taking, the Auditor General may apply to the Exchequer Court, not for a decision of the Exchequer Court controlling the exercise of power by the administration, but merely that if it appears to the court to be a case of sufficient importance and gravity, and where a sufficient prima facie case is made out, they shall stay the payment of the people's money to the contractor until the House assembles and has an opportunity to pronounce upon it. It may be, and probably will be, that the administration will still take the bit in their mouths, and put the matter through by the force of numbers; and that seems to be the idea of the Minister of Finance whenever he talks on this question. He thinks it a question of numbers; I think it a question of right. The leader of the opposition has proposed that in such cases there shall be that safeguard for the people's money—that the Auditor General shall not be compelled to pay it out until the matter has been investigated by the Exchequer Court and reported to the next session of parliament—but with a proviso. The leader of the opposition foresees that there might be instances in which a hardship might result; and therefore he provides that in cases of urgency, the will of the administration shall in the meantime prevail and whatever money is necessary to have paid out in the interest of the service shall be paid, even though in the end it might result in an unjustifiable loss to the country. The hon. Minister of Finance therefore need not be at all anxious about the question of responsible government. Parliament will retain control, and parliament will have something tangible to deal with, instead of being met by the difficulty that we have been met with in the past, of having it said when this matter comes forward that it is almost an idle question to deal with, because it has already been disposed of. Let me point out another evidence of the far-seeing wisdom of the Conservative party as contrasted with the somewhat limited vision of the Liberal party, by reading a few lines of what Sir Charles Tupper said on this very point in 1878, when this Act was introduced. He said:

> The difficulty that appears to present itself to my mind is this. You are professing to give the public an independent parliamentary officer, but who is to see, before the payment of the public money, that under the law it is entitled to be paid. If you leave the government power to override his decision and pay the money, what then is gained by the Bill?

Experience has shown that every word of that is written in wisdom, and it is absolutely necessary in the interest of the public that there should be, not a control of the administration by the Auditor, but control of both by parliament—and as I pointed out, when I spoke on this subject before, I do not advocate anything that would infringe in the slightest degree on the doctrine or the efficient working of our parliamentary system. What is proposed is that there shall be an effective check on the administration, and that when an important case arises, the matter shall be stayed until the attention of parliament has been called to it, and it has been dealt with by parliament. In that way we shall have an effective control, instead of an academic discussion of the matter after the money has been paid out. I was referring to the Minister of Finance in the early part of my remarks, and I want to point out the view taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1878. His view was that the Minister of Finance least of all others should have control. This is what he stated:

> Although the Department of Finance was in no respect a spending department, being intended as a sort of check on the others, still the Minister of Finance for the time be-

ing must necessarily be in harmony with the other members of the government.

That is just where the difficulty is. If you leave this matter entirely to the uncontrolled decision of the Treasury Board, without compelling them to give reasons for their decisions, you will find the ministers necessarily standing in with each other, and you will find that the Minister of Finance, instead of being a check on the others, standing in with them, so that you will have the case tried by the very parties who are on trial. The main object of the Audit Act, as explained in 1878, was to inspire the public with confidence in the public accounts. If that inspiration was necessary in 1878, it is doubly necessary to-day. When we find that attacks are being made upon almost every public official, not only every public official, but every cabinet minister who stands for the public as opposed to the government—when we find the government prepared to get rid of all these men who stand in their way, we want something to inspire the public with confidence again. Let me read one more quotation from the debate in 1878, showing what was required, and then ask the government if they think this has been verified by time. In 1878, when the Act was introduced, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said :

> What the House has got to consider is a matter of extreme importance in the interests of the public. It is necessary that we should have a perfect audit of the public accounts and that we should have our public accounts as much as possible, not only correct but above suspicion

That is what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is aiming at in bringing this matter before the House. Public attention has been called to it in a very significant way. The Auditor General has at present a very precarious tenure of office. That he has the universal confidence of all classes is undoubted and that the circumstances call for an assertion of his independence and freedom of action is equally undoubted. Let me point to this one circumstance. I would like to know from the right hon. the First Minister as well as the Minister of Finance, who are so fond of talking about the principles of responsible government, how it comes that within the last few days they have been guilty of a most conspicuous disregard of those principles ? The Auditor General is a servant of both Houses of parliament and cannot be removed except on the joint address of both Houses. How comes it that when this servant of parliament is forced by stress of circumstances, by the fact that the administration has made his position intolerable, by the fact that he finds it impossible to act longer unless he is prepared to be mixed up in questions of doubtful honesty—how comes it that when this servant of parliament sent his resignation to the government and gave his reason for resigning, the government so far ignored the principles of responsible government that they simply filed that away in their vaults instead of transmitting it to the House at the earliest possible opportunity, and left the House to get the information from the public press ? Do the government realize that down to the moment when the leader of the opposition demanded on behalf of the people that that letter from the Auditor General should be laid upon the table, we had not a syllable from the government on the matter ? Do they realize that the Auditor General is a servant of this House, but cannot communicate directly with the House ? Do they realize that his only way to communicate with this House is through the administration, and that it is the duty of the administration, the moment they get a communication from the Auditor General, to put the House in possession of it ? Do the government understand that until the 1st of July had passed—the date fixed for resignation—they had made no announcement whatever to this House concerning the request of the Auditor General ? Yet those gentlemen talk about responsible government. Why, if they are allowed to go on at the same rate violating constitutional principles, as they have been doing in the last few years, it will not be five years before the last vestige of responsible government will have disappeared.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY. If there was anything wanting in the complete indifference with which the government treats this question to challenge the admiration of people outside who may admire that sort of thing, we have that supplied to-day. We have had a few brief remarks from the Minister of Finance, occupying but a very few minutes, and with these the right hon. leader of the government seems to be quite content. But despite the apparent indifference of the government, both sides view this question with considerable concern. Both sides realize its gravity. While both sides recognize that under our system the most complete freedom must be given to the government to administer the affairs of the country, while we all recognize that the King's government must go on, yet no one doubts that it must be subject to certain checks, and I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister if he is prepared to say that parliament has not the right to provide its own checks. We have been told by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice time and again that the duties of the Auditor General are merely those of an accountant and a calculator.

He was to add up figures ; he was to see if there were vouchers for payments ; he was to see that there was a parliamentary ap-

propriation ;—but anything going beyond that was an infringement of the rights of the ministry, and therefore he must be checked. We are told to-day by the Minister of Finance that there is no need for change, as there is no change in the conditions. The hon. gentleman knew, when he spoke those words, that the Auditor General's Report teems with correspondance with men who, through neglect or for some other reason have not given a proper account, yet have been given treasury warrants in spite of the protest of the Auditor General. What does that mean ? It means a growing disregard on the part of the present government of every wholesome rule designed to provide proper checks upon the public expenditure. But, while the hon. gentleman says that there are no new conditions, he is himself furnishing new conditions. Only last year he sought to take away the checks that already exist. He showed himself to be in accord with that drift of opinion which favours leaving the ministry entirely unchecked. He introduced a Bill to limit the already limited powers of the Auditor General. It is true that he was driven by the force of public opinion to withdraw that Bill. He backed down not because of any desire to have a better public service, but because he dared not face the electorate bearing the responsibility of having pressed such a measure through parliament. Still, there is a growing tendency in certain quarters to narrow the powers of the Auditor General. I defy the Minister of Finance to rise in his place and declare that it is not the policy of the government to-day to restrict the Auditor General's powers, to narrow the scope of his duties and to prevent him from enforcing the checks which parliament, when he was appointed, designed that he should enforce. One would have expected the Minister of Finance, when speaking on behalf of the government and dealing with the suggestions made by the leader of the opposition, to suggest that those changes would narrow the sphere of ministerial responsibility. But the hon. gentleman made no pretense of that kind. He simply waved the matter aside, declaring that no wrong existed and no remedy was needed. Well, perhaps I may be a little wrong in saying that he raised no objection. My attention is now directed to the fact that the hon. gentleman would not allow the intervention of a judge, would not even allow one of the judges of our courts to pass a judgment which would merely have the effect of a stay of proceedings ;—even such an interference with the ministers could not be thought of. It will be a surprise even to laymen in this House that the government is so jealous, not of its proper powers but of the slightest restraint, of anything that will prevent them from having a free hand to do just as they like. Every one in Canada who has had even a slight experience of public life knows the pressure often brought upon parties to force governments into position, that, I would hope their better judgments would rebel against. One would think that the government would seek to be safeguarded against such an influence, would be glad of better checks by the Auditor General in order that they might escape the pressure driving them in a direction which they know to be wrong.

Now, let me take the case the Minister of Finance spoke of—the Davis contract. I do not intend to discuss the Davis contract but to point out that we had a little new light on this subject from the Minister of Finance. He declared that he was not going to discuss the question whether that contract was prudent or imprudent. He told us that the Auditor General had done his best against payment under the contract. He said the government had made inquiry and had taken advice, and found that money was due. The Auditor General declared that the money was not due, because the service had not been performed. The only negotiations which took place were those under a provision, which had been inserted in the original contract in 1896, that the government might resume the whole work, taking it out of the hands of the contractor, if they thought proper to do so. Means were found under this to compel Mr. Davis to make a new contrat. This was not a vague suggestion, it was a clear declaration in plain English that they had changed the contract, that they had used a clause they had not put into the contract to coerce the contracts, right or wrong, to agree to new conditions. Suppose the Auditor General had been silent. Suppose he had merely made his protest and submitted his report to the House. Suppose he had not been persistent. What would have been the position ? Why, we should now be paying $22,000 or $23,000 a year for eighty-four years more than we are now paying. Has Mr. Davis been unfairly dealt with ? Was a contract made that should not have been made ? It is perfectly plain that the government found themselves in such a position that they were obliged to take what, I contend under other conditions, would have been a very unfair course.

I shall not detain the House long, but I merely wish for a few moments to refer to the Auditor General and his position. It is a regrettable thing that a gentleman of Mr. McDougall's position and standing, a man entirely in sympathy with the government of the day, an officer appointed by the Liberal party and one who has given long and valued service under three governments—appointed under the Mackenzie government, served for eighteen years under the Conservative government, and for the last seven years under the Liberal government (a government of the 'new Liberals')—I say it is a regrettable thing that such a man has now to choose between public duty and being the servant of the ministry of the day. It is an alarming state of affairs. It would have been an easy matter

for Mr. McDougall to plead what he might have pleaded under ordinary conditions—his age. Finding his position irksome, finding that he had to play a false or double part or resign, had he been a less courageous or honourable man he might have pursued the easy course, pleaded his age and asked for superannuation and gone out quietly. He has thought fit to take a different course. He has intimated that he is prepared to resign—in fact he has resigned so far as his own act is concerned—and he makes no condition as to his superannuation. But his desire is to remain and serve the people, if he can be put in a position where he can serve them effectively. If that power is not given, then he chooses to walk out like an honourable man. This disregard of the Auditor General on the part of the government is a challenge to the people. I do not know of a bolder challenge given to the people than that which has been given by compelling a man occupying so responsible a position to retire. The position of the Auditor General is a most responsible one, there is none more so in connection with our government, except it be that of the Prime Minister himself. Now, I will place on 'Hansard' Mr. McDougall's reasons for resigning. He made those reasons perfectly plain some time ago. The government are in no sense taken by surprise, for they knew all about it. This is what Mr. McDougall has to say in transmitting his resignation to the government a short time ago.

Auditor General's Office, Canada,
Ottawa, 21st June, 1904.

Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith a communication, addressed to the Governor General in Council, applying for superannuation. I have to request that you will submit this application to His Excellency in Council at your earliest convenience, under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, section 4, subsection 2, as amended by 54-55 Victoria, chapter 16.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance.

Now, those are the reasons contained in the Auditor General's resignation. I am sure they are such as will pay high tribute to the character of that gentleman, a gentleman who has served the country so many years, and who is now finding himself driven out of his position as the safeguard standing between a ministry and the people of this country in our enormous expenditure. He realizes, as every man in Canada must realize, that conditions have enormously changed. We have an immense expenditure, we have new complications, we have new services, and if we do not create corresponding safeguards, we should find ourselves in a position that will be a menace to the interests of the people of this country. No man can say that we are not living in new conditions. We are living in a period in the history of Canada when conditions are rapidly changing. Let us act according to the conditions under which we are living. Let us not look for precedents, precedents are not necessary. Let us learn from the teaching of experience; to use a happy phrase of the First Minister, let us learn from wisdom and profit by it. Now, here is what Mr. McDougall has to say in his communication dated June 21, 1904:

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council:

I have the honour to request the government to superannuate me, to take effect from the 1st of July next. This may be done by superannuating any time during this month. The superannuation, if the time is not named, counts from the 1st of the following month. This is in pursuance of the following sentences in the preliminary part of my report.

This I referred to a moment ago. It was published in the Auditor General's Report and was in the hands of the ministry for some months. This is what he said on that occasion, and he repeats it now, as a reason for his resignation:

The magnitude and number of the transactions going through this office are now so increased that I feel parliament should seriously consider also the amendment of the Audit Act along the other lines suggested in a former report, to enable this office to cope with the expansion of the business of the country. I feel so strongly on this point that if parliament does not see its way to bring the matter up this session, I shall at the end of the session ask to be superannuated.

He further goes on:

The session is not ended, but from the remarks of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice on Mr. Lennox's motion for a committee, it is plain that the Audit Act will not be amended this session, and therefore there is no purpose in delaying my superannuation.

My age is 65 years past, I having been born on the 6th of November, 1838. I entered the service on the 1st of August, 1878, and under ordinary circumstances would count for 52 per cent of my salary of $4,000, or for $2,080. It, however, appears to me that I am entitled to nine years additional service to be added to my service in this calculation, to make it thirty-five, the maximum, which would make my allowance $2,800. This claim of additional service I make under chapter 18, of 49 Victoria, section 4.

This is the Act to which he refers:

The Governor in Council, may in the case of any person who entered the civil service after the age of 30 years, as being possessed of some peculiar professional or other qualifications or attainments required for the office for which he was appointed, and not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, add to the actual number of years service of such person, such further number of years not exceeding ten, as is considered equitable, for reasons stated in the Order in Council made in the case; and such additional number of

years shall be taken as part of the term of service on which the superannuation allowance of such person shall be computed ; and the Order in Council in any such case shall be laid before parliament at its then current or next ensuing session.

I was gold medallist in mathematics in the University of Toronto in 1859 with special presentation report to convocation which, if any one has sufficient interest in it, may be found in the newspapers of the time. I was a member of the Dominion parliament for several years before appointment.

Please make the superannuation early, whether you can see your way to adding the additional time or not.

Respectfully submitted,
J. L. McDOUGALL,
Auditor General.

Mr. McDougall makes it perfectly plain that he is making superannuation the last consideration. His first consideration is that he be provided with such additional means as are necessary under the changed conditions, many of which the ministry have furnished by their own arbitrary action. He asks that these changes be made, and if they are not made he plainly intimates that only one course is left open to him, namely, to retire. Now, I am sorry to see in some very respectable quarters, in some sections of the press supporting the government of the day, some comments which I think are very unfair. I am sorry to see that they have taken their cue from the Minister of Finance, and they speak of the Auditor General as a gentleman to be looked upon with great suspicion, that he is a meddlesome person, that he would be dishonest himself if he had an opportunity. Let me read from a very respectable newspaper supporting the hon. gentlemen opposite some comments upon the conduct of the Auditor General since his resignation became public, and I will leave it to the hon. gentlemen opposite to judge whether this is an honest criticism, whether it is a criticism that they share in. If they do share in it, I am sure nobody will be disposed to dispute their sole possession of it. This is only one of the many extracts that I might quote from different newspapers. The Sarnia 'Observer,' a Liberal newspaper, had this to say in its issue of June 28, 1904. Its heading 'The watchdog is willing,' is very significant in view of the article which follows :

The 'watch dog of the treasury,' as the Auditor General is sometimes designated, shows in his application for superannuation that he is as ready to raid the treasury when he sees a chance as any one of those whom he has been taxing in his annual reports with making demands that were not justified by the services performed. He states in his application that he will accept superannuation if the government will add ten years to the length of his service. This is to be done so that he may receive a larger superannuation allowance than his real services entitle him to. He is asking the government to commit an illegal act so that he may draw out of the treasury for the balance of his life more money than is fairly and lawfully coming to him—the very thing that the Auditor General is specially charged to guard against. It would be a huge joke on the Auditor General if the government acceded to his request and his successor vetoed the payment of the extra pension money on the ground that it had not been earned, and payment of it would be illegal.

This comment is a very fair specimen of comments that are appearing in Liberal journals supporting this government, a Liberal government that is driving an officer of parliament from his position. I am told that there are some hon. gentlemen sitting in this House who are looking forward to filling the position of Auditor General. I would like to ask what is the position of any man, inside or outside of this House, who may accept that position following upon the course now contemplated by the government of absolutely refusing to do anything. The only disposition which the government has shown is to tie the hands of the chief officer of parliament and not to give him such facilities as he is entitled to and as the people of this country will demand should be afforded to him. The man who next fills that position will have a rule of conduct laid down in advance that he is to be the pliant creature of the government and if he is not such a creature he will not get the appointment. That is written in black and white, and if he does not obey that rule he will know what is to follow ; he is to be attacked and blackguarded by the Liberal journals of this country, to be told that because he is seeking what a man may seek under an Act of parliament, what men are obtaining every day although they have been servants in less important capacities than the Auditor General, that he is seeking to obtain illegally, money that does belong to him. I do not know whether it has been the rule of the government to starve a chief officer. This man, Mr. McDougall, received some advance in his salary some 16 years ago. There is no position in the service of the government, except that of the Prime Minister, in which a public servant earns so great a salary by services performed, as that of Auditor General. Here is a man receiving a salary which might ordinarily be called a fair salary, but which, by comparison with the salaries paid for other services, is a beggarly salary. Great responsibilities are attached to the position, and where there are great responsibilities you must get good men to fill the positions and must pay salaries commensurate with these responsibilities. If you do not you cannot expect to get the men. If hon. gentlemen lay down the rule that they are going to starve servants they will get men to work as cheaply or more cheaply, but they will be men who will be willing to comply with the rules which the government lay down rather than the rules that should be laid down for the guidance of an Auditor Gen-

eral. I know of no case since Mr. McDougall has been appointed where a man has been treated in this way, speaking not in a personal but in a broad official sense. This world can, of course, get along without any man, but we cannot get along without healthy principles for the guidance of men in all walks of life. It is not a matter of great personal concern whether the Auditor General goes out of office, but I repeat again, it is a serious question in a broad sense, and one which cannot be put aside with one wave of the hand, in what—I was going to call the undignified—manner adopted this afternoon by the Minister of Finance. I still do not despair that the government will not allow this session to go by without taking steps to put this matter right. I do not know the mind of the Auditor General, but he is a man who has those correct and stern ideas of public duty which would induce him to risk everything at his time of life, at a time when a man may not easily obtain other employment. He has, as I say, put everything aside in the interests of public duty. I am still unwilling to believe that the government will allow his resignation to take place, and I trust that while they may vote down this resolution they will deal with this matter during the present session.

Mr. C. B. HEYD. As an admirer of the Auditor General and as one who has a great deal of sympathy and personal friendship for him, I was, in common with a great many people in Canada, shocked at the statements that were made by him in connection with what is known as the Davis contract, which has given rise, I presume, to most of the discussion which has taken place in connection with his desire for a change in his status. I have read carefully the Auditor General's statement in connection with that matter. I did so with considerable interest after seeing in the 'Evening Journal,' in the Toronto 'News' and in 'Saturday Night' statements of which this is a fair sample :

> Credit the Auditor General with a half million saved. The way he butted in. How government contracts sometimes go, especially just before general elections. The story of the light and power agreement for Cornwall canal. Half a million dollars or more in one contract saved to the public treasury by the interference of the Dominion Auditor General. A bad contract made infinitely worse by a Liberal government ; partially redeeming action taken later by the Laurier administration, but the worse feature remaining.

And so on. Of course as a member of parliament and one interested in the good name of the government I was exceedingly anxious to see whether the statements contained in that paper were true and I therefore read with considerable care the various documents presented by the Auditor General, and I have come to the conclusion, after a careful reading of his letters and the statements that he has made, and the answers made by the government, that the Auditor General was wrong in his dates, wrong in his facts, wrong in his inferences, wrong in his conclusions. It appeared to me that if the Auditor General had been animated by a feeling of hostility to the past government and to the present government he could not possibly have adopted a course more calculated to give vent to such a feeling. What was there in the contract of 1896 to justify the construction placed upon it by the Auditor General ? The Auditor General unfortunately put himself in the position, not of an auditor, but of a critic, an adverse critic of the government, animated with the desire to do them all the harm he possibly could. After having shown the tremendous loss that the country was about to sustain in a letter addressed to the Treasury Board he says :

> Then I call your attention to the rather singular fact that there were two arrangements in connection with this matter. The first was made eleven days before the election of June 23rd, 1896, and the other twenty-nine days before that of November 5, 1900.

The inference naturally left upon the mind of a person not familiar with all the circumstances was that the late government and the present government had entered into a contract which was exceedingly valuable for the contractor in consequence of a liberal political subscription on his part. Is there anything to justify that ? I regard that statement made by the Auditor General as an insult to the Minister of Railways in 1896 and equally insulting to the members of the government of the present day. What was there in the contract of 1896 to justify the statement that it was inspired and completed eleven days before the election of 1896 whereby the Conservative party would get a liberal political subscription ? Is there anything in the contract to justify the statement ? Are the dates of the Auditor General correct ? He is wrong in both instances. He says here eleven days before the election, and yet to-day the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said that the Order in Council was signed on February 18, or four months before the election took place, and the contract itself was signed on the 25th, or two days after the time the Auditor General says.

In a matter of such moment dates are of much importance. If this contract were finished up in the interests of the contractor, eleven days before the elections, there might be an inference that there was something crooked in it ; but all the Auditor General's statements in connection with that are wrong. The contract was not made eleven days before, but two days after the elections, and the Order in Council was passed four months before. Therefore, the imputation that the Auditor General throws upon the late government that in making this contract they were influenced in order

to get an election subscription from the contractor, is false upon its face. It appears to me that the Auditor General suppresses a significant fact in connection with the late contract. In the light we now have, we may believe that the contract entered into in 1896 was probably improvident, but we have no right to assume that it was corrupt, because there is nothing to indicate a corrupt intention. The government were to pay for a certain number of horse-power at a certain rate, and also for a certain number of lights to be determined on thereafter, at so much per light. It may be that with the knowledge we had of electricity in these days, it was impossible for the government to tell whether the price was too dear or not, but anyhow they put in a clause, that by giving twelve months' notice they could take over this work from the contractor, and that very clause should prevent it from being regarded as a corrupt transaction. If in 1896 they were paying too much for horse-power or light, any subsequent parliament, by giving twelve month's notice, could take the matter out of the hands of the contractor, and under such circumstances I should think a contractor would not be willing to put up a very large sum in order to obtain a contract. The element of corruption is removed by this very clause. But, why did the Auditor General go on to say that the second contract was made twenty-nine days before the election, thus conveying the impression that the contractor was this time giving a liberal contribution to the funds of the Liberal party; that the Conservative party not then being in a position to advance his interests he flopped over and made it of interest to the present government to increase by 63 years the term of his contract, and to require a larger horse-power and a greater number of lights than were necessary. The contract itself does justify any such statement. We are told by no less a person than the lawyer of the Auditor General, a lawyer selected by himself, that that was not true; that the present government made no new contract, and that it was their duty to fix the number of lights and the amount of horse-power required according to the contract of 1896. That is all the present government has done. What was there in that transaction to justify the Auditor General pointing out significantly that this contract was entered into twenty-nine days before the election of 1900? What was there to justify him in conveying the impression that there was a corrupt intent? What was there to justify him in conveying the impression to the Liberal electors that the Conservative government was corrupt in 1896, and to the Conservative electors that the Liberal government was corrupt in 1900? The contract itself on its face shows that the statement of the Auditor General is incorrect, because he was wrong in his dates. It was not made before the election, but after the election, and the Order in Council went out four months before. If the present government did not make a new contract; if they did not increase the advantages to the contractor; if they simply carried out the terms of the contract of 1896, what justification have these newspapers for the statement that both governments are corrupt, and that the Auditor General butted in and saved $500,000 to the people of Canada? I believe it is the intention of the Auditor General to be honest and to look after the interest and welfare of the country, but like a great many others he leans over too much to one side. There have been a number of Liberal judges appointed in Ontario during the last few years, but instead of the Liberals being able to get any advantage from them, they lean over to the Conservative side, and in this particular instance the Auditor General being a well known Liberal, I presume he thought it his duty to be particularly careful of his treatment of the Liberal government, lest he might be accused of partiality, and so he has leaned over, and wherever there was an opportunity of conveying the impression that there was corruptness or crookedness, the Auditor General has given special significance to these things, and evidently concealed all the redeeming features in the contract. If the late government made a mistake, and if we are paying too high a price under this contract then on twelve months' notice the work can be taken out of the hands of the contractor at its actual value plus five per cent. Under such circumstances there is no necessity for scare headings being used in the newspapers, and it is unjust for them to attribute a corrupt intent to the government. I always had the opinion in days gone by, that contractors for the Conservative government managed things a good deal slicker than is apparently the case here. If there were a clause in every contract allowing the government to take over the work on twelve months' notice, I should think there would be no danger of anybody getting a rake off from contractors. In my opinion the powers given to the Auditor General at the present time are wide enough. I do not profess to be able to bring the knowledge of expert accountants to bear upon the subject, but I have here the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth, a lawyer of great judgment who was asked by the Auditor General to give his opinion, and Mr. Aylesworth gives it, not as a politician, but as one of the most eminent counsels in Canada, and he says:

> I cannot find from examining and considering the Audit Act any indication that parliament intended your office to be superior to, or to exercise any supervision over, the various departments of the government, in so far as questioning the validity of their contracts is concerned, but there appears clear provision

in the statute for bringing all such questions to the notice of parliament itself.

The legislation seems to afford a very complete scheme by which your department may be an efficient check upon expenditure, and by which parliament may be at once informed if anything unusual or irregular takes place. You have the power (and no doubt the duty) under section 32 (c) of the Audit Act, to refuse your certificate if at any time convinced that a cheque is applied for where 'the money is not justly due.' You are by section 33 expressly precluded from authorizing any payment unless upon due voucher that the work has been performed or materials supplied. By section 10 of 51 Victoria, chapter 7 (1888), you are, in reporting to the House, to call attention to every case in which cheques have been issued without your certificate, or in which a payment was 'in any way irregular.' Your duty accordingly when not satisfied that money claimed is justly due is to refuse to certify, and thereupon the Treasury Board becomes 'the judge of the sufficiency of your protection.'

But the statute has carefully provided that in all such cases the matter must come before parliament upon full report, making it apparently, by section 49 of the Audit Act, your personal duty to present such report if the Minister of Finance does not do so within the time prescribed by the statute.

Responsibility is by this means removed from you and made to rest upon the proper shoulders. The Treasury Board is responsible to parliament, and if parliament considers that in this matter or in any other matter upon which you may take a similar course an improvident or improper contract has been entered into, the minister who is responsible, or the government, will be held to account.

He secured the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth, one of the most eminent lawyers in this country, who gave his opinion that the powers that the Auditor General ought to have are amply provided for in the present law. I am willing, on the present occasion, to take Mr. Aylesworth as my guide, as I have not the functions or the legal knowledge necessary for me to express an opinion. But I say that the Auditor General apparently was wrong in his dates, wrong in his facts, wrong in his conclusions and wrong in his deductions. He appears to have charged the late government, and the present government impliedly, with a corrupt intent, contrary to the very documents themselves; and, that being so, I am quite content to abide by the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth and the present government, that the Auditor General has at present quite enough power to enable him to efficiently discharge his duties as auditor.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, it is rather refreshing to hear the specious arguments to which the hon. gentleman has just treated the House. He starts out by saying that the Auditor General is wrong in his dates, wrong in his facts, wrong in his interpretation, wrong in his conclusions and wrong in his deductions—according to the high authority of the member for Brant (Mr. Heyd), the one man who has been at the business for a quarter of a century, endeavouring by every means in his power to interpret the law according to his best judgment, and, when he found that his interpretation of the law did not meet with the approval of others, submitting it to the ablest lawyer he could find in the country, and following his advice as far as he believed it to be correct. If there was no other evidence to show that the Auditor General was an honest and conscientious man, it seems to me that very fact is sufficient. The hon. member went on to say that, notwithstanding the fact that the Auditor General had been appointed by the present government, he was found in opposition to them at almost every turn when money was being paid out. When the previous government was in power and the same Auditor General disagreed with them with regard to the payment of public money, his friends proclaimed that as an evidence of his fairness. The hon. gentleman is doing what he nearly always does; he makes his statement and then runs out, as if he were doing something sharp. It seems to me that a man who makes an argument and cannot listen to the reply is either wanting in moral courage or in courtesy. When the same Auditor General opposed the late government with reference to the payment of money the hon. gentleman's friends held that to be an evidence of his ability and fairness, and an evidence that the government of that day was doing something improper; but when the same man comes into contact with his friends and endeavours to guard the public treasury in the same way as he did in the time of their predecessors, he is declared to be a man wanting in judgment, wrong in his facts, wrong in his interpretation, wrong in his conclusions and wrong in his deductions; and, therefore, he can only do it for a malicious purpose against the very party who put him in office. Is that human nature? Is that likely? Will the great mass of the people believe that? I do not think they will. If there was one thing needed to justify the conclusion that the Auditor General is an honest and conscientious man, it is the very thing we are discussing to-day. This, I say, is complimentary to his fairness, to his impartiality, to his honesty of purpose. He is doing faithfully, no matter which party is in power, what he believes he was put there to do; that is, to guard the public treasury, and to see that no money is paid out unless it is authorized by parliament, and to see that payments are made in accordance with the provisions made by parliament. The hon. member defends the contract. After reading it and considering it, he comes to the conclusion that the contract for lighting the Cornwall canal and supplying power is a good one, that there is nothing wrong with it, that it is defensible, and he is willing to defend it; and he gives,

not only the present government, but the late government, a certificate of purity and competency in making this contract. What did the Minister of Finance say before dinner? He said: After going over the contract, we agreed with the Auditor General that it ought to be revised and amended, and we submitted a draft to the Auditor General, so as to be satisfied that it would meet with his approval before we entered into it; it met with his approval, and we withdrew the Order in Council which we had previously passed. Was that not an admission that it was wrong before? If it was not wrong, was there any necessity to change it? Is not that the strongest argument that the Auditor General was right? Some very severe strictures were passed on the Auditor General, because, after the government withdrew the Order in Council and endeavoured to have it go into oblivion, he allowed it to see the light. The hon. member for Brant went on to say that the Auditor General is like some of the judges, too straight—so straight that he leans over the other way. That is a very fine compliment to the judges of the country. Coming from the source it does, it will not perhaps be regarded as of much account. To say that the judges of the country are not impartial, but that they show partiality by leaning too much the other way, is the stricture of one of the parties responsible for their appointment; and then he turns around and compares the Auditor General with them, saying that he has a similar nature, that he leans over too far the other way. I assume that the hon. gentleman must have meant that he leans towards the Conservative party. The hon. member says the Auditor General is trying to provide arguments to the Conservative party to enable them to put the government out of power. In that he is unfair. What is the resolution before us? It is a simple one, and one, in my judgment, justified by the facts which have been brought out from year to year. It is as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act should be so extended as to confer on the Auditor General powers ample in every respect to protect the public interest and to safeguard the public treasury.

That is all it is. If the law to-day does not enable the Auditor General to protect the public interest and safeguard the public treasury, as it was intended by its framers it should do, then we ought to supply what is necessary to make it effective. Every year we have had our attention drawn by the Auditor General to the fact that the Act does not provide sufficiently ample powers. As an evidence that his representations have a solid basis, I can point to the fact that several times the Act has been amended to meet his suggestions. That surely proves that he was right in the representations he made. Well, since the last extension of the Act, he has again and again drawn our attention to the fact that other amendments are necessary. Of course as time goes on we find defects in laws which were not anticipated when they were passed. The defects in the Audit Act, the Auditor General has pointed out to parliament, so that parliament may act. We are asked to-day why the Conservative party do not bring in any amendment. What would be the use? How many Bills have the Conservative party brought into this House, and how many days have they not spent in trying to get the House to pass these Bills, but all to no avail? Everybody knows that the very fact that these Bills received the support of the Conservative party was sufficient reason to hon. gentlemen opposite to vote them down. And the same fate would overtake any amendment to the Audit Act which we might propose from this side. The government would not allow any amendment proposed by the opposition to pass, because that would be a reflection on themselves. The Minister of Finance says that the Act gives the Auditor General ample powers in every respect. But if it does, how comes it that three or four years ago the Public Accounts Committee considered this question at great length and decided that the Act was not sufficiently ample? The ex-Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster, was on that committee and also the present Finance Minister, and that committee decided that it was necessary to give additional power to the Auditor General. Why then was that not done? It was not done because the session was short and coming to its close, and there was not time to consider what measure might be advised. At various times since the matter has been brought up in the Public Accounts Committee, but no remedy has been applied, and the Auditor General has gone on from time to time, drawing the attention of the government to the defects in the law. He has refused to pass accounts which, in his judgment, contravened some provision of the law. He has debated the point with the department responsible for the expenditure, and after being overruled has gone to the Treasury Board and debated the point with that board, and again and again has been overruled. We are bound to assume that the Auditor General is a conscientious official, anxious to do his duty faithfully. Again and again his decisions have been overruled, and he has continued to urge that money was paid out improperly. Let me draw attention to a case in point. We provided by a statute that when bridges were built which cost a certain amount, the government would contribute 15 per cent of their cost. The Auditor General deemed it his duty to ascertain whether the statement of cost was a cooked one. The government thought that in so doing he exceeded his duty, but he refused to accept that view and after some time he succeeded in having an in-

vestigation. What was the result ? It was found that the very account to which he objected was so made up as to show that the bridge cost a great deal more than it actually did, and had he passed the demand for payment, very many thousands of dollars would have been paid over to which they were not entitled. There is an evidence that the Auditor General is right in the stand he takes. The government contended that he had no business to inquire into the details ; and had the Auditor General submitted to that contention, the country would have been mulcted a considerable sum. Why should we not make the point clear by amending the Act so as to give him the right which he claims to have ? We are told by the Finance Minister that the Act contains ample powers. If that be the case, how is that year after year the Auditor General has disputes with almost every department over the payment of money, and almost invariably has been overruled and the money paid out ? Take the Davis contract, about which there is so much talk at present. What was the objection of the Auditor General in that matter ? In the first place he drew attention to what he regarded as a very unbusinesslike contract. He pointed to the fact that if he were to authorize the money to be paid, there would be thousands of dollars paid out in return for which the country got no service whatever.

Now, if that be a fair interpretation of the Act, if that might be done under the Act, would it yet be a proper thing to do ? When any one receives money, he receives it for consideration given, and when the country pays money it is supposed to receive something in return. But the fact was disclosed that there was no service rendered for that money. The contractor could not give the electric light because there was no connection with the power station—the power was there but it was not applied. Yet, an account was sent in of $19,000. Suppose that money had been paid out for nothing, would the country approve it ? Would the Finance Minister defend it ? And yet the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) stands up and reads the advice of Mr. Aylesworth that, according to the law, he does not see how the Auditor General can refuse, because the contract made with the Department of Railways and Canals said that the contractor should have so much money at a certain time ;—it failed to provide that a service should be rendered before the government incurred obligations. So, according to Mr. Aylesworth, the Auditor General had no power under the Audit Act to check this payment. Well, do not you think he ought to have that power ? Do not you think it would have been in the interest of the country to amend the Act so as to have given him that power ? I think so. And the country has long since reached the conclusion that the Audit Act should be amended so as to give the Auditor General ample power to protect the treasury. Now, when the Auditor General checks payment of money and the payment is still presisted in, the matter is referred to the Treasury Board. Here is the clause of the statute :

> If the Auditor General has refused to certify that a cheque of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General may issue, on the ground that the money is not justly due, or that it is, in excess of the authority granted by the council, or for any other reason than that there is no parliamentary authority, then upon a report of the case prepared by the Auditor General and the Deputy of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, the Treasury Board shall be the judge of the sufficiency of the Auditor General's objection and may sustain him or order the issue of the cheque in its discretion.

In this case they overruled him and ordered the money to be paid, we think, improperly. The Auditor General fell back upon two objections. He said, in the first place, the law provides, under section 11 of chapter 37 of the Consolidated Statutes, which relates to the Department of Railways and Canals, how a contract shall be made. This section is as follows :

> The minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency.

Now, this was a case of lighting the Cornwall canal. It was clearly not a case of pressing emergency, for the lighting of the canal could go on under the system already in use when this contract was made. So the Auditor General contended that he had the right to refuse to allow the payment of that money unless other conditions were complied with. If the contract was not let by public tender, the deputy or the clerk in the department under whom the work is done or goods supplied, must certify that the work had been done or the goods received and that the values were reasonable. The Auditor General had no such certificate before him and he demanded the certificate. They refused to give it to him. So, the contract was not let by tender, and the work was not certified to as being good value. Therefore, the Auditor General conceived it to be his duty not to allow the public treasury to be raided and the money paid. Was he right or was he wrong ? Mr. Aylesworth said that, according to the Audit Act, the Auditor General could not check the payment of that money, the Treasury Board having overruled him. Why could he not check it ? Because the provisions of the Audit Act were not sufficiently strong. That is why we propose by this resolution that the Act should be amended and strengthened. We ask the government to take the matter up. We ask parliament to express its opinion. For it would be of no use for us to propose such a law ; we

could not carry it through. The Minister of Finance asks why, if there is any defect in the Audit Act the opposition do not introduce a Bill to amend it. I have suggested the reason. It would be only a waste of time. We have not the power to put through such a measure. And, besides, it is the government and not we who are charged with responsibility of directing public affairs. We are here to see to it that any measures which they propose shall be as nearly perfect as we can get the majority to make them. The opposition would willingly support a Bill to strengthen the Auditor General—they would have done it last year, and they are willing to do it at any time. We hold that the Auditor General ought to have as wide powers as are necessary to enable him to effectively protect the public treasury. Alexander Mackenzie said at one time that he was like a soldier in the trenches, sleeping on his arms that he might be ready to protect the treasury against the incursions of those who desired to get that money of the public improperly. It was to provide relief for himself and those who might follow him that he asked parliament to pass an Act authorizing him to appoint an Auditor General. That Auditor General he appointed. He showed his desire to protect the public treasury so far as he thought the necessities of the situation demanded it. But experience has shown us ways in which that Act can be improved. My hon. friend says that the demand of the electors, after a quarter of a century's experience, is that this Act shall be improved. There is not a doubt that that is the feeling of the public. What is true of every other law is true of the Audit Act. Every year we place upon the statute-book, laws, which, in our judgment and to the best of our knowledge and of the experience we have, are sufficient. And yet further experience shows how those laws can be advantageously amended from time to time. Parliament, after careful inquiry exercises its judgment in voting money for public purposes, and then it is left to the Auditor General to see to it that the money is spent according to the intention of parliament. Now the Auditor General, I assume, never refused, from mere wilfulness, to give his certificate for the payment of money. I am sure every one will credit him with honesty. And it is to be supposed that he does not wilfully get into trouble or conflict with any department, or with the Treasury Board, or with the government. But, as an honest man he is bound to fight any or all of them if that is necessary in order to maintain the proper checks upon the expenditure of public money. And he has fought them for years, until he has become sick and tired of that job. And now he says: If you will not amend the Audit Act, if you will not place at my disposal proper provisions and assistance such as I require to safeguard the treasury, then, I want you to accept my resignation.

I, as an honest man, cannot hold the position unless I endeavour to do my duty and if the government makes it impossible for me to do my duty, if they will not put within my reach provisions that will enable me to do my duty, I want at least to show the country that I desire to do right, and when I cannot do it I want to get out—and he has sent in his resignation. I say that the country to-day regards with great suspicion that resignation of the Auditor General. I venture to say that, irrespective of politics, forty-nine out of fifty of the electorate to-day will tell you honestly, if you ask them, that they are desirous of keeping the Auditor General there, of strengthening his hands rather than weakening them. They desire to keep him there because he has shown his desire and his ability to protect the public treasury, he has shown his willingness and his honesty of purpose, he has shown that he is prepared to fight either party, his own party that put him in that position as well as the party that was opposed to him. He has shown honesty and a high sense of duty, and has endeavoured to do his duty. Will the country strengthen his hands, will the government strengthen his hands, or will they prevent him from doing his duty? We know that in many instances the Treasury Board has overruled him, and instead of strengthening his hands have been weakening him, instead of giving him moral support they have been discrediting the man, and his judgment, and his ways, killing the very means that were designed to protect the treasury of the country. Every obstacle it seems to me is being thrown in his way so as to make it impossible for him to do his duty as he conceives it should be done. Does the country want that? In my judgment it does not.

The Auditor General has given fair and ample notice to the government; Unless you amend this Act, unless you support my authority, I want to get out. Are they going to let him get out? If they do, the country will know the reason why. He has told us the reason why. We draw attention to it to-day so that the country may know, that parliament may understand. We do not desire to see the Auditor General get out, we desire him to remain there. But we desire also that the Act should be amended in any needful particular so as to make his powers, in the words of this resolution, ample to protect the public interest and safeguard the public treasury. He has appealed to parliament because the government has refused to support him. Is parliament going to be equal to the occasion? Will the representatievs of the people do their duty? We are endeavouring to do it

on this side of the House. Who are we opposed by ? By the very men who are charged with the responsibility of protecting the public treasury. We are working in the interests of the country, we are opposed by the very men whose duty above everything else in the world is to protect the country and to look after its interests. If this government and parliament refuse, what will be the inevitable result ? What conclusion will the people reach ? They can come to but one conclusion, and that is that the government do not desire to protect the public treasury as they should, that the government do not desire to strengthen the hands of the Auditor General, the employee of parliament, not the employee of the government, but the servant of the country. They do not wish to give him that moral support, that constitutional support which they above all others ought to give him to enable him to do his duty. Then I say if they fail in this matter we will appeal to the great parliament of the nation, we will lay this subject as fully as we can before the electors of the country, and I have no doubt that when they know the whole story, when they know that the Auditor General has been refused support, when they know that he has been antagonized by the present government, when they know that thousands and tens of thousands of dollars, yes I am within the mark in saying hundreds of thousands of dollars of government money, has been improperly paid out, money paid out for which the country never got anything in return—when the people know that, they will be very likely to blame the present government. I think it will take from them thousands of votes. I shall have no objection whatever if it results in putting them out. But I would rather see them do their duty and remain in, than to be kicked out for not doing their duty. I have that much respect for the Prime Minister who leads them. I believe there are some good men on that side of the House and some very bad ones. But they remind me of Sir Oliver Mowat and his friends. A number of them were said to be very good men and a number were said to be bad. He always had one man in his cabinet called the wicked partner who would father all the bad transactions, and Sir Oliver himself was the redeeming feature of the cabinet. But in this case the worst of it is that it is the bad element that seems to predominate all the time, the government leans over that way, the bad men control the elections, and the country does not get the benefit of the good element in the cabinet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we do as well as Sir Oliver Mowat, I do not think Ontario will complain.

Mr. SPROULE. You mean by holding on to power. I can only say that the hon. gentleman and his friends are very apt followers, they seem to be falling into the same line very readily, especially in the work done by the wicked partner. The wicked partner seems to be on top here, and getting much more on top every day. That is why we want to set them right, or else give the country a chance to rectify the wrong. We intend to tell the country as plainly as we can, and if the government refuse to do their duty as they seem inclined to to-day, they will have to suffer the consequences. Now for these reasons I am in favour of this resolution. I think we cannot pass it a day too soon. The Minister of Finance says : Why did'nt you propose this law three years ago ? Why did'nt you propose it two years ago ? Why did'nt you propose it last year ? Is it ever too late to mend ? It is true that in the interests of the country it might well have been proposed three years ago, or two years ago or last year ; but because of our laches in that respect are we to go on in the same line for ever ? When we know that a wrong is being done is it not high time that we amended our ways ? Though it may appear late, even at the eleventh hour a repentant sinner may return. It is because of our desire to do right that we propose this resolution to-day ; and I can only reach the conclusion that it is because of the government's desire to do wrong that they oppose it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat : I understood him to say that as a result of some imperfection in the Audit Act tens of thousands of dollars had been paid out without consideration. Will my hon. friend be good enough to give us some specific cases ?

Mr. SPROULE. I mentioned one with regard to the Sorel bridge. I mentioned one with regard to this contract, where the Auditor General shows that an application was made for over $52,000 and for the most of which there was no return given to the country whatever. It may have been a defect in the contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend ought to be aware of the fact that in neither case was there a dollar paid.

Mr. SPROULE. The government certified the accounts and was willing to pay the money, and it was because of the obstinacy of the Auditor General that the money was not paid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The request made to my hon. friend was that he should sustain his statement that tens of thousands of dollars had been paid out. That is what I wanted.

Mr. SPROULE. What I said was this, that the government had made their fiat, saying that the money must be paid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But it was not paid.

Mr. SPROULE. The Auditor General prevented it being paid. Why was not that money paid on the Sorel bridge ? Was it the government who prevented it ? No, it was the Auditor General. Who prevented the money from beng paid out on the Davis contract ? Was it the government ? The department certified to it as all right, and it was the Auditor General who prevented the payment. Am I not correct ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He had not the power to do it.

Mr. SPROULE. It was saved to the country.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then there is no necessity to amend the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of Corry & Laverdure, I am told that $125,000 was improperly paid out, although the Auditor General did his very best to save that to the country, but he could not do it. Take the Farran's Point canal, another case. Was I within the mark ? I was very much within the mark, I might have trebled the figure which I gave and I would still have been within the mark.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Might I ask my hon. friend a question ? We are now getting down to facts and I find that in so far as the Sorel contract, and the Davis contract are concerned, the Auditor Generad had power to stop the payment and did stop it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) now says that in the Corry & Laverdure contract, $125,000 was paid out improperly. Would my hon. friend state whether that was discussed before the Public Accounts Committee, or what evidence there is that that was done ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know that it was discussed before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What evidence is there that it was done ?

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister dispute it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. That any money was paid ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Improperly.

Mr. SPROULE. The word improperly is a very strange one ; a payment might be in accordance with the contract and yet be made improperly in the interests of the country. That is what the Auditor General complains of, that the payment was made improperly.

Mr. LENNOX. It was not in accordance with the contract either.

Mr. SPROULE. It was not in accordance with the contract. Because the Auditor General desires to prevent these improper payments we want to give him ample power to do it, and if in any of these cases the money was not paid out it was not paid out because the Auditor General prevented it ; the government gave certificates to pay it and were willing to pay it.

Mr. A. C. BELL. While there is not much disposition on the part of the government to treat this matter as one of sufficient importance to discuss it on this occasion, still there can be no doubt that in the opinion of the people of the country generally the Auditor General is the most useful official of the country. He is the gentleman who was spoken of as a very important official in the years when the Conservatives were in power, when this matter was discussed by leading and prominent members of the Liberal party, then in opposition. They said that he had an onerous duty to perform when he had the supervision of expenditure of probably $40,000,000. The importance of this proposition was emphasized by Liberal speakers at that time on account of the large amount of money in question. If that was a good argument previous to 1896, it is manifestly much stronger to-day because now the expenditure of the country is almost double that expenditure of $40,000,000, and while it is true that the members of the administration to-day are disposed not to treat this discussion very seriously, but simply to pass it over, following apparently the line taken by the Minister of Finance in connection with it, that party did treat it seriously during the years when they were in opposition. I find that in 1895 the Hon. David Mills devoted a large part of a day in parliament to a resolution moved on a motion to go into supply, to a discussion of this matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. On the same lines ?

Mr. BELL. Not on the same lines.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will my hon. friend read the resolution ?

Mr. BELL. It does not seem to be included in the discussion in 'Hansard.' The discussion occurs at page 2408 of the 'Hansard' of 1895. On that occasion, I am bound to say, a different phase of the subject was treated. The point at issue then was an application of the Auditor General to the government and to parliament for assistance and relief. On that occasion, as nearly as I can gather from the speeches, the Auditor General was rather pleading for increased remuneration for his officials and increased power of control over the officials of his department. Therefore the discussion on that occasion was not by any means on all fours with this, but still it is evident from Mr. Mills's speech that he regarded this official as being one of the most important appointed by the govern-

ment of Canada. He presses particularly upon the attention of the House the fact referred to over and over again that the Auditor General is not at all an official of the government of Canada, but an official of the parliament and of the people of Canada. Mr. Mills in this discussion called attention to the fact that the duties of the Auditor General are twofold; first, that he conducts an administrative audit in the interests of the people. That is to say, not only does he see that the various appropriations are so expended and accounted for and justified by voucher as to protect the administration, but he also sees that the government of the day uses these appropriations for the purposes for which they are voted by parliament so that there can be no question at all that on that occasion the Liberal party, as represented by Mr. Mills, gave a great deal of prominence to this feature of the case, that the Auditor General is to a certain extent exercising a supervision and control over the administration and for that reason it is urged in the course of that speech and elsewhere that that official should receive the most thorough and unlimited support from the parliament of Canada. In so far as this matter has been treated by the government on this occasion they have apparently made up their minds not to consider it very fully at this time. They have urged in the first place through the Finance Minister, as a reason for not considering it, that the time is not opportune, that the matter is brought to the notice of the House at a time when parliament has practically reached the conclusion of its business for this year. To my mind that cannot possibly be the reason why the government has decided not to come to the assistance of the Auditor General in this matter. If it were, it would involve our assenting to the proposition that they had no knowledge of this application of the Auditor General until this matter was brought to their attention by the opposition. That, this House and the country know, is not the case. The Auditor General during every year, as is set forth at great length in the pages of his report, has been engaged in constant controversy with the government of the day, and so far as my reading has gone I must say, uniformly, in every case in which the Auditor General has felt it his duty to differ in opinion as to the appropriations made to the government, the government, relying on and using the authority of the Treasury Board, has overruled the Auditor General. I do not believe that any one in this House, particularly on this side of the House, is disposed to differ from the view laid down by the Finance Minister in so far as they will not consent for one moment to allow the Auditor General to assume the function of deciding the policy of this country. We are not disposed to part with one jot or title or particle of that system which we have inherited, adopted and developed in this country under which every portion of the expenditure made by Canada must be made upon the authority of the government of the day. We do not for one moment contemplate nor see how it would be possible, or how any reasonable man for a moment could consider, that the functions of the government of Canada should be devolved upon any official, Auditor General or any one else, and therefore we, I think, are entirely at one with the government in insisting that nothing should be done to deprive the government of the day of any of its constitutional rights or powers. We look upon the responsibility of ministers to parliament and through them to the people as the basis of the system which we have inherited, which we have worked under in the past and which we must continue to work under. We do not want any suggestions to come from the government side of the House that we are endeavouring in any way to interfere with constitutional practice. I do not think it would be possible for the minister to make it appear plain that the Auditor General, in the request he is making of the people of Canada—for he is appealing to the whole people of Canada—is asking them to give him the power of taking the government by the throat when he might see fit to do so, or to make him a final court of appeal to say when the government is doing right and when it is doing wrong. I do not think that the Auditor General has any such idea in his mind and if he had he would find no support for it on this side of the House.

I believe that the desire of the Auditor General would be to a large extent gratified by some such measure as that which has been outlined by the leader of the opposition today. The Auditor General thinks that under certain circumstances which come under his cognizance in a way to lead him to believe there has been an improvident bargain, he should be fortified to the extent that he could bring to his assistance a mode of investigation by which he could prepare himself to submit to the administration through the Minister of Finance, reasons which might induce the government to correct the defects in any contract. I do not think anything could be more appropriate for that purpose than a reference to the Exchequer Court or to some other court in which information of a conclusive character could be derived from the examination of witnesses. There is at present in our system no means by which, if the administration of the day is disposed to be careless or prejudiced in favour of a contract, the Auditor General can make such an inquisition as would be necessary to bring before the government such information as might induce them to change their minds. We know that the people of this

country cannot have any first hand knowledge of such disputed questions, and that indeed it is hard for members of parliament to make discoveries in reference to such, because the report of the Auditor General is only in their hands twelve months or more after the transactions have been discovered. It seems to me that it would not at all be adverse to the principle of constitutional government and it would not be prejudicial to honest and economic administration in this country, if some provision were made by which the Auditor General might for a short time suspend the operation of a contract or the payment of an account until he could ascertain by some judicial process such information as would enable him to submit to the government a complete statement of his views, and of the grounds which might induce the administration to change their minds. While it may not have been intended, yet there is something disingenuous in the argument of the Minister of Finance, who does not consider the question at all, but who at once appeals to that strong sentiment in the House and in the country, which is opposed to any change which would deprive us of that system of ministerial responsibility upon which we rest, and must rest in this country. The Minister of Finance was simply begging the question. While I do not wish to pursue him into a detailed consideration of the Davis contract, out of the consideration of which probably this question has come to the surface, still, even in that case I would almost seem inclined to think that the Minister of Finance might find that there were some reasons which would make it advantageous to the administration to have the Auditor General, who stands between them and these persons to whom the money of the country is being paid, strengthened in his position. I should think that might be done not only in the public interest, but also for the comfort and convenience of the government itself. No harm could result by any extension of the powers of the Auditor General which stop short of confiding in him any authority superior to that of parliament, or of the ministry which parliament for the time being sustains in power. It would seem that the government would have done well if they had copied the example of preceding administrations which have over and over again amended the Audit Act, and which have shown a disposition to strengthen the hands of the Auditor General in every constitutional manner. I would advise that this matter be treated not too lightly, because it is absolutely important for this administration and for succeeding administrations, that the people of Canada should know that the administration desires to have as sweeping an investigation as possible into the public accounts which any properly authorized official like the Auditor General may institute. I was sorry to hear in the course of the discussion reference made to the suspicious character of the negotiations and contracts between Mr. Davis and succeeding governments in Canada. If such insinuations were made in the report of the Auditor General it was very unfortunate. It is most important that we should always extend to administrations in this country that generous treatment which we are disposed to extend even to criminals, and to believe them innocent until they are proven guilty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is awfully kind.

Mr. BELL. I do not think there could be a more unfortunate feature in our public life than that there should develop a disposition on the part of public men, or on the part of public organs to attempt to force on the minds of the people of this country, a predisposition to believe that there was a dishonest purpose on the part of any administration. We ought to assume, and we must assume, that our goveruments are pure. It is such a cheap, such an easy and such an abominable practice, to go on insinuating corrupt motives and corrupt acts on the part of an opponent, that to my mind every man who wishes a healthy sentiment in the public life of Canada, ought to discourage it to every extent in his power. We ought be willing to believe that the government of the day are doing what they can in the interests of the people. So far as I am concerned I have no sympathy with this casting of suspicions, and I regret that this matter should be discussed here at all. I do not believe there was any such corrupt bargain in the case I have referred to. I do not believe anything of the kind was intended, and if the Auditor General has introduced such an insinuation into the report he has gone entirely outside of his duties and functions, and has made a grave mistake. But, while that is the case, there can be no doubt that among the party organs on both sides, and probably among public men on both sides, there is a constant tendency to cover up their own faults by insinuating evil doing or corruption on the part of their opponents. Therefore it is to my mind in the interests of every succeeding administration of this country, to conduct our public affairs in such fashion that the people of the country shall learn to have confidence in the fact that the purpose of every succeeding government is to have the fullest and freest inquiry into all matters, so that the people of the country may always rest in confidence that the business of the country for the time being is honestly transacted. While it may not be an opportune time for the administration to engage in this work now, and while it may be enough to observe that we are approaching the end of a long session, still I

think it would be well for the administration to let it be understood that so far as they are concerned they have nothing to fear from any inquiry of any kind whatever which is conducted within proper constitutional limits by any official of the government or by anybody else. I am satisfied that this administration does not fear anything of the kind, and I believe it is in the interests not only of this government but of any government that may succeed, to make that point perfectly clear. If there is any weakness or any defect at all in the powers which the Auditor General has to discharge his duties, that defect should be repaired. So nearly as I can discover, the view which the Auditor General takes, and the view that all reasonable men take, is, that there may be a necessity to a certain extent, I do not know how far, to increase the powers of the Auditor General, to make inquiry under certain circumstances. If that be admitted there is a great justification for some change in the law which would enable the Auditor General to discharge his full functions under certain restrictions, which restrictions should be clearly stated and which should not be of such a nature as to admit of constant and unwarranted interference.

There should be some power granted to the officer whose duty it is to watch the expenditure, if he thinks a bargain has been made without sufficient knowledge of the circumstances, or that it is an improvident bargain, to suspend, for a certain time, action in the direction of payment, to enable him to institute such an inquiry as would satisfy him, and through him, the people of the country that everything was being done that could be done to secure economical expenditure. That is, to my mind, all that is asked for by my leader, both in the matter and in the manner in which he has introduced this question to parliament at this time. We know that the auditor was not always a feature of our politics, either in the mother country or in Canada. There was a time, not very long ago, when there was no such office as an audit office either in Great Britain or in this country; but no man to-day would, I think, suggest that we should go back to those days and dispense with the audit office, and leave it entirely in the hands of an administration to satisfy the people as to the nature of the public expenditure by simply appealing to the country on the ground of their fitness, their character, their standing and their respect for themselves as an administration. It does not imply that a man or an administration is dishonest because you ask them to submit to certain checks and guards on expenditure. It is, to my mind, merely a proper course to follow in reference to the multitudinous expenditures of this country, which no government can possibly supervise for itself, or in reference to the employment of the host of officials that we have in Canada. No administration can thoroughly supervise for itself all the enormous expenditures of this country; the people cannot supervise them for themselves; and the members of parliament have no opportunity of supervising them. We must retain the services of the Auditor General; and when he shows a reasonable ground for the contention that he requires to have his powers increased, we should be ready to increase his powers. I feel that this is not a matter which the opposition would be disposed to introduce as a contentious matter. It is too important; it is above that; it is a matter which the administration of the day should decide; but it is the duty of the opposition to bring it to the notice of the administration. There can be no question at all, I presume, that to-day, just as in the days when the Conservative party were in power, the Auditor General looks upon the opposition as his natural allies. It is his business to watch the administration so far as their appropriations are concerned, and to watch the officials in so far as all the expenditures are concerned; and it is only natural that he should regard the opposition of the day as his natural allies and assistants. In every case where the Auditor General thought the government were not giving him such support as he felt himself entitled to, but on the contrary regarded him as rather overmeddling, as too carping and critical, as a man with whom, in course of time, they might grow somewhat out of patience, and to whom they might not turn a ready ear, nothing would be more natural than that he should either appeal to the country as a whole or take the natural course, during the time parliament is in session, of appealing to that body of people who constitute the opposition of the day. But, after all, this is a matter which it is the duty of the administration to deal with. If the administration can show, as they have not on this occasion attempted to show, that the Audit Act is amply effective and that there are no grounds whatever for any request on the part of the Auditor General or the opposition to improve it, then they are perfectly justified; but I do not think the government of the day are altogether justified, when this matter is brought to their notice, in treating it as it has been treated by the administration on this occasion. It must be said that they have treated it with scant courtesy. The Finance Minister made a very short speech. He did not profess to exert himself, but disposed of the whole subject as one which might be lightly brushed aside. He treated it as an attack by the opposition, and did not deal with the question in its broad aspects. He made only a brief reference to the particular contract out of which this whole question may be said to have taken its rise; and, so far as that particular contract was concerned, it seems to me the effect of the speech of the

Finance Minister was to justify the position of the Auditor General. The result would seem to go to show that by the intervention of the Auditor General the great purpose to which the people of the country are devoted —the economizing of the public funds—has been served. If that is true, it is a very powerful argument why some careful inquiries into this matter should be made.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER. I do not intend to occupy many minutes in the remarks that I propose to make on the subject now before the House. It is not, I think, necessary that I should do so. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition dealt fully with the outlines of the Bill which he suggested, and the reasons he gave for suggesting such a measure to the government, have not so far been answered. So far there has been no attempt whatever to reply to my hon. friend. It was a matter of surprise to me that the hon. the Minister of Finance should have avoided the substance of the question before the House, as he did, by referring to what he called the abstract motion of the leader of the opposition. The Minister of Finance knows perfectly well—no one knows better—why my hon. friend moved that abstract motion. He knew that the object of my hon. friend was to keep himself within the rules of the House. He knew that my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, made this abstract motion in order that he might lay before the government the draft or form of a Bill which could become law only if taken up by the government. There is nobody in this House who is not perfectly aware that if to-day a Bill of that character were introduced by anyone from this side, it would not have the slightest prospect of becoming law. There is no hon. member who does not know that the only chance such a Bill would have of getting upon the statute-books would be for the government of the day to take it up and put it through the House. It was for that reason that the leader of the opposition took the particular method he did, and laid before the House and the country a proposition that I think the government ought to have accepted. In the course of his remarks, the leader of the opposition said that he was not wedded to the particular wording of the Bill. He did not care exactly in what words the subject matter was expressed. All he proposed was to lay before the House what he thought was required as an improvement to the Audit Act and to leave to the government to adopt what phraseology they pleased, so long as they gave effect to what he considered was required. Therefore the Bill is before the House, to all intents and purposes, as fully as if it had been introduced in the ordinary course. Everybody knows how impossible it would be for this side to have such a measure adopted. The only possible way of its becoming law would be for hon. gentlemen opposite to take up the measure we suggest. That suggestion has been made, and we are waiting yet for some reply to the remarks which the hon. the leader of the opposition gave in support of the measure he outlined.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance pleaded the right of parliament to do wrong if it chose and deprecated any limitation of its functions. Those are in effect the words he used. Well, we could not restrain or limit the powers of parliament even if we desired to do so. Nobody contends that it is possible for us to restrain or affect or limit parliamentary power. But I would like to ask this of the Finance Minister. Would he be good enough to state what sentence there is, from the beginning to the end of the proposition made by the leader of the opposition, which can be in any way construed as an attempt to interfere with the powers of parliament. Every passage of the Bill we propose, shows that there is not the slightest intention on the part of anybody to interfere with the fullest control by parliament. On the contrary what the leader of the opposition wants, is that parliament shall have the means of itself dealing with the subject. He does not want to give to any judge or auditor the power which parliament itself alone should exercise. In what possible manner can the proposed Bill interfere with the powers of parliament ? What is the proposition ? It is that in the event of the auditor appointed by this House and acting for this House, being of the opinion that the occasion called for such action on his part, he could petition the judge of the Exchequer Court to investigate certain matters that have come before him as auditor. The proposition is not that the judge shall deal with the question, not that he shall decide as between the government and the party claiming money, but that he shall investigate and report to parliament for the action of parliament. Surely in the face of such a proposition, the contention of the Finance Minister that we are endeavouring to get rid of the paramount authority of parliament is simply absurd. On the contrary we are endeavouring to increase the effective power of parliament. We are endeavouring to give parliament the means of dealing with matters which are now dealt with in the cabinet and secretly.

The Minister of Finance says that he cannot vote for the motion of the leader of the opposition, because it implies that the powers under the Audit Act are not now sufficient. In effect

he contends that the Audit Act, passed many years ago under conditions very different indeed from those of to-day, cannot be improved to meet the circumstances in which we now live. Well, Sir, I have heard of Conservatism and Old Toryism, but for for such a proposition as this to come from a Liberal and a member of a Liberal government is certainly an extraordinary thing. Would it not be an improvement to provide that, when the Treasury Board overrule the Auditor General, the officer of parliament, they shall give reasons for that overruling ? That is one of the propositions of the hon. leader of the opposition. If that were adopted, the report of the Auditor General—and he is bound to report to parliament the overrulings of the Treasury Board —would give us not only the fact of the overruling but the reasons for it. Would anybody say that that would not be an improvement ? We read, session after session, Treasury Board decisions simply telling us that the Treasury Board do not approve the action of the Auditor General and overruling that action. That is all that is told us. These gentlemen may be right or they may be wrong, but, in their magnificence they are altogether above informing us why they take the particular view they do. Now the Auditor General, I say again is an officer of parliament, not an officer of the government; he is put there to overlook the expenditure of the government. He has before him in some particular case, the claim of a contractor or other person for a sum of money and the voucher and certificate of one of the ministers, the head of one of the departments of the government. Looking into the case he comes to the conclusion that there is something wrong—not necessarily something dishonest, we need not go into questions of dishonesty here, but something imprudent, informal, or, perhaps irregular—in the contracting of the debt. He refuses, acting for the public, to certify for the payment of the money. Well, what is done ? The Auditor General is overruled. By whom ? Why, by a committee or board of the gentlemen he is set to watch. by the Treasury Board, consisting of members of the cabinet. The public who trust the Auditor General are so particular about his independence that they will not allow the government to discharge him but provide that he is to be discharged only by parliament itself. But his decision is overruled by the colleagues of the head of the department who demands the money. So far, good, perhaps. I quite admit that in public affairs it would be impossible to leave it to any Auditor General or any other officer, no matter who he may be to have the last word in relation to expenditure of money. Nobody disputes the honesty of the Auditor General, but people may sometimes doubt his judgment. He is only human. Therefore, it would be wrong to make him a Czar and give him the right to say finally that moneys shall or shall not be paid. But, when he is overruled by an interested body, by the government of the day, who perhaps not dishonestly, but for reasons of their own, want the money paid, is that to be the end of it ? It would not be right, it would not be in the public interest that the Auditor General should be absolute; but is it in the public interest that the ministers should be absolute ? Is it to be for all time to come, with the growing importance of the transactions in this country, that a difference of opinion between the Auditor General and the minister is to be absolutly decided by the minister, through the minister's colleagues ! Surely, if that is to be the case, there is little essentially good in the auditorship. It is quite true the Auditor reports the overruling to parliament. But that overruling is reported to parliament after the transaction is closed, because the Treasury Board have the power to order the money to be paid and without giving reasons. We ask, therefore, on this branch of the Bill, that, when the Auditor General is overruled the reasons for the overruling shall be stated, in order that when the report is made to parliament, we shall know not only why the Auditor General has objected but why his objection has been set aside.

Then, we contend that some special remedy should be provided for extreme cases, and I will refer to that later on. Nobody pretends—the leader of the opposition would be the last to pretend—that this special remedy was to be used for every occasion. It is not probable, it is not even possible. that it will come in to frequent use. Because, the Auditor General is an officer of parliament and if he is found to bring up every petty question before parliament, parliament will very soon deal with an officious petty officer of that kind who cannot appreciate the significance or importance of particular transactions under his consideration.

Now. Sir, the requirement of the reasons for overruling is not the only amendment that has been suggested. Section 48 of the Audit Act was evidently framed for the purpose of enabling the Auditor General, from time to time, to make suggestions to parliament. It was, no doubt, foreseen that, however careful parliament might be in the framing of the Audit Act, many things would occur in the experience of an auditor which might well be reported to parliament for its consideration. Therefore, section 48 of the Act was inserted as a sort of safety valve, if I may so call it, and a very useful one it is in my opinion. Now, section 48 as it stands in the Act today, enables the Auditor General to make special reports to parliament. As the Act stands it reads thus :

In reporting as hereinbefore directed for the information of the House of Commons, the re-

sult of the examiniation of the appropriation accounts, the Auditor General shall call attention to every case in which cheques have been issued without his certificate——

That, of course, is not a matter of auditing, that is ignoring the Auditor, and he is expected to call the attention of parliament to it.

—or in which a grant has been exceeded—or in which money received by a department from other sources than the grants for the year to which the account relates has not been applied or accounted for according to the directions of parliament—or in which a sum charged against a grant is not supported by proof of payment—or in which a payment so charged did not occur within the period of the account, or was for any other reason, not properly chargeable against the grant, or was in any way irregular——

Then the leader of the opposition proposes to add two provisions, and I desire to call the attention of the First Minister particularly to them, because, in my judgment, they are of very great importance to the people of this country, especially in regard to one of the departments. The first is :

—or in which a sum charged against a grant for capital account was expended wholly or in part for a purpose properly chargeable to revenue account——

Now, upon that subject let me say a few words. We have again and again discussed in this House the proper application of expenditure for capital and for revenue. We find, in passing the estimates every year, that large sums are granted on capital account. It is impossible, when the estimates are before the House, however anxious gentlemen here may be to do their duty, to know whether the whole of that money is properly chargeable to capital or not. The government obtains a grant for, say, half a million of money applicable to a certain line of expenditure, and to be charged to capital. For example, in the railway grants a sum of three or four hundred thousand dollars may be applicable to expenditure upon bridges, and half a million in some years has been granted on capital account for steel rails. Now, no one in this House, when the estimates are passed, can undertake to say absolutely how much of that should be capital and how much revenue. But when the accounts come before the Auditor General after the expenditure has taken place, the Auditor General can tell that and can, by obtaining expert advice, know very closely indeed how much of that money should have been really charged to capital and how much to revenue. But as the statute has already been passed upon the estimates, making it all applicable to capital, he, as auditor, has nothing to do with it ; all he can say is that $500,000 has been expended upon rails and $350,000 upon bridges, and upon the Act which was passed by parliament he is directed to charge all to capital. Now, I say that the Auditor General, while carrying out strictly, according to his duty, what parliament has directed him to do, that is to charge that money up to capital, should be enabled and required to report to this House specially that it has come to his knowledge in the investigation of the accounts that a portion, perhaps all, of that which was so charged to capital ought really to have been charged to revenue account. Can anybody dispute that this is an important feature of auditing ? The Auditor General cannot help us as the Audit Act stands. The estimates have been passed, they have become an Act of parliament. He is directed to charge a certain expenditure to capital, and he must obey, though he finds in the course of the year that the government is renewing bridges with that capital appropriation. If he were to report the fact to parliament we could see that sometimes a half a million of money that has been charged to capital and added to the debt of the country has enabled the minister of the day to show a profit of several hundred thousand dollars on the operation of the railway ; and the result of the hon. gentleman showing such profit is that the apparent profit is used to justify expenditure in other directions. Why should we not know the truth ? Is there any business man throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion who, in his own affairs, would not say : I want to know precisely what we are doing, I want to see what is a capital charge and what is a revenue charge. It may all come out of my pocket, but I want to know exactly how the business is going on. And so will the people of this Dominion. It may not matter to us whether the debt is incurred on capital account or whether we have had a deficit in the earnings of the railway, it is all a debt. But we do want to know whether the railway is being worked at a profit or at a loss, and it is a proper thing for that purpose that such a report as this should come from the Auditor General to parliament when he finds that the estimates, as they have been granted by parliament, are cloaking the truth. Therefore, I say that this is a proper amendment to add to the old Act.

Then there is a second addition proposed :

—or in which by reason of the generality of the appropriation, or otherwise, he has been unable, to properly check or control the expenditure.

Now, that arises very largely in connection with the same department, but it does not apply solely to that department. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will recollect that it has become a feature of the Railway Department that the whole of its estimates, involving from two to three or four million dollars, is summed up in about half a page. But take any other department of the government, and you will find greater detail of every expenditure. The

result is this: We find three, or four, or five hundred thousand dollars asked, for a certain description of expenditure. Take one instance, $385,000 say for strengthening bridges. It is put in the estimates in that general and vague way. We get out from the minister here, and endeavour to put upon 'Hansard,' how many and what particular bridges he is going to strengthen, and how much he wants to expend upon each bridge. Now, it may be a question whether the Auditor General can go to 'Hansard' and say to the department later on: I shall not allow you to expend more on that particular bridge than you asked parliament to allow you to expend on it; I shall not allow you for any bridge more than you said you needed for that bridge; and if you do not expend the amount you asked for a particular bridge, the surplus that you did not require shall not go into your general expenditure, but shall lapse.

That is the way business is done. If an engineer upon a railway asked $20,000 to renew or strengthen a particular bridge and expended only $10,000 upon that bridge the other $10,000 would lapse; he could not put the balance in his general expenditure and use it as he pleased; yet the result of these general estimates that are placed upon the statutes of the country under the present system is that the railway department can do what it pleases with the money. It is obvious that if this system is continued as it has been going on for years past and as it may have always been going on for aught I know, the minister may ask $300,000 or $400,000 to strengthen bridges and he may expend the whole of that money on one-half of the bridges and leaves the other half to come up next year. Therefore, the Bill provides that the Auditor General shall be at liberty to report that under an estimate given in that general form he is unable to properly check the expenditure and prevent the department from using that money otherwise than as was intended. This Bill in this respect provides a needed check upon the departments which is lacking under the present Audit Act.

After all, however, the main question is the reference of certain matters to the judge of the Exchequer Court. Let us see how that comes about. A claim is made upon a department and is passed by that department so that it comes before the Auditor General for his consideration. The Minister of Finance says that the Auditor General has full power, that he can make any investigation he likes, can send for papers, and examine people under oath. That is all true, but, after the Auditor General has done all that, after he has called his witnesses, examined the papers, taken testimony upon oath and decided in his discretion that the money should not be paid, what happens? Why he is overridden by the Treasury Board, who will order the money to be paid, and that without giving a reason. Should it be left in that position? The colleagues of the minister at the head of the department whose accounts are being questioned by the auditor are the final judges. It is quite true that the Auditor General can report these facts to parliament, but it does appear to me—and I think this will commend itself to every gentleman in this House—that when there is a dispute between a department and the auditor or between the Treasury Board and the auditor, both parties to the dispute may become a little prejudiced. They are all human, ministers just as well as auditors, and the Treasury Board ministers are anxious to stand up for their colleagues and their colleague is anxious to stand up for what he calls his department. The auditor, on the other hand, is no doubt anxious to stand up for his decision and so when we get the papers before us as reported by the Auditor General, either one side or the other claims that there is prejudice. The ministers say: Oh, this auditor is trying to rule the country and the ministry. The Auditor General, no doubt, says: The ministry is trying to get things through because the department wishes to get them through. Neither of these is quite the functionary that an impartial jury would like to rely upon, and therefore it seems to me desirable that in important cases the judge of the Exchequer Court should be allowed to take evidence, report all the circumstances to parliament in order that parliament might take action. It may occur to some that that would interfere with the progress of business. Is that so? First of all the proposition is that after the Auditor General has been overruled he must, if he wants to appeal, file his petition within ten days. Now, I take it that the world is not going to come to an end, because there is a ten days delay in settling a question of that kind. I think most people would be delighted that the delay did not exceed ten days. What then? Within those ten days the Auditor General must file his objection in the court and give notice to the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board and the Auditor General can then fight it out if they please, but in order that the delay might not injure a contractor the judge before whom a matter comes up may order the money or a portion of it to be paid forthwith. How would that apply in such a case as has been mentioned here? Take the Davis case. There you have a contract running over many years. A claim for the year's service comes before the Auditor General; there is a dispute; he refuses to pass the account; the Treasury Board overrules him and he files his objection. Now, what would the judge probably do in a case like that? Any judge would say in his discretion: Well the country for this year has had that service; I will order that you pay at

once whatever appears to be reasonable for this year's service, but I will go on and inquire into the whole of this contract and report to parliament so that when it comes before parliament next session they may deal with the case. Would that be unreasonable ? Would there be anything in that prejudicial to the contractor ? What happened in this case ? Owing to the protest of the Auditor General and perhaps to a little public comment upon the matter, the government, instead of waiting for parliament dealt with the matter themselves, and induced the contractor to modify the terms. The hon. gentlemen seem to think that that shows there was no necessity for the judge. To my mind it shows that in such a case we ought to have a judge. It is quite true that in this particular instance the government did find that the contract was a bad one for the people and did induce the contractor to modify its terms, but where would the country have been if the government had not arrived at that conclusion ? Supposing that the government had concluded : We are going to stand by the department and not alter the contract. What they admit by their conduct to have been an injury and outrage upon the public, would have stood for all time, because we would have had no means of getting at the true facts of the case.

The fact that the government themselves, under the protest of the Auditor General, have been obliged to alter and modify a contract is the strongest argument as to the importance of having means in other cases to ascertain whether modifications, or alterations, or cancellations should take place. I press that upon the First Minister. I have no doubt the right hon. gentleman has the utmost confidence in his own uprightness and probity and in his desire to do what is right in the public interest ; but there may not always be such a First Minister as he ; there may not always be ministers such as his colleagues, and we may not always have cabinets who would be so willing to admit that in 1900 they did wrong, and who in 1902 would coerce the contractor to abandon his legal rights and take a modified agreement. They might not even always have the power to compel the contractor to modify his terms. If this reference could be made to a judge who would send for that contractor and for the department and for the Auditor General and get all the facts and report to parliament, then that omnipotence about which the Minister of Finance is so anxious would come into play, and parliament could insist upon justice being done, and parliament could insist that the contract, outrageous as it might be, should—of course after making all due compensation—be cancelled as a matter of duty to the people. It is not right that it should be left to the mere discretion and whim of the government of the day, to say whether they will go to a contractor and point out to him that the contract entered into was a blunder. I am not making any charge of impropriety, but on the face of it, it is absolutely clear that there was a blunder in connection with this contract ; for Mr. Aylesworth points out that the contract made in 1900 actually does not follow the terms of the Order in Council authorizing it, and that possibly it would be found that a contract so entered into would not be enforcible. We may find other occasions in which the government, not wilfully but through the blunder of some person enters into a contract that is not in accordance with what they themselves intended. Why should not such things as this be brought out by an inquiry ? It is not necessary to impute fraud and wrong doing. There may be occasions among governments, as there are among business people where blunders are perpetrated, and why should they not be rectified ? Why should the rectification be left to a ministry, who perhaps at certain seasons cannot afford to admit that they have made a blunder ? Why should it be left to them to overrule the Auditor General, and then merely tell us their Treasury Board did not agree with him. Surely it is in the interests of the country that there should be such an inquiry as is proposed in the Bill in a proper case; and what is the harm? If this power were used by the Auditor General unnecessarily or unreasonably the remedy lies with ourselves. He is our officer and we can dismiss him. He will not dare do such a thing ; the law would be used but seldom. The best protection this country could have against improper conduct on the part of politicians of either party, would be the deterring effect of such a law on the statute-book. I am surprised that the Minister of Finance gave so little attention to the propositions that have been made. I cannot understand any government, I cannot understand this government, refusing what is really a protection to themselves. Its acceptance would advance them in the esteem of the people because it would show that they were willing to have a proper check on behalf of the public as against themselves and as against their departments.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The leader of the opposition asked this House to declare : that the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act should be so extended as to confer upon the Auditor General powers ample in every respect to protect the public interests and to safeguard the public treasury, the inference being, that the provisions of that Act are not now in every respect sufficient to protect the public interest and to safeguard the public treasury. It will be

proper for us to consider what are the present safeguards before we deal with suggested changes. Incidentally I may observe that the Audit Act has now been in force for about twenty-five years. Some of the best men on the other side of the House, have been endeavouring to point out the necessity for some changes in the Act, and I think without offence I may say, that they have brought to the discussion of this question not only the information they may have acquired during their experience in parliament, but as well, information which must have come to them through daily contact with the Auditor General for some time past. And, notwithstanding their personal experience, and notwithstanding the information they may have acquired as a result of their intercourse with the Auditor General, they have not been able to point out a single case which has occurred during these twenty-five years in which a dollar of public money has been paid out as a result of some defect in the Audit Act.

Mr. BARKER. Can the minister tell us on how many occasions the decision of the Auditor General has been overruled ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Evidently when they have been overruled they have been properly overruled, and if they have not been properly overruled how does it come to pass that parliament has not investigated the question and determined as to whether the Auditor General or the Treasury Board was right ? Is it to be assumed forsooth, that the Auditor General is to be right on all cases and that the Treasury Board, representative of all governments that have been in power in this country, has always been in the wrong ? Is it to be assumed, as was said this afternoon for instance, that the Auditor General always seeks the best legal advice that can be obtained, and that having obtained the best legal advice he invariably follows it—when it agrees with his own opinion.

So that I presume that when the Auditor General has decided one way, if the Treasury Board has overruled him, the Treasury Board, in the opinion of my hon. friend, must always be in the wrong. If that applies to the present government, my hon. friend from Hamilton must remember that it applies with equal force to those who have gone before. I may be permitted to observe that to the tone of those who have spoken on this subject no exception can be taken. I do not for a moment pretend that it has not been discussed in a proper spirit and tone by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a serious question, and I agree that it ought to be the subject of investigation by parliament. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that one of the reasons why there should be a change in the Audit Act—and he spoke as if it was in his judgment the paramount reason—were the frequent overrulings of the auditor by the Treasury Board. Have these been more frequent under this government than they were before ? The hon. leader of the opposition speaks with very great authority in this House, not only because of the position he occupies, but also because of his personal character ; but something, it seems to me is required to support that assertion. I have caused some inquiry to be made, though I have only had a few hours at my disposal for the purpose, and I think I may safely say that the overrulings in recent years have not exceeded those of the years preceeding 1896. So that if these overrulings form a reason for a change in the Audit Act, that reason existed prior to 1896.

Mr. SPROULE. May I remind the hon. gentleman that the Audit Act was amended twice to meet the views of the Auditor General?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And it was suggested that it should be amended very much oftener. I have only looked into the matter very cursorily, because, while the hon. leader of the opposition sent me a copy of this amendment, I had not an opportunity to look at it until I came into the House at 11 o'clock. In 1880 the Public Accounts Committee recommended that the Audit Act should be amended, but nothing was done.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite sure it was amended.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will look at Bourinot, under the Audit Act, he will find that amendments were recommended by the Public Accounts Committee in 1880, and that those amendments were not made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Act was not amended in 1880, but it has been amended in some respects three times.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At other times other amendments were suggested. My hon. friend is not aware of the fact that the Auditor General has had a standing grievance, not only against this government, but against other governments. He appears to play the role of the Ishmaelite, whose hand is raised against all men, and against whom all other men's hands are raised.

Mr. SPROULE. He must be an Irishman, because he is always 'agin' the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, he just missed being an Irishman. If he were an Irishman, he would have a keener sense of humour, and I am quite sure he would not have read his own reports which he has published each year and survived the effect. I have no quarrel with the Auditor General. He has been good enough to say, I notice, that as

the result of some statements I am supposed to have made, he has come to the conclusion that the government are not going to amend the Audit Act, I have looked over all the statements which I have made this session—and I do not make so many that I am not able to review them—and I can find no evidence that I said at any time anything implying that the government did not intend to amend the Audit Act if an amendment appeared necessary. I venture to say that no gentleman in this House or in this country has a higher regard for the Auditor General's great personal character and work, and his honest and sincere desire to do his duty according to his lights than I have. I want, however, to recur to what I said a moment ago. During all these years that the Audit Act has been in force, a great many thousands and millions of dollars have been paid out by the Auditor General; and notwithstanding the enormous capacity for criticism which he undoubtedly possesses, and notwithstanding the ingenuity which my hon. friends on the other side of the House are undoubtedly endowed with, no one has been able to point to a single case in which one dollar of public money has ever been paid out because of any defect in the Audit Act. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) said—and I am sorry to say that the statement was repeated by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—that tens of thousands of dollars have been paid out of the public treasury without any consideration having been received for them. Where is the evidence in support of that? Wild, rash statements of that sort are good enough perhaps in the byroads and the sideways of the country, but they are not good enough for the House of Commons. A statement of that sort ought not to be made without something being advanced in support of it. My hon. friend from East Grey as a rule is careful in the statements he makes, but I ask him if he can point to a single case in which, not tens of thousands, but a single dollar has been paid out without consideration having been received for it. My hon. friend named the case of Corry & Laverdure. If my hon. friend would make a statement of this sort in this House on his own personal knowledge, no person would accept his word more quickly than I would; but when he made that statement, he was obliged to say that he made it from information.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to know where the information is. I would like to know when the inquiry took place before the Public Accounts Committee when any such statement as that was proved. It seems to me that our friends on the other side of the House are far too anxious to perform the duties they owe to their constituents and to the country to allow a payment of even $100 to be made to any firm of contractors without consideration, by this government or any other government, and not have it investigated. They know what their duty is and how to perform it; and if such a scandalous transaction as that occurred, can any one pretend for a moment that there would not have been a gentleman to rise on the other side of the House and denounce it, and bring it before the Public Accounts Committee, and, as a result, have this government expelled from power, as they ought to be expelled if guilty of any such transaction?

Mr. SPROULE. It is hard to expel them when they have the votes. Is it not a fact that in the Davis case, if you can believe the letters that passed between the Auditor General and the Railway Department, that department certified to an account although nothing was received for it, and that the money was paid only because the Auditor General was overruled by the Treasury Board?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There again, I can scarcely believe it possible that my hon. friend, with his long parliamentary experience, would for a moment say that a money payment had been made, and that after the payment was made the Auditor General was overruled. That is impossible. The payment can only be made after the Auditor General is disposed of. It cannot be made in advance.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say it was made in advance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You must not get away from the fact that Mr. Davis did not receive one farthing in respect of that contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I assume that he did.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend must not assume what is not true. He must assume what the fact is, that he did not receive a dollar.

Mr. SPROULE. For this reason, had I not a right to assume that? The Auditor General objected to the payment unless a certificate was given by the Railway Department to the effect that value had been received or that the contract had been let after tenders were invited, neither of which was the case. But he was overruled by the Treasury Board and still the claim was sustained. Beyond that I did not go, for I assumed that after that the money was paid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was not.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite willing to be corrected and accept the correction. But if the money was not paid, was that not due to the fact that the Auditor General prevented payment?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I accept the hon. gentleman's argument and say it was due to the fact that the Auditor General had sufficient power under the Audit Act to prevent the payment, which proves that the machinery of the Act is all right. Let us get back to the facts. I am not going to follow the example of my hon. friend and indulge in surmises. That matter has to be dealt with in the Public Accounts Committee when we will have every opportunity of investigating it from beginning to end. The government have no fear concerning the result of any investigation to be held. But let me say to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that not one farthing was paid in connection with the Davis contract, except under the amended contract, which was prepared after I myself became Minister of Justice—I was not in the department when the original contract was made—and which contract was approved by the Auditor General. But we are not dealing with that matter. We are dealing with the matter of Corry & Laverdure. I may have misunderstood, but I understood before six o'clock the statement to have been made that in connection with that case $125,000 had been paid out without consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. That was my understanding.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I challenge that statement. I go further and say it is impossible it could be true—my hon. friend understands of course the sense in which I use the expressions—because if it were true, my hon. friends opposite would not have allowed twenty-four hours to pass by without demanding an investigation. And if they did not, they would be, as has been suggested, recreant in their duty. And I am quite certain they are not. But eliminating altogether the question of duty, I am quite sure they would not allow such an opportunity as that to pass by to criticise this government and discover the first scandal which can possibly be charged to it since 1896.

I am not disposed to say that some changes might not be made in the details of the Audit Act. And if changes are necessary in order to enable the Auditor General to more effectively perform the duties assigned to him—not the duties of Czar of Canada, not the duties of controller of the destinies of this country, but the duties of Auditor General—if anything be required to enable him more adequately to perform those duties, all he has to do is to point out in what respect the Audit Act is imperfect, and he will be met by this government with open arms. We have no desire whatever to do otherwise than give every facility to that gentleman, who was appointed by Mr. Mackenzie and whose office was created by the Liberal party, to adequately audit any claim made on this government. But before I proceed to deal with the suggested changes, will my hon. friends bear with me while I point out the safeguards that we now possess ? The estimates for the public service are prepared each year in each department by the officials of that department, and after these estimates have received the approval of the head of the department, they are brought down to parliament. When they come to parliament they are fully discussed. Every item is open to public discussion and must be justified. And we who have sat in this House the last few years know that the severe critics of the opposition will insist on almost every dollar of every item being justified before the item is allowed to pass. When that is done we have the appropriation, and when the Appropriation Act is passed, it is for the executive to deal with the money appropriated and to be expended. And you must bear in mind that not a dollar can be paid out by the executive except with the approval of the Auditor General. And if an account is sent to him for approval and he considers that it requires to be investigated, he exercises to the extreme limit his powers of investigation. Why, at the present time if I were asked to make a suggestion with respect to amendments to the Audit Act, my suggestions would be that his powers of investigation should be limited, at all events, with respect to time. That is to say, he should not have the right to keep before him for three, four, five and six months before reporting to the Treasury Board, as he can do now, an account sent to him to be audited. His powers of investigation are absolutely unlimited, and if anything were required to support that statement, I need only refer this House to the correspondence exchanged and the investigation held with respect to this very Davis contract. That matter was before the Auditor General for months at a time, and when the accounts came in he required not only a careful examination of the contract, but he employed, as one of my hon. friends said this afternoon, the best legal talent available to aid him in his investigation. He went further. He went down to the canal and made a personal investigation. And not content with that personal investigation, he summoned the engineer of the department, Mr. Munro, and instructed him to inquire. Not content with Mr. Munro, he sent for Mr. Hoffmeister, the gentleman who was connected with the Soulanges canal. Not content with that he summoned three engineers to his assistance —the engineer of the electric light company of this city, Mr. Parke, of Toronto, and a professor from McGill College, Montreal. So he had not only the benefit of the investigation by Messrs. Munro and Hoffmeister, but also by these three expert engineers I have just mentioned, and he kept the mat-

ter before him as long as he chose. And there is no provision that I know of which can limit the time during which he may hold an investigation or which can limit the powers conferred on him. What is there to prevent him taking all the time he chooses and making every investigation he pleases ? He has got these powers just as fully as they could be exercised by any judge of the Exchequer Court. After the matter comes before him and after he holds this investigation, after he examines all these witnesses and causes all these inquiries to be made, then forsooth when it suits his own good will, if he has a leisure moment, he decides one way or the other—either in favour of the payment or against it. And if he decides against it, then there is an appeal to the Treasury Board. The matter then comes before the Treasury Board, and if there is a question of law involved, it must be referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion. And when the matter comes before that department, it is disposed of by the deputy minister with the concurrence of the minister. The opinion of the Department of Justice decides the question of law, and it is only in the event of that department giving an opinion adverse to the Auditor General's contention that the Treasury Board acts. Now, it has been suggested incidentally that in one case the Treasury Board had overruled the Department of Justice. I should like to have a reference to that case. I do not believe it possible such a case exists, because it would be a practical violation of the Treasury Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Department of Justice only intervenes where the Auditor General decides on the ground that there is no parliamentary authority.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand that the amendments I suggest alter the law in that respect.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not referring to my hon. friend at all. I am referring to something said by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) with reference to the case of Corry & Laverdure. It is only after all this has been done that the Treasury Board acts. And if the Treasury Board orders the issue of a cheque, then parliament requires that all the correspondance exchanged between the Auditor General and the Treasury Board should be submitted to parliament at the next session. Now, it is suggested that there ought to be an amendment to the Audit Act, so that the Treasury Board might be obliged, as I understood my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), to give a reasoned opinion in support of its overruling. Of course, the Auditor General is obliged, in his reference to the Treasury Board, to give reasons for the position he takes. There may be something to be said in support of that, but see what there is on the other side. What would be the advantage in giving the reasons for the overruling, as my hon. friend from Hamilton argues ? It would be that members of parliament, when they are called upon to examine into the controversy between the Auditor General and the Treasury Board should be in a position to weigh the reasons on both sides, and so reach a conclusion whether the Auditor General or whether the Treasury Board is right. Technically, there may be something to be said——

Mr. BARKER. May I ask the minister (Mr. Fitzpatrick) why the report is sent at all ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say that technically there may be something to be said in favour of that view. And when it comes to the refinement of a point, my hon. friend from Hamilton seldom goes wrong. But what is the advantage ? It is that parliament may be able to decide as between the Treasury Board and the Auditor General. Now, both the report of the Auditor General and the overruling of the Treasury Board comes to parliament. The gentlemen who overrule the Auditor General are here in parliament to give their reasons. Why cannot the reasons be given here ? Why state the reasons for an overruling when you can have the gentlemen here who made the overruling, and may catechize and cross-examine them on the subject ? Are you to have one set of reasons in the report on the overruling and another given here in parliament ? When you get the Treasury Board Report, the payment has been made by the Auditor General ; and, after the Auditor General has made this payment, the whole matter must be referred to parliament. It comes here for the consideration of parliament, and when it is before parliament the constitution provides proper machinery for any further investigation required. You have the Public Accounts Committee, before which you can go, and to which all these questions may be submitted. By that committee these matters can be fully investigated. That committee has greater powers than are possessed by any court in the country. Everybody knows that the Public Accounts Committee is not bound by rules of evidence or by rules of procedure ; its powers are inquisitorial ; you can inquire into any fact in any manner you please and bring in any evidence you choose, and this you cannot do before a court. If you bring the matter before the Exchequer Court you must proceed according to the well-known rules of law. And my objection—passing on rapidly from this, in order to relieve the House from the necessity of listening to me for an undue length of time—my objection to any reference to the court is that, as a lawyer, I object to any confounding and confusing of the legislative functions of parliament with

the judicial functions of the court. We do not want a judge of the Exchequer Court to investigate our affairs. We do not want to share any of the functions we are called upon to perform with any judge or any court. I am not dealing with the personnel of the Exchequer Court, nor do I take into consideration the individual who happens to preside over the court at the present time; but I say it would be an abandonment of our duties as a parliament to confer upon any court the right to investigate any questions under our control. And let me add, in view of the experience, short though it may be, that I have had as minister of the Crown, and especially that in the Department of Justice, that one or two, or even half a dozen, judges of the Exchequer Court would not be enough to perform the duties that would arise under this proposed measure. If the Auditor General had the power to refer any question about which he had any doubt to the Exchequer Court, I think we should find the records of that court pile up with amazing rapidity.

Now, I do not want to deal with the question of the contract that has been raised, but I would like to echo, feebly it is true, but at least earnestly, the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) just before the House rose at six o'clock. It seems to me that we in this country are too much given to imputing to our public men improper conduct and improper motives. So far as I am concerned, I am far from being willing to believe that all this profligacy and corruption exists in the public life of Canada. On the contrary, the lesson I learn from the experience I have acquired since I entered this House is that there are men in this House, on both sides of it, who, if they gave to their private affairs one tithe of the time, one tithe of the energy, one tithe of the industry, that they give to the public affairs of this country, they would be very much further advanced, so far as their personal affairs are concerned. And I take it that if there is any wrong-doing in connection with anything for which the government is responsible, the remedy is not to be found in making idle, vain charges. For, after all, we must bear in mind that slander and libel will travel miles while truth is getting its boots on. We must not overlook the fact that unfortunately there are those in this country who are too prone to believe everything wrong as concerning public men. There are those in this country—and I speak of both sides of politics—who are too prone to believe that every man who comes to this House comes for his own personal profit and his own personal advantage. And I say that that is not fair to the public men of Canada; it is not fair to the men who occupy positions in this House to proceed, by insinuation, to suggest wrong-doing. The proper course is to make a statement and, having made it, to abide by the consequences after a full and fair investigation.

Now, I have, perhaps, travelled further than I had intended to do and further than I ought to have done. But, briefly, the view I take is this, that so far as the Audit Act is concerned, that Act now contains all that is necessary to enable the Auditor General to carry on the duties which it was originally intended he should perform. If to enable him to more faithfully perform those duties amendments are required, the government would be, not only willing, but anxious to do anything necessary to facilitate his task. But I say it is not by substituting the courts for parliament that we can accomplish that object. And, so far as the Auditor General is concerned, I repeat what I said a moment ago: I have no quarrel with him personally, but he is too much of a man, I assume, and too vain of his own opinion, not to see that people who differ from him should not be afraid to declare their differences. And when I come to discuss the matter further, I shall have occasion to point out inaccuracies in connection with the statement in connection with the Davis contract far more serious and more important than the one pointed out by the leader of the opposition this morning.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I am not about to discuss the legal phase of this question. I have listened attentively to the speeches made this afternoon and this evening. I was especially struck with the speech of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I do not wish to flatter him, but he has thrown more light on this subject, for me at least, than anybody else who has spoken.

I was pleased to hear him say that the government is willing and anxious to amend the Audit Act. If that is done I think that is all the present auditor will require. Now I think if an inquiry is made, I have no doubt it will satisfy the Auditor. I think he is not an unreasonable man, if he had been he would not have occupied that position for 26 years. He was appointed by Mr. Mackenzie when premier of this country, he was well known to the premier, he sat in this House, he was a useful member of this House, he was the best mathematician in this country, and would not have received the appointment if he had been an inferior man. His services were needed at that time. The country was being robbed right and left, according to what Mr. Mackenzie himself said. He said he had all he could do, he had to stand guard over the public chest to keep the thieves away. That is why he appointed a man of the stamp of Mr. McDougall. Then when the Conservatives came into power four or five years after, and during the 18 years they remained in power, they retained the services of Mr. McDougall, they held up both his hands, and I never heard they had any accusation against him. I never heard that the opposition of that day had very much against him either. So he must have been a pretty good man in that office. The Minis-

ter of Justice tells us this evening what an able officer he is, how he has gone down to the Cornwall canal, taking engineers with him, and made a thorough investigation as to the lighting of that canal by these lamps, and ascertaining whether the government were paying too much for them. 30 cents a night seems to me to be altogether too much. However, that is not my business except as a member of this House whose duty it is to see that we do not pay more than a thing is worth. The government should inquire into this matter, they should have inquired long ago whether the previous government had made a foolish bargain or not. It seems to me rather late in the day to make these inquiries. However, the Auditor tells us that they are paying too much, and if so, then I think the government ought to assist him with a view of paying only what is right. I think it is our duty to maintain the present Auditor in his office. It will cost us less. If you superannuate him—he is only 65 years of age and he is good for ten years more—if you superannuate him you will have to pay him almost as much money as the next Auditor will get, that is, you will have to pay two auditors and you only require one. He is quite able and competent to discharge those duties, so I think the government had better amend the law; he is asking nothing unreasonable and I think the government should do it. Now speaking of auditors, do not the farmers, does not everybody in this country know what auditing means and what it costs? Why, Sir, there is not a village, town, township or county, or a loan society, or any other business corporation but requires an auditor to look into its financial affairs. Some business corporations have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars by inefficient auditors. Now when you have a man whom the whole people of this country respect, in whom you have full confidence, try and keep him as long as you can. Why, Sir, it is to my own knowledge that one loan company in a town near where I live have lost thousands and thousands of dollars through an inefficient auditor. I am pretty sure that the government will take this matter up. I am speaking on their behalf, I sympathize with them; I do not want them to go to the country with this affair hanging over their heads, having to meet the charge that they have thrown out the most efficient auditor this country ever had for the purpose of putting some man in his place that is anxious for the job. That is what they will surely be charged with if they let him go.

House divided on amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Henderson,
Armstrong,	Hughes (Victoria),
Avery,	Ingram,
Barker,	Kaulbach,
Bell,	Kidd,
Bennett,	Lancaster,
Birkett,	LaRivière,
Blain,	Lefurgey,
Borden (Halifax),	Lennox,
Boyd,	Léonard,
Brock,	MacLaren (Perth),
Broder,	Maclean,
Bruce,	McGowan,
Carscallen,	Monk,
Casgrain,	Morin,
Clare,	Northrup,
Clarke,	Pringle,
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Culbert,	Robinson (Elgin),
Daniel,	Roche (Marquette),
Donnelly,	Rosamond,
Earle,	Smith (Wentworth),
Fowler,	Sproule,
Ganong,	Taylor,
Gilmour,	Vrooman,
Gourley,	Ward,
Hackett,	Wilmot,
Halliday,	Wilson.—56.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Lang,
Archambault,	Lapointe,
Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beith,	Lavergne
Béland,	(Drummond & Artha.)
Bickerdike,	Law,
Blanchet,	LeBlanc,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Logan,
Bourassa,	Loy,
Brodeur,	Macdonald,
Brown,	Mackie,
Bruneau,	MacKinnon,
Bureau,	Macpherson,
Calvert,	McColl,
Carbonneau,	McCool,
Champagne,	McGugan,
Christie,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	McLennan,
Cowan,	Marcil (Bagot),
Davis,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Delisle,	Matheson,
Demers (Lévis),	Meigs,
Demers (St. John),	Mignault,
Desjardins,	Mulock (Sir William),
Emmerson,	Murray,
Erb,	Oliver,
Ethier,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Fisher,	Puttee,
Fitzpatrick,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gallery,	Riley,
Galliher,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gibson,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Girard,	Ross (Yukon),
Gould,	Russell,
Grant,	Scott,
Guthrie,	Sifton,
Harwood,	Sinclair,
Haszard,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Stephens,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Hyman,	Tolmie,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Tucker,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turgeon,
Kendall,	Wade,
	Wright.—94.

PAIRS :

Ministerials.	Opposition
Dyment,	McCormick,
Sutherland (Hon. J.),	Haggart,
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Wallace,	Tisdale,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Campbell,	Osler,
Ross (Ontario),	Clancy,
Gervais,	Kemp,
McCarthy,	Seagram,
Copp,	Hale,
Lewis,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Laurier (L'Assomption)	Johnson (Cardwell),
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Tobin,	Ball,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Lovell,	Kendry,
Tarte,	Dugas,
Thompson (Haldimand),	Calvin,
MacLaren (Huntingdon),	Roddick,
Morrison,	Porter,
Douglas,	Thomson (Grey),
Proulx,	Lavell,
German.	Tolton.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived.

PROCEDURE RE CONCURRENCE.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed in committee with the estimates which have already been under consideration, I have a suggestion to make as respects which I have had a conversation with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and in which I think I shall have his concurrence. Our session has now advanced into the new fiscal year and we have no supplies voted. From day to day claims will come in for the services of the current year, some of which may not be very urgent, but many of which are of a character that cannot conveniently be postponed. That would notably be the case in regard to the civil service and the payment of labour generally. In the case of larger claims, perhaps, no serious harm would come from a little delay, but it is very inconvenient to have claims of that character delayed even for a very short time. I have therefore to propose that the committee shall grant us what is called a 'vote on account' to the extent of one-fifth of the items that have not already been dealt with by the committee. We have dealt with a number of items which now stand on the order paper for concurrence. At the earliest possible moment I will ask the House to concur in these items and I would besides now ask the committee to favour us with this general vote of one-fifth of the items which have not yet been considered. I quite realize that in asking the committee to make this appropriation, it is necessary to have an understanding as to the effect of the committee granting this vote on account. Many of these items may possibly be the subject of consideration and debate. It is quite possible that some gentlemen may wish to object to some of them and therefore it should be perfectly understood that in voting for this one-fifth, as a matter of urgency, no hon. gentleman should be held as committing himself to the expenditure, but that every member should be absolutely free to discuss the matter as fully as if this vote had not been passed. It is a matter of urgency, it has been done on a number of occasions in past years and I hope I shall have the concurrence of hon. gentlemen opposite in meeting these urgent claims in the way I have suggested. I therefore beg to move that

A sum not exceeding the amount set forth below, be granted to His Majesty for the following services for the year ending the 30th June, 1905——

Then we set forth all the items not yet dealt with and take one-fifth in each case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The same question arose last session and I then satisfied myself that it had been the practice, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has just stated, to concur in such a vote on account. It is thoroughly understood, as I thought it was thoroughly understood last year, that in assenting to this vote for reasons which are in the public interest, we are not in any way depriving ourselves of the right to object to any item or to discuss to the fullest possible extent any of the items, a vote on account of which is thus given. In order that there may be no possible misunderstanding on that subject, I now express my concurrence in what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said. We are voting these items not because we have considered them, not because we are prepared to approve of them all, but because they are submitted by the government and no doubt will eventually be passed, and for public reasons it is necessary that many of them at least should be passed in this manner, in order that the public service might not suffer. In that view and only in that view, I assent to the proposal which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has just made.

Mr. BOYD. I wish once more to enter my protest against the causes which have made it necessary to have this vote on account taken. That necessity is brought about by the late date at which parliament is called together, and I enter my protest most strongly against the present practice as I did last session; at that time, I procured from 'Hansard' that the premier when in opposition held views expressed by myself on this matter. Coming as I do from one of the outlaying portions of this country, coming here at a great sacrifice, at a season when every man who has any business to attend to should be at home looking after it, coming here in the spring and staying here away into the summer and fall as we have been doing for the past few years, and as we seem likely to continue to do, I once

more protest on behalf of the people I represent, on behalf of those members who have to stay here Sunday after Sunday, week after week, month after month, when other members who happen to live in constituencies close to Ottawa, can come and go and attend to their business, spending three or four days out of each week in Ottawa, devoting the rest of their time to their business at home. Gentlemen representing constituencies in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and British Columbia, have to stay here day in and day out, week after week, month after month, all to suit the convenience of the government of the day. This government is not the only offender; previous governments have been equally at fault in this respect. I say that this House should be called together not later than November and that members of the government should see that their officials have their reports ready so that the House may meet at some reasonable time and not have it sitting at such a late date to suit the whim of the government or of some official of the government as has been the case in the past. If I thought that by not acquiescing in this vote I would help to bring about that happy day, I would do everything I could to prevent the government securing this money. In this case, I shall allow it to pass, but if it is to occur again the Minister of Finance may make up his mind that I shall oppose it so far as I am able.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been repeatedly challenged across the floor of the House for allowing all votes to pass without objecting to them. It was said last year that we voted all the money that was voted without objecting to more than two or three of them. Now this vote is part of the main estimates, and it must not be understood that in assenting to this we are assenting to the use of every dollar of money that is voted or that we are depriving ourselves of the privilege of adversely criticising the expenditures involved in the supplies which we are voting to-night. That right we intend to enjoy to the fullest extent and we do not wish to have it thrown across the floor afterwards that we did not object.

Mr. FIELDING. I entirely concur in the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that in passing these items, no member is to feel that he is committing himself or in any way restricting his freedom of discussion.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would not the Minister of Finance make some reply to my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) in regard to the holding of the sessions? I am firmly of opinion that a great improvement can be made in the conduct of the business of this House and also in the time of year at which the House is called together. I heard the hon. member from the western province (Mr. Boyd) make the same protest last year; I have heard him make it again to-night, and I think that every man in this House is of opinion that some improvement can be made and the protest having been entered, I think we are entitled to some statement from the government that they will seriously consider this protest and endeavour to arrange the public business so that it can go through with greater facility. These prolonged sessions are getting to be a serious thing for the members of this House. I feel it, and a great many hon. members in this House feel it, and we are looking for some kind of relief. It would be well worth the consideration of perhaps a joint committee to try in some way to improve the present condition of affairs.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The relief which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) seeks may probably be obtained before the next session of the House, because if the government ventures on a general election, it will be no longer in their power to fix the time for the calling of parliament.

Mr. LOGAN. You have another guess.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER. I wish to support the position taken by the member from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) in calling for an earlier opening of the session of parliament, but I cannot support the attitude of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) or of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes). As a specimen of cold blooded nerve, the appearance of these two gentlemen on the scene at this particular stage of the game, beats the record. I do not hold the government blameless for not having called the session earlier, but it is a matter of notoriety, it is a matter within the knowledge of every member of this House, that while the government has been to blame for not calling the session earlier, that has not been the sole reason for the undue lengthening of the session. It is not by any means the sole reason why we are here in mid-summer when we should be at home attending to our business. If the length of this session has been a burden to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), surely these gentlemen can sympathize with us who have had to stay here day in and day out, week in and week out, month in and month out, while they were attending to their own business, or serving their own pleasure at home or anywhere else they may have been. If this House is in session to-day in the middle of summer, it is because from day to day and from week to week, if not from month to month, a handful of members on the other side of the House have deliberately, persistently, and purposely obstructed the business——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. OLIVER. The spectacle——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; take it back.

Mr. OLIVER. The spectacle; the disgrace to the country——

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order and ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, if that language is to be allowed in this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was just about to remark that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) cannot say that hon. members purposely obstruct business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Deliberately obstructed business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Or 'deliberately' either.

Mr. OLIVER. I will amend that statement by saying——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take it back unreservedly and say, that so far as I can see their obstruction was absolutely purposeless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to state the fact so that it may go on record for the benefit of the electors of this country, that from day to day and from week to week, a handful of members of the opposition, numbering from ten to fifteen and perhaps not more than twenty, have held this House in session, not discussing questions of principle, not discussing questions of importance, but discussing trivialities, discussing quibbles, discussing anything that could delay the business of parliament. If the electors of this country knew the manner in which their business was conducted in parliament by certain of their representatives on the other side of the House, they would be ashamed of these representatives and ashamed of themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. OLIVER. Because it is possible for members to live within a days ride of this House to transact their business at home and still put in an occasional appearance here, it is a fact that these gentlemen systematically do so, and those of us who are not in that happy position are compelled to suffer in consequence. We have suffered year in and year out, and so far we have suffered in silence. But, when men who pay very little attention to their parliamentary duties such as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), get up to read lectures in this House, it is time for somebody to speak out and to tell the electors of this country how their business is being transacted by a portion, at any rate, of their representatives.

Mr. INGRAM. We have now heard from the independent member from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and I have been recently reading what is perhaps the cause of the hon. gentleman's speech to-night. Probably it will be news to hon. gentlemen of this House to know, that my hon. friend has received some government patronage, and he is now paying back to the government a return for the patronage they have bestowed on him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. INGRAM. Does any man deny it? My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has stated in this paper that he is an independent man, an independent supporter of the government, and yet to-night he finds fault with gentlemen on this side who in their judgment have criticised the estimates, and have given their attention to public business.

Mr. SCOTT. Might I ask a question of my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram)?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SCOTT. If I have the hon. gentleman's permission I will ask him a question.

Mr. INGRAM. Speak louder.

Mr. SCOTT. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is serious in stating that the hon. member for Alberta has received patronage from the government?

Mr. INGRAM. I made the statement and the hon. member for Alberta did not deny it. Is the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) a wet nurse for the member for Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER. To tell the truth I did not consider that any statement made by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) was worthy of denial.

Mr. INGRAM. We can refer to the public press, and we can find from the hon. gentleman's own newspaper something about that transaction. Do I understand him to deny it?

Mr. OLIVER. Deny what; make your statement.

Mr. INGRAM. Has my hon. friend received any government patronage?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I will put it a little stronger. Has the hon. gentleman's newspaper office published any immigration literature for which the government paid?

Mr. OLIVER. Published immigration literature? Do you speak of advertisements in the newspaper?

Mr. INGRAM. Never mind getting down to particulars; just state whether it is so or not.

Mr. OLIVER. In the first place the hon. gentleman does not own a newspaper; in the next place the newspaper with which the hon. gentleman is connected has not published any government immigration literature.

Mr. INGRAM. We understand the hon. gentleman to deny——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He does not deny it.

Mr. INGRAM. Am I correct in understanding the hon. gentleman to deny that the newspaper office with which he is connected received government patronage?

Mr. OLIVER. The newspaper with which the hon. gentleman is connected has certainly received government patronage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. It has been receiving it ever since it has been a newspaper, both from the late government and from the present government. There has been no change in the conditions in regard to that matter.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend did not think it worth his while to reply to the member for East Elgin, but he has been forced to do it, and he cannot show that he did not receive the government patronage. Now, I would like to say a few words with respect to the prolonging of this session. I want to tell my hon. friend from Alberta that if it were left to that hon. gentleman to criticise or find fault with any action of the government, we would find him minus his independent spirit, except of course when it suited himself. On this occasion it evidently suits him to rise in his place and defend the government and condemn hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for doing what they consider their duty. When the election takes place it is certain that hon. gentlemen opposite will find fault with the opposition for not criticising the public accounts. They will assert that we did not record our votes against the expenditure of this government. We are from day to day doing what we believe to be our duty in drawing the attention of the government to certain improper expenditures. So long as we are here we propose to continue in that course, and we do not propose to be lectured by the hon. member for Alberta. If that is the extent of his independence, we would ask him to kindly remain silent for the balance of the session, while we proceed with what we believe to be our duty. It is true, that the criticism on the estimates is confined to a comparatively few members on this side of the House; but I think we can claim the credit of having at least as many men capable of criticising the estimates as hon. gentlemen opposite had when they were in opposition. We can say this also with a great deal of pleasure, that our criticism has been carried on in a gentlemanly manner. We have not used the language which the hon. gentleman's friends used previous to 1896. We have used language that has been strictly parliamentary and that we are not ashamed of, and in criticising these estimates we propose to continue in the same tone of language. Hon. gentlemen blame the opposition for extending the session. I want to know from the government if they are assisting in shortening the session by retaining to this late date certain public measures which we find on the order paper—no less than seven measures? Are we to blame because these measures have not been brought down? Every hon. gentleman knows that in connection with constitutional government in this country or in any other, one of the weapons the opposition have in their hands is the estimates. Why do they reserve the right to criticise these estimates? First, to object to any unreasonable expenditure; and, secondly, as a means of hastening the government to bring down their measures in order that the opposition and the country may know what they propose to lay before parliament. All this is our right and duty, which we intend to exercise and we do not intend for one moment to tolerate any interference with our rights so long as we are exercising them in what we believe to be the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. OLIVER. I just rise to say that I am very glad the hon. gentleman does not approve of the remarks I have made. They were not made with the view of securing his approval.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Cornwall canal, enlargement, $26,500.

Mr. FIELDING. It is to be noted that all these sums will now be reduced to four-fifths. That is merely clerical work which I shall have to ask the clerks of the House to attend to.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is a revote of $8,450. Last session, $136,000 was voted, all of which was expended but $8,450. The total expenditure on this canal in connection with these works up to the 1st of May, 1904, was $7,016,328.33. The amount asked for is to be expended as follows; section 1, repairs and enlargement of the regulating pier of old lock, No. 17—estimated amount, $15,500; protection to North Bank at Pitt Street, $3,000; Sheik's Island, final estimate, $8,000. These three sums total $26,500.

Mr. PRINGLE. Might I ask the minister if there is anything in this appropriation for building workshops?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in this particular vote. It will come later.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister to the very dilapidated state that the wharf at Cornwall is now in—not the canal wharf, but the lower wharf at which the Richelieu steamers land. This wharf is in wretchedly bad condition, and I would like to know if any steps have been taken to have it repaired or rebuilt ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That particular wharf, being on the river, is under the management and control of the Public Works Department and does not come under my department.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose this item includes the lighting and so on, and I may just as well bring that matter up now.

Mr. EMMERSON. It does not include the lighting, but I suppose my hon. friend might as well bring it up now as any other time. The link between this item and the subject to which my hon. friend refers is to be found in the fact that this vote has to do with the Cornwall canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps the minister would explain the position of the government in so far as this contract is concerned ? Why did they extend the term of the original contract given in 1896 ? Why were changes made ? The minister should be able to give us a full statement of this whole matter, because it looks a very questionable one.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was sympathizing with the complaints made regarding the length of the session and therefore was not going to inflict on the committee any very lengthy details. But it seems to me that the whole matter has been explained, and the explanation has been repeated so often that it would be like imposing on good nature to inflict it again upon the committee.

Mr. CLARKE. I think we could stand it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know how long suffering my hon. friend is, but it seems to me it is only a diseased mind which could suspect anything wrong in connection with this transaction. I think I have explained why the $26,500 are required, and it is for my hon. friends opposite to show why it should not be voted. Having shown that the money is absolutely necessary, there should be no question about passing the vote.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have asked the minister a reasonable question and he states that on account of the length of the session he does not feel like inflicting any further explanation on the House. In fact, he treats the whole matter as a joke. But let me tell him that in 1896 the government then in power entered into a contract for the lighting of the Cornwall canal for twenty-one years. In addition it was specified in that contract that the government were to pay 30 cents per light for the number of lights that would be required, a certain amount per horse-power for any horse-power required, and they were to have the right to expropriate the whole property at any time on paying five per cent over the original cost. Under that contract the government were not compelled to take the power or any of the lights unless they saw fit to do so. They might establish another water-power if they chose and run their own lights or in any other way take power to open or manage their gates themselves. They simply specified that if they wished to work under this contract, they might do so. However, nothing was acted upon under that contract until the year 1900, just before the elections. At that time an Order in Council was passed by the government stipulating that there must be 250 arc lights placed on that Cornwall canal at a cost of 30 cents per light per night for the whole 365 days of the year. Thus the total cost for simply lighting the Cornwall canal was $27,375 per year. In addition an Order in Council was passed stipulating that the government should take 400 horse-power per annum for operating the locks, gates and bridges, at a cost of $63 per horse-power or $25,200 per annum. The government were thus to pay $52,500 per annum for lighting and operating the lock gates on the Cornwall canal. That is the contract which was made by the government now in office. These 400 horse-power which the government were to use for operating the locks, gates and bridges would only be used nine months in the year. They could not be used during the winter months, as neither gates nor the bridges are then opened. So that the stipulations of $63 per annum per horse-power really meant $63 per nine months. When this government were thus changing the contract and making a contract different from that passed in 1896, why did they not contract only to pay for this horse-power during the time it was used ? Because in making the rate $63 per annum, when they were only to use the power during nine months, they were really paying at the rate of $80 per annum. But that was not the most serious point. In addition they also passed an Order in Council extending the duration of the contract from 21 years to 84 years, or until 1979. Was there any reason why this contract should be extended ? Surely if the contractor had a contract for 21 years, that was quite long enough. That time, I should think as a member of this House, was sufficient ; it was as much as any contractor could reasonably expect from the government or from a private concern.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend, of course, has read the contracts and does not want to misconstrue the position.

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly not.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then, he will be delighted to know that the original contract was for twenty-one years with the right to renew for three consecutive periods of twenty-one years each.

Mr. J. D. REID. At what page do we find that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At page 9 of the general terms and conditions which are referred to in the lease.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have the original contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No doubt, but the hon. gentleman has not the general terms and conditions that are referred to in the lease.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where are we to find them ? We go to the blue-book for information.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman is going on the information that it has pleased the Auditor General to give the country, not on the facts.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the hon. minister wish to state that the Auditor General has mis-stated the case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes, certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister in his place in this House says that——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, I say so. There is no hesitation, equivocation or doubt about it—I say it positively. And I appeal to the hon. gentleman who made the contract and who is now sitting in this House.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the hon. minister read the clause ? Why have we not had this information before the House ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will read it. Take page 6 of the blue-book. It says——

> Witnesseth that the said lessor in consideration of the rents, covenants restrictions, provisos and conditions contained, described and expressed herein and in the annexed terms and conditions which are hereby adopted by the lessee and made part of this indenture——

And so on.

Now, a part of the information which is not in the blue-book but which should have been included in it and which was attached to the original contract, a copy of which I hold in my hand and which I lay on the table in order to make it a public document, is these annexed terms. On page 9, you will find the following as article 20 :

> Article 20.—The first day of July, A.D. 1895, and the first day of July of each twenty-first year thereafter following shall be dates from or up to which respectively the term of this lease of water-power shall be computed. The lessor covenants and agrees that if during the term of his lease the lessee do well and truly keep and perform all and singular the covenants, agreements and undertakings on the part of the lessee to be kept and performed as herein and in this particular lease contained, then the said lessor shall or will, at the expiration of the term of the lease, on the written request of the lessee made at least three months before such expiration, execute and deliver to the lessee, or to his legal representatives and recognized assigns, a removal of the said lease for a second term, which shall then be of twenty-one years, and also at the expiration of the aforesaid and of every subsequent period of twenty-one years, for eighty-four years from the said first day of July, A.D. 1895, and then to be completed and ended, with the same covenants and conditions as contained herein.

There is the original lease, and these are the terms of the original agreement. And I want now to state—because this is of some importance—that there is not a departure to the extent of one hair's breadth from the terms of the original lease with respect either to the price, the period the lease has to run, or the conditions of expropriation under the lease made in 1900 or at any time thereafter.

Mr. J. D. REID. I differ from the hon. minister. So far as the time is concerned—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, settle one thing at a time.

Mr. HAGGART. Are the specifications attached to the lease ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Here is the lease, the hon. gentleman can read it.

Mr. SPROULE. Why were not these papers laid on the table long ago ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman had better ask the Auditor General.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood they were asked for and promised some time ago.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, that document was never asked for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked for papers which included that. I did not ask for this particular document because I did not know of its existence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then, I apologize, I was mistaken, I did not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) had asked for it. However, I have given communication of this document before.

Mr. EMMERSON. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) get the papers he asked for ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but I did not know of the existence of this one.

Mr. HAGGART. I asked for the lease, the specifications, the Orders in Council, and also certificates of the chief engineer and the deputy head of the department

showing the value. Have these been brought down ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As to the values, I have the certificates of the three experts appointed by the Auditor General.

Mr. HAGGART. But has the hon. gentleman the values determined by the department ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no question about the values.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask if the hon. gentleman has laid on the table all the documents in existence bearing on this matter ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. The documents in existence go back to 1894, and they make a pile a foot and a half high. But I undertake that any document the hon. gentleman wishes for he shall have it, so far as I can control them.

Mr. CLARKE. The statement has been made just now that one hon. gentleman who asked for information was not aware of the existence of this document, which, evidently, is a very important one, and which should have been presented to the House by some person, especially in view of the report of the Auditor General.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not now saying anything with respect to the members of the opposition, but any man reading that document compiled by the Auditor General could see that it is an incomplete document. It refers to the terms and conditions attached to the contract. These terms and conditions were never produced because they would belie the statement heralded throughout the country with respect to the terms——

Mr. CLARKE. If the Auditor General has made any statement the effect of which would be to mislead or deceive the members of this House, it was the bounden duty of the government to implement that statement and place parliament in possession of all the facts. I asked the hon. minister a moment ago if he had laid all the documents on the table. I understood him to say that the documents go back to the year 1894 and are very voluminous. We are entitled to get all the information that would enable us to come to a conclusion on this question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) would indicate any document to which he wishes access, he can have it.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. minister will lay all the documents on the table we can examine them and see which are germane to the question before us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would take longer than to the end of the session to copy the whole file. But, let us proceed regularly. We are not, after all, interested in befogging the issue ; we are interested rather in clearing this transaction up. And the question is whether the contract was for twenty-one years, or for eighty-four years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, one thing at a time. Let us settle each point as we go along.

Mr. CLARKE. But surely if the desire of the government is that the issue shall not be befogged it rested primarily with them to implement the information of the Auditor General.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are doing that.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a long time since the statement of the Auditor General has been published. If there has been any misconception, surely the responsibility rests upon the minister or his colleagues for not bringing down the documents which would supply the missing links in the information already before us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A month ago I made a statement in the House correcting a statement made in connection with the time and nobody has undertaken to deny it.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister tells us that it would take longer than from now to the end of the session to copy these documents. But, surely, we cannot discuss this matter unless we are in possession of all the documents ? That statement must appeal with some force to the hon. minister. We get this information piecemeal. For instance, the document which the hon. gentleman has laid on the table is put before parliament for the first time, as I understand it, to-night. How can we be expected to grasp the meaning and effect of this document placed before us in the midst of a discussion at a quarter to eleven o'clock ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are dealing with a contract not made by us, but made in 1896 by the government that preceded us. The hon. gentleman who made the contract is here, and he can be questioned.

Mr. CLARKE. An hon. gentleman has made the statement within five minutes that he has asked for information long ago that has not yet been brought down.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice will probably answer me this : Is the lease that is made latterly upon the same conditions as was embodied in the one I made ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you have the power of fixing what rent you like for the lights?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course ; at the expiration of every period of twenty-one years. It is because men have been assuming all manner of things with respect to it

that the present impression exists. The original contract, if I may be permitted to say so, was entered into in 1896, in the month of June; but the entering into that contract was only in pursuance of an agreement that had been made previous to the 8th of February, 1896, which was then embodied in an Order in Council at the time. That contract, which was made at that time with respect to the period which the contract was to run, with respect to the number of lights, has not been departed from to the extent of one hair's breadth. The only thing that has been done by the subsequent contract is to do what the original contract provided should be done, that is to say, that the government engineer should determine the number of lights to be used and the quantity of horse-power necessary to operate the canal. That is all that has been done, and in every other respect the contract remains as it originally was. The original contract provided that Mr. Davis should supply light at the prices mentioned there, for the period mentioned there, and should supply power at the price mentioned in the original contract in 1896, for the period mentioned there, but that the number of lights would have to be fixed when the Cornwall canal was finished, when the construction was ended, and that the number of lights should be fixed by the one man competent to fix them, that is to say, by the government engineer, and that the number of horse-power should be determined by the government engineer, he being the only man competent to do it. That is all that was done in 1900—to fix the number of lights and the number of horse-power. In all other respects the contract is the original contract.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is under a mistake. He deduces from the statement of the Minister of Justice that this contract for the prices and for the lights extended for a period of twenty-one years. The fact of the matter is that there is a statement in the original contract which allows the government to fix the price and to determine the period. That is one of the conditions that you can fix or reject. Is not that what is in the contract?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. This presents a new phase of the subject to those of us who are desirous of ascertaining all the facts. The statement made by the Minister of Justice is certainly, coming from a gentleman in his position, a serious statement, so far as the bona fides of the Auditor General is concerned. In view of that fact, we ought to have these documents distributed amongst the members of the House at once.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will suggest further, that we should have the original documents, with the original signatures on them and the original specifications attached—all that laid on the table of the House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. CLARKE. If these matters will lead to a fuller, fairer and more intelligent discussion of this question, the House is entitled to be put in possession of all of them. There are no two opinions about that. I think if the Auditor General has, as the Minister of Justice has suggested, deceived the members of this House and the people of the country in the statement he has presented to us in his report, that it was the bounden duty of the government, at the earliest possible moment, to remove any impression that might have been caused by the publication of the statement of the Auditor General, and by placing before us these documents, so that they may be read into the report.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report from beginning to end he will not find in that report anything to justify the statement that we have departed from the original contract with respect to the extension of time, except in so far as that may be a matter of inference, because in one letter the Auditor General says that the safeguards which surrounded the public interest in the original contract did not appear in the second contract. That is the extent to which he goes, but he does not in any part of his report say that the original contract was for a term of twenty-one years. On the contrary, if my hon. friends will read the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth, on page 21 of the Auditor General's Report, they will find this statement:

> There appears an Order in Council of October 9, 1900, authorizing the agreement of October 19, 1900, under which the claim to payment is now made, but it is to be observed that this agreement of October 19, 1900, in fact amounts to nothing more than a fixing of the quantity of electric horse-power and electric light the contractor is to supply.

That is all it amounts to, and that is all in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, we are bound to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. The Auditor General is not here to make reply and answer the statements the Minister of Justice has made. In view of that fact, I repeat, and again urge upon the government, that we are entitled to have all the documents which have any bearing on the statements published by the Auditor General printed and circulated amongst the members of the House, in order that we may give an intelligent consideration to this whole matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think there ought to be any time lost in correcting the false impression that exists with respect to this contract. I think myself that a great deal of misapprehension exists in the public mind with respect to this contract For instance, I saw in the Montreal 'Gazette,' about the 30th of June, probably one of the most respectable newspapers pub-

lished in Canada, a statement to the effect that this original contract made for a period of twenty-one years was subsequently extended for a period of eighty years by this present government. That is absolutely incorrect; and when a paper of the authority of the Montreal 'Gazette' makes a statement of that kind, it is time that we should correct it.

Mr. CLARKE. I appeal to the hon. gentleman that if the public are being misled to any extent, if the members of the House are being misled to any extent by the publication of the Auditor General's Report, or by the article published in the Montreal 'Gazette,' it was the bounden duty of the government to place the House in possession of the facts that would remove the misapprehension that existed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. CLARKE. You are doing it now; and in view of the fact that these documents are being presented to us now, I think they should be printed and circulated at once amongst all the members, in order that we may have an opportunity of becoming seized of all the facts.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I made this statement a month ago, and I think now the time has come to speak with absolute frankness and candour in connection with this matter. I think that two or three gentlemen on the opposition side and two or three on this side should get together and look at the papers and decide which of the papers belonging to this voluminous record shall be published. That is perfectly fair, and I am quite prepared to acquiesce that the whole record should be examined.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that we ought certainly to have placed before us all the documents that have any bearing on this matter. I do not know whether the suggestion of the hon. gentleman could be improved or not. It seems to be a reasonable suggestion that some persons in whom we have confidence should examine these documents and select those that are pertinent, with a view of having them printed at once for the use of the members of the House. We want to get all the facts, and it is of the most vital importance to us that this House and the country should know whether the Auditor General, intentionally or unintentionally, has by anything that has been inserted in his report, or by anything that has been omitted from his report, misled the public as to the true intent and meaning of this new contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course there must not be any misrepresentation about this; I would be the last man in the world to charge the Auditor General with deliberately misleading the public. I want to state my facts and do not want to be responsible for inferences. The statement of fact which I make is that, attached to the original contract which is to be found at page 7 of the Auditor General's Report, there are terms and conditions in the schedule which are not produced by the Auditor General and which do not form part of the contract as he has printed it. That is the statement I make.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman said something further, that the omission of that portion to which he has referred has misled the public, and the Auditor General of course is responsible for that omission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And I say now—and my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) must not speak for me, he is much more eloquent than I am but I like to make my own speeches if he does not mind. The statement that I made was that in those specifications and terms and conditions attached to the original contract there was a clause which provided for a renewal of this contract for eighty-four years. That is what I say and by that statement I will be bound.

Mr. COCHRANE. There was no compulsion; you need not have renewed it if you had not seen fit.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is another question. At the period of renewal at the end of each twenty-one years provision is made that the rent shall be changed by the lessor; at the expiration of each twenty-one years the government has the right to determine the amount of rent the lessee is to pay.

Mr. CLARKE. I submit that if there is any substantial difference in the two contracts, that is an additional reason why they should long ago have been laid before parliament. If the last contract made any great change from the original contract and the renewal we should have had all the contracts here before us before discussing them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You have them.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman had sat reading that report as late as I have he would see the difference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Undoubtedly there is a reference to these terms and conditions by the Auditor General, perhaps he may have thought that it was sufficient to attract the attention of the public to these terms and conditions in that way. Therefore, I think we should not be hasty in attributing anything to the Auditor General. Article 20 of the General Terms and Conditions which would seem to provide for a lease of the water privileges is as follows:

> The first day of July, A.D., 1895, and the first day of July of each twenty-first year thereafter following shall be dates from or up to which respectively the term of this lease of water-power shall be computed. The lessor

covenants and agrees that if during the term of his lease the lessee do well and truly keep and perform all and singular the covenants, agreements and undertakings on the part of the lessee to be kept and performed as herein and in his particular lease contained, then the said lessor shall or will, at the expiration of the term of the lease, on the written request of the lessee, made at least three months before such expiration, execute and deliver to the lessee, or to his legal representatives and recognized assigns, a renewal of the said lease for a second term, which shall then be of twenty-one years, and also at the expiration of the aforesaid and of every subsequent period of twenty-one years, for eighty-four years from the said first day of July, A.D., 1895, and then to be completed and ended, with the same covenants and conditions as contained herein, unless modified as provided for in article 24, and with the exception of the rent, which rent shall, at the end of each term of years, be determined by the lessor, and if not agreed to by the lessee, the said rent shall be determined by the Exchequer Court, whose decision, after hearing the evidence of engineers, experts or other parties, which either the lessor or lessee may wish to present, shall be binding as to the rent payable for the renewal term: Provided, that if the lessee fail to keep and perform all or any of the said covenants, he shall not be entitled to any such renewal of his lease. The foregoing provisions of this article shall in no way interfere with the provisions and stipulations of article 21.

Under the agreement of 1896, the terms under which electric light was to be provided are set forth, but it is well to read in this connection article 24 which also is referred to. Article 24 is as follows:—

As to leases granted under the present provisions, the lessor shall also have and hereby reserves the right to modify any of such provisions in any subsequent lease granting a renewal thereof, but without affecting, however, the mutual rights and obligations of the parties thereto in respect of the amount of water-power leased and of the right of the lessee to use the same for the purposes originally contemplated. Provided also, that the lessee shall not be entitled to any such renewal lease or further term of the land, water-power or premises, as provided in article 18 of these presents, unless the rents reserved in the then existing lease have been punctually paid and all the conditions therein set forth to be fulfilled by the lessee have been duly fulfilled.

Now I understand that it is the argument of the Minister of Justice and I have been following him as closely as I can, that there is a definite agreement, under the agreement of June 25th, 1896, as to the period during which electric power shall be supplied. Do I correctly understand the minister as meaning that the lessor is bound to accept electric power for a period of eighty-four years, being a period coterminous with the term of years for which the lease is granted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is another question. The question now under consideration is whether or not there has been any departure from the terms of the original agreement with respect to the extension in any respect whatever. I say there has not been.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Evidently imperfect knowledge is the trouble in connection with this whole matter.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does my hon. friend say that there are no changes between the first contract passed in 1896, and the last contract passed in 1903?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what I said.

Mr. CASGRAIN. As to the number of lights and horse-power?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The number of lights and horse-power was not provided in the first contract at all.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend is wrong. I shall read it to the hon. gentleman at once. It is provided in the first agreement, which will be found at page 7:

That the lessee shall supply electric power to the satisfaction of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals for the working of all the locks on the Cornwall canal at sixty-three dollars per horse-power per annum.

That the lessee shall also supply and work electric direct current arc lights of not less than 2,000 candle power, in perfect working order, at such points and such number as shall, from time to time be deemed necessary by the chief engineer aforesaid, running all night.

And so on. Now therefore the number of lights and the number of horse-power was to be determined by the engineer. The second contract, which is to be found at page 11, contains this clause:

It is therefore agreed between the said parties hereto that the said Michael P. Davis shall under the said indenture furnish and supply to Her Majesty electric current for power purposes as aforesaid not less in any one year than four hundred electric horse-powers, and also supply and work electric direct current arc lights not less at any one time than two hundred and fifty lights, nor, without the consent of the lessor, more than two hundred and seventy lights.

A third contract which is at page 41, changes this again and it is said:

Now this indenture witnesseth that in pursuance of the aforesaid agreement, and in consideration of the premises, and of the considerations in the said indentures of the twenty-fifth day of June, 1896, and the nineteenth day of October, 1900, contained, the said parties hereto mutually agree, and it is hereby agreed and declared that at and from the 1st day of July, 1903, and thereafter during the continuance of the term granted and agreed on by and in the said two indentures, the said Michael Patrick Davis shall supply such electric power, not exceeding four hundred horse-power——

My hon. friend will notice the difference there.

—to the satisfaction of the chief engineer of railways and canals, as may by the said engineer be from time to time required in writing for the working of the locks and other purposes.

The same provision is repeated as to the electric light, but there again the contract says that the lights shall not exceed at any one time 250. You therefore have three distinct contracts as to the number of lights and horse-power, that are to be furnished. In the first contract it was to be determined by the chief engineer; by the second contract the government was to pay for not less within one year than 400 electric horse-power and 250 lights, and by the third contract it was changed again and the contractor was to supply horse-power not exceeding 400 and lights not exceeding 250. There are three differences here. The Minister of Justice cannot now say that there was no difference made in this respect between the first contract executed in 1896, and the last contract executed in 1903.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My answer to that is very simple. I will not travel over all the contracts, because this argument is made merely for the purpose of befogging the issue. The statement I made was that in the contract of 1900 there was no departure from the original contract except in respect to the number of lights and the number of horse-power, and I said there was no provision in the original contract with respect to lights and horse-power. I made that statement and 'Hansard' will bear me out in that. What my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has done, is to read what has already been read as to the number of horse-power and lights to be determined by the chief engineer. All the second contract of 1900 did was to put into effect the original contract, and to do that which the original contract contemplated; that is to say, to fix the number of lights and the number of horse-power as recommended by the chief engineer. That was what was done and that is all that was done. When we come to deal with the other contract as to the change we can easily deal with that, but one thing at a time. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me as to whether or not the original contract provided for the renewal of the right to supply horse-power for four consecutive periods amounting to 84 years, or whether or not the original contract had merely in contemplation the right to a lease of the power and of the land. The original contract had in contemplation lease of the power and of the land for 84 years; that is to say, the government parted with possession of the land and parted with possession of the power, and the original contract contemplated that Davis should supply electric light and should also supply electric power. The distinction my hon. friend has in his mind, is, that the obligation to take the power and to take the land was only for twenty-one years, whereas the lease of the power and the land continued to exist for 84 years. Here is the answer to that. On page 11 you will find the contract that we have made with Mr. Davis in 1900, and you will find in this contract that after having made provision for the number of lights and the number of horse-power, it is said:

Nothing herein shall be taken to vary, other than as above specified or provided, any of the provisions of the said indenture.

The original indenture remains absolutely the same with all its provisions, except that we determine the number of lights and the number of horse-power to be supplied.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it not make a change in regard to the payment?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say that I want to get at the meaning of the two contracts and the difference between them if any, and what I shall suggest now is for the purpose of having it answered by the Minister of Justice for my own information. The agreement of the 25th of June, 1896, granted the use of certain water to Mr. Davis for a period of 21 years for the purpose of creating power. By virtue of the general conditions which were attached and which became part of the agreement, that period could be increased to 84 years subject to the conditions, some of which I have read, and the conditions which I have read give power to the lessor to vary the rent at the conclusion of each period of 21 years, and in case of difference that rent was to be determined by the Exchequer Court. I may say in passing, that is one case in which the Exchequer Court has been called into action in connection with a government contract, although this afternoon the Minister of Justice did not seem to think that that was very good policy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am glad to find that that general principle is recognized by the terms and the conditions with regard to leases of water-power, which I understand have been in force for many years. In addition to the general conditions, the lessee made certain covenants and his first covenant was that he would pay a rent of $1,000 yearly every year during the term, for the use of the land and the power which was granted to him. That yearly rental was to be paid in advance on the second of January and the first of July each year, except during the first two years when he was not to be charged because his plant for the purpose of developing power would then be in the course of construction. Then follows the provision:

That the lessee shall supply electric power to the satisfaction of the chief engineer of railways and canals for the working of all the locks on the Cornwall canal at sixty-three dollars per horse-power per annum ;

That the lessee shall also supply and work electric direct current arc lights of not less than 2,000 candle power, in perfect working order, at such points and such manner as shall, from time to time be deemed necessary by the chief engineer aforesaid, running all night whenever so required, along the canal, &c.

Then the lessee was obliged to place such poles as should be directed for the purpose of conveying this power to the lights and I suppose also for the purpose of conveying power to the stations at which it was to be received for the operation of the canal. Up to that point you have not very much more than this ; that the government have the right to name the number of lights and they have the right to fix a certain number of horse-power which are to be supplied by the lessee. But until the government fix the number of lights and horse-power which they require, the lessee has not very much comfort out of the contract so far as anything is concerned that he might receive out of it. Up to that time it is an option on the part of the government, with the qualification that when they do exercise that option, they shall pay for the light and the power supplied at certain fixed rates. Does that idea agree with the view of the Minister of Justice ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know, so I could go quite that far.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has bestowed more attention than I have on the contract, and when he comes to speak he will correct me if I am wrong. In directing my attention to the second contract dated October, 1900, the Minister of Justice has quoted this provision of the contract :

Nothing herein shall be taken to vary, other than as above specified or provided, any of the provisions of the said indenture.

That would be very well indeed if it stopped there ; but there is something very significant immediately after, and which seems to indicate that my view as to the term during which light and power should be supplied, viz., that it cannot in any event under the first contract exceed the time of twenty-one years, is the correct view ; because we find that to be the understanding of the parties as evidenced by the provision which immediately follows in the contract and which is :

This agreement shall extend for twenty-one years from the date of the said indenture No. 12336, and shall thereafter be further extended by successive renewals to the first day of July, 1979, thus making the term of this contract co-existent with the leasing portion of the said indenture, and shall be binding on Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, and upon the said Michael P. Davis, his executors, administrators and assigns.

That would seem to me to be a direct statement by the parties of their understanding of the first agreement, and to express that understanding in this way, that the terms of the first agreement, so far as light and power are concerned, do not extend beyond the period of twenty-one years. Then the contract of the 19th of October, 1900, proceeds to make the term during which this light and power shall be supplied to the government co-extensive with the term already existing for the leasing of the land and water-power. I do not see how it is possible, in view of the terms of the contract of 1896 and of this provision which I have just quoted, to contend that the contract of 1900 did not extend for the term of sixty-three years the term during which the light and power should be accepted from Mr. Davis. As pointed out by my hon. friend from South Simcoe, that is borne out by the terms of the Order in Council of the 18th of October, 1900, which is supplementary to the Order in Council of October 9, 1900, and which is as follows :—

On a memorandum dated October 15, 1900, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that the Order in Council of October 9, 1900, authorizing the entry into contract with Mr. M. P. Davis in respect of the lighting, &c., by electricity of the Cornwall canal, be amended to such effect that the terms of twenty-one years therein named as the term of the said lease may be extended by successive renewals to July 1, 1979, thereby bringing it into conformity with the lease of water-power granted to Mr. Davis mentioned in the said order.

That Order in Council, of course, makes it perfectly clear that in the opinion of the government at that time the term of the contract for supply of light and power was not co-extensive with the term of the lease of land and water ; and the object of the Order in Council was to give the necessary authority for the making of the contract dated October 19, 1900, under which the term is extended from twenty-one years to eighty-four years. It would therefore seem to me, subject to such correction as may be offered my honourable and learned friend the Minister of Justice, that there was in that very important respect a divergence in the contract of 1900 from the terms of the contract of 1896. I might summarize the difference between the two contracts. Under the contract of 1896 the Crown had an option, but was not effectively bound to accept any particular amount of power from Mr. Davis, although if it did accept power, it was bound to pay for it at a specific rate. Under the contract of 1900, the amount of power which must be paid for at that rate was definitely fixed. Under the contract of 1896 there was no agreement binding upon the Crown as to any number of lights which the Crown was bound to take at the rates

specified, although if the Crown did agree to take any number of lights, they must be paid for at the rate specified, 30 cents per light for each night. Under the amended contract the Crown became bound to pay for a definite number of lights on the terms of the contract of 1896. Under the contract of 1896, however, the Crown did enter into an agreement to accept a certain number of lights and a certain quantity of power, to be afterwards defined, but only for the period of twenty-one years. That would seem to be in conformity with the general terms and conditions under which the Crown had the right to vary the rent at each particular period of twenty-one years; and therefore the Crown in making the bargain as to light and power, would naturally restrict itself to a term of twenty-one years in order that when that term expired it might vary the price, or say, we will not proceed further with this because the prices at which power and light can be furnished are materially different now from what they were when this contract was first entered into. But under the contract of 1900—I speak subject to correction by the Minister of Justice—that was absolutely departed from, and the terms as to price which were fixed by the contract of 1896 for a period of twenty-one years only, became then fixed for a period of 84 years. In these three important respects it seems to me as at present advised, that there were very important differences between the contract of 1896 and the contract of 1900.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it will perhaps be advisable, in the interest of the House and of the country, to have the terms of the contract set out, so that we may understand exactly what they mean. The original contract of the 25th of June, 1896, contains the following paragraph:

To have and to hold, the said lot of land and the said surplus water and such increased flow of water into the said canal from the said creek through any works of the lessee, as appurtenant to the said lot of land for the erection of an electric plant and the operation of the machinery therein, and the privileges, rights and easements thereof for the term of twenty-one years from and after the first day of July, A.D., 1896, and ended on the first day of July, A.D. 1917, and thereafter for a term or period of twenty-one years, renewable as is provided and mentioned in the annexed general terms and conditions.

Here you must read in of the annexed general terms and conditions article 20:

The first day of July, A.D. 1895, and the first day of July of each twenty-first year thereafter following shall be dates from or up to which respectively the term of this lease of water-power shall be computed.

That is read into the original contract, which provides for the granting of this power for the erection of an electric light plant and the operation of the machinery; that is the object for which it is conferred.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon. friend pardon me if I make a suggestion simply for the purpose of getting down to the real issue, if there is any, between us? I do not understand that the development of light and power by the lessee was solely for the purposes of the government?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not solely, but chiefly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may or may not be; we cannot tell; but it is contemplated that he shall develop it for other purposes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, and that is important in connection with what I am quoting:

The lessor covenants and agrees that if during the term of his lease the lessee do well and truly keep and perform all and singular the covenants, agreements and undertakings on the part of the lessee to be kept and performed as herein and in his particular lease contained, then the said lessor shall or will, at the expiration of the term of the lease, on the written request of the lessee made at least three months before such expiration, execute and deliver to the lessee, or to his legal representatives and recognized assigns, a renewal of the said lease for a second term, which shall then be of twenty-one years, and also at the expiration of the aforesaid and of every subsequent period of twenty-one years, for eighty-four years from the said first day of July, A.D. 1895, and then to be completed and ended, with the same covenants and conditions as contained herein, unless modified as provided for in article 24, and with the exception of the rent.

It is not necessary for me to read further. So that you have the original lease containing the condition that it is to be renewed for four successive periods of twenty-one years and that the lease is granted to Mr. Davis, not only of a lot of land, but of the surplus power for the purpose of erecting electric plant.

Mr. HAGGART. These are the general specifications attached to all leases.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, every canal lease of water-power has the same provision and there is no exception in this case. It is the usual form attached to all leases:

And the said lessee covenants and agrees to pay Her Majesty the Queen, Her heirs and successors——

That is what the lessee obliges himself to do——

And the said lessee covenants and agrees to pay Her Majesty the Queen, Her heirs and successors, the rent or sum of one thousand dollars yearly and every year for the rent of the said lot of land and for the use of said surplus water and any increased flow of water into the said canal from the said creek through any works of the lessee; all such water to be drawn and conducted from and out of the Cornwall canal at the regulating weir, as shown on the plan hereunto annexed.

The said yearly rent shall be paid in advance on the second day of January, and the first day of July, in each year, dating from the first day of July, A.D., 1896, the rent for the first two years, in consideration of the erection of the necessary buildings, machinery and other works, not being charged.

Then follows this important clause :

That the lessee shall supply electric power to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals for the working of all the locks on the Cornwall canal at $63 per horse-power per annum.

That is his obligation. He gets a lease of the power for the purpose of erecting plant and machinery for a period of eighty-four years, and he obliges himself to pay a rent and to supply the power. Where is the restriction there as to twenty-one years? His rent is to continue throughout all the term of the lease, which is for four successive periods of twenty-one years each, but at the expiration of each period the Crown has the right to increase the rent. His obligation is to supply the power and lighting and that continues throughout the entire term of the lease. The next paragraph provides :

That the lessee shall also supply and work electric direct current arc lights of not less than 2,000 candle power, in perfect working order, at such points and such number as shall, from time to time be deemed necessary by the chief engineer aforesaid, running all night whenever so required, along the canal, and maintain and keep the same in good order and condition and provide all electrical connections, labour, tools, plant, material and everything necessary for the regular operation of the plant at his own cost and expense at thirty cents per light per night.

My construction of that agreement is that it provides for the lease to Mr. Davis of the surplus water of the Cornwall canal, after the requirements of the canal have been provided for and after all leases then existing and all leases that might thereafter be made had been satisfied. He got the surplus and in addition he obtained the right to construct some works at the entrance of the canal so as to increase the flow of water. He obtained that for four successive periods of twenty-one years each and his obligation was to pay the rent and supply power. First look at the reasonableness of the conditions, for after all we have to look at this contract in the light of the conditions existing at that time. The government was parting with the possession of the only available means of lighting that canal by electricity and of providing the electric power necessary to operate it. The government was handing these over to Mr. Davis for eighty-four years. Is it not a reasonable construction to put on this agreement that when the government was parting with that power to Mr. Davis, it stipulated that Mr. Davis should provide what was necessary to operate and light the canal. And that obligation to supply the power and the lights will be coexistent with the terms of the lease under which he took possession of the means necessary to do that which the government wanted to have done. Let us go back to the original agreement and I can see no reason why there should be any dispute with respect to it. That original agreement was as good a one from a business standpoint, as it was possible to make. It provides for the price to be paid for the lights and the power, and the question is whether at the time the lease was made these prices were fair and reasonable. Can that be successfully disputed? I say it can not. I say that at the time this lease was made the prices stipulated were reasonable. The only possible criticism would be that the government did not provide that at the expiration of each definite period the prices might be reduced, because ordinary prudence would anticipate a reduction in the cost of electric power, and provision should have been made that at each recurring period new prices might be fixed. But the contract provides that at the expiration of each period of twenty-one years the government has the right to determine the rent which Mr. Davis is to pay. If the government continues to pay high prices for light and power, it may charge a proportionately high rent for the lease of the land. In this way it has the upper hand. I shall not weary the House any more with this contract except to this extent. We must bear in mind that it was not possible at that time to determine the number of lights that would be required and it was equally impossible to determine the number of horse-power. The canal was then in process of construction, and it was impossible to say, before it was completed, what number of lights would be required to light the canal and what number of horse-power would be required to operate the locks and gates. Consequently the government said : We will oblige you to supply the power and the lights and we will fix the price ; but in so far as the number of lights and horse-power is concerned, that will be fixed by the government engineer when the canal is ready to be put into operation. And in the year 1900, when the canal was completed, the government engineer, as appeared by the Order in Council, fixed the number of lights and the number of horse-power required. And what has been the result? The number of lights which he estimated has been found by three experts appointed to investigate, with the consent of the Auditor General, to be exactly the number required. That appears by the Auditor General's Report on page 47 :

The 250 lights appear to be no more than sufficient to light the canal, as the lamps which are placed 400 feet apart are not too close for proper illumination.

That is the conclusion of the experts, so that the number of lights fixed in antici-

pation by the Deputy Minister of Railways and the government engineer has been found to be exactly what was required. The government engineer also, under the terms of the original contract, was to fix the number of horse-power, and he made an estimate which will be found on page 33 of the Auditor General's Report. They fixed the number of horse-power at 417. The contract provided for 400. When we get down to detail, as we shall in a few minutes, I think, I can give the report prepared by the government engineer which shows that what he anticipated is borne out. It shows the exact number of locks, the number of gates, number of bridges, sluices, weirs and so on, and the exact horse-power for each and shows the quantity of power actually required for the purpose of the canal to be 451 horse-power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the experts report 125 ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. The experts went down and examined the canal with a view to the work to be done and the installation that it would be reasonable immediately to adopt, and recommended that a contract be entered into immediately and that was the exact number of horse-power is found in the Auditor General's Report at the foot of page 49. That horse-power is given there at 268. In advance of the experts the Auditor General, not satisfied with the position he took said : We will not take any estimate or average ; there is the canal and there are the appliances and we will pay for the number of horse-power actually supplied. And it was ascertained at the time that the horse-power actually supplied was 126. And he provides in the draft contract that the power required for all the appliances might amount to 400 horse-power, because the contract provides that Mr. Davis is to be paid up to 400 horse-power. The Auditor General knew that. The only trouble is, as I said in discussing the matter before, there is no use trying to get away from the issue—that this was entered into with Mr. Davis in 1900, and he was obligated to provide the power within a certain time—I think it was two years—and at the expiration of that period the government ought to have had the equipment necessary to utilize the power he was ready to supply. When he had made his bargain and completed his contract, he came to the government and said : Where are the appliances on which this power is to be used ? And the government was compelled to acknowledge that it was not ready. Experimenting had been going on and the work could not be finished. Mr. Davis said : According to the strict terms of the contract I am entitled to be paid for a certain horse-power because I am ready to supply it, and if you cannot use it that is your fault ; I have done all that I am obliged to do. Was not that a fair and reasonable position for Mr. Davis to take ? The difficulty arose through the government, in the course of experimenting with winches and so on required on the canal being prevented from getting ready in time. For instance, three different winches were experimented with. And, to show how this thing has gone, let me say that the experts who were dealing with the winches calculated that these appliances would require, to move them, ten horse-power each. It has been found now that it takes twenty horse-power to move each winch. There are six winches on the canal, so 120 horse-power is required for winches alone. It seems to me the matter is a simple one. Mr. Davis, having executed his part of the contract, was entitled to ask the government to pay him, whether they were ready with their part of the work or not. That was what it came back to. And the government, not being ready at the time found it convenient to take advantage of the section of the contract and say to Mr. Davis : We will have to modify the terms of your contract or else take over the whole thing under the expropriation clause. To suggest corruption under these circumstances seems a little far-fetched. If Mr. Davis had a corrupt bargain with either government or with anybody connected with either government and was in a position to enforce it he would not have taken the position he did. The best evidence of the honesty of all parties is that everybody has acted in good faith and that not a dollar has been paid out improperly or unreasonably. So far as I am personally concerned, I know Mr. Davis. He has been carrying on a large public contract in my own constituency. I know Mr. Davis's character sufficiently well to say that he would not be connected with any corrupt bargain with any government. If he has any political preferences, they do not cause him to lean to our side. He is an honest man, I am sure he is a good contractor, and would not want to do anything but what is fair and right, and, so far as this contract is concerned, he has not done anything but what is fair and right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I had not got to the stage of criticising the terms of either one contract or the other. The subject with which I was dealing, and which the Minister of Justice left to the latter part of his remarks was the difference between the contract of 1896 and the contract of 1900. I will not go over the ground. I have already gone over. I have pointed out that under the agreement of 1896 there was, in fact an option in the government, because the government were not bound to take more than one light or one horse-power. To take that much would have satisfied the terms of the contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree with that. It was a question to be determined by the government engineer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree with that. We are not so far apart as to the construction of the agreement, except in one respect which I shall mention a little later. I admit the power of expropriation in the agreement of 1896 is a very important one and its usefulnesss was illustrated by what the Minister of Justice has said—that it was the means of inducing Mr. Davis to enter into a different agreement after the Auditor General had raised some objection to the proposed payments under the two agreements of 1896 and 1900.

The Minister of Justice did not deal, it seems to me, with one very important matter that was brought to his attention in my remarks. Under the agreement of 1896 the lighting and power were to be supplied only for twenty-one years. I directed the hon. gentleman's attention to the very plain and definite statement in the agreement of 1900. I do not see how there could be any answer to it. And I am sure the hon. minister does not see how there could be any answer becaues he has made no reference to it. It says :

This indenture shall extend for twenty-one years from the date of the said indenture No. 12336, and shall thereafter be further extended by successive renewals to the first day of July, 1979, thus making the term of this contract coexistent with the leasing portion of the said indenture, and shall be binding on Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, and upon the said Michael P. Davis, his executors, administrators and assigns.

Now with that clause of the agreement of 1900 staring us in the face, is it possible for us to say that the parties to the agreement of 1896 understood anything else ? They have placed under their hands and seals as distinctly as the English language can state it, their understanding that under the agreement of 1896 light and power were to be supplied only for a term of 21 years. How are they going back on that ? So far as the government is concerned, I have pointed out the Order in Council of October 16, 1896, which expressly states the same thing in so many words, speaking of course only for the government, because the Order in Council would not bind Mr. Davis. Further than that, even by the Order in Council of the 9th October, 1900, the same thing is stated, and it is in the latter part of that Order in Council :

It to be an express provision that, in the event of any difference of opinion arising between the contractor and the Department of Railways and Canals as to the number of horsepowers actually supplied, that quantity shall be determined by three arbitrators, one to be named by the Department of Railways and Canals, one by the contractor, and the third by the two so named ; or failing agreement, by judge of the Exchequer Court ; the said contract to be in force for a term of twenty-one years.

That is what the government themselves say, looking at the contract of 1896 : The agreement which we made was for a terme of twenty-one years. Even if my construction of the agreement of 1896 were not the true one, still it seems to me that the government had power to say exactly that which they did say in the Order in Council of 1896. They were not bound to take more than one horse-power or more than one electric light from Mr. Davis, and if they saw fit to take 250 lights and 400 horse-powers, they could accompany it by a stipulation which they inserted in the Order in Council of October, 1896, namely, that their contract to take more than that should be in force only for a term of 21 years. I do not see that there is any answer to that argument, which, I place with some confidence before the House and before the Minister of Justice, because the first matter we want to settle is whether the Auditor General is right in the position which he has taken that there was in that regard an extension of time for supplying light and power from 21 years to 84 years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. With respect to the obligation, if the engineer of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals decided that one light was sufficient to light the canal and that one horse-power was sufficient to operate it, Mr. Davis was bound by that conclusion of the engineer ; but if the engineer came to the conclusion that 250 lights would be required to light the canal and 400 horse-powers to operate it, and chose to take only one horse-power from Mr. Davis and the balance from somebody else, that he could not do. Whatever was required to do the lighting and operating had to be taken from Mr. Davis under this contract. If the engineer determined that there were to be so many lights and so many horse-powers, then Mr. Davis was entitled to supply all the lights and all the horse-powers. That is the first fact. Then as to the next, my hon. friend's argument is that under the term of paragraph 10 on page 11 : ' This agreement shall extend ' and so forth, the position is this : That formerly Mr. Davis was entitled to a lease of the power for 84 years, but there was no obligation on the part of the government to take light and power from him for any period beyond 21 years. That is the result of the insertion of this paragraph of the obligation to take light, and the obligation to take power is extended for the same period as the lease of the water-power and the lease of the land. That is my hon. friend's position.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what the agreement says.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. From my standpoint that is not the agreement. I contend that the original agreement provided for the leasing to Mr. Davis of the surplus power

and of the land for 84 years, and that the condition upon which that lease for that period is granted to him is that for that period of 84 years he shall pay $1,000 a year, subject to changes at each renewal, and that the obligation to pay the rent and the obligation to supply light and power are coexistent or coextensive with the condition of the lease, that is to say, that the one is for 84 years and the other is for 84 years also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice can take that position only by arguing that both parties under the terms of the agreement of 1900 to which I have referred, were under a misapprehension as to the true construction of the contract of 1896. If the Minister of Justice is right as to the meaning of the agreement of 1896, then you never would have found this clause to which I have drawn attention in the agreement of 1900, because it would have been absolutely absurd. You will observe that in the first part of it they say this :

> That nothing herein shall be taken to vary, other than above specified or provided, any of the provisions of said indenture.

Then they go on to make a provision that is absolutely inconsistent with the view which my hon. friend entertains of the meaning of the agreement of 1896, there cannot be any question about that. Both parties say distinctly in this agreement what the government has said in both Orders in Council, that under the agreement of 1896 the term during which the government were obliged to accept light and power was a term of 21 years, only not a term of 84 years. And we are always entitled, as the Minister of Justice knows, to construe one agreement, where its meaning is in any way doubtful or ambiguous, by other agreements made between the same parties ; and when we find any possible doubt as to the meaning of the agreement of 1896 we have a perfect right to go to the agreement of 1900 for the purpose of understanding anything which is in the slightest degree doubtful. Construing both agreements together, as we are bound to do, it necessarily follows that the agreement of 1896 did not mean a term of 84 years but meant a term of 21 years.

However, as the Minister of Justice has very fairly suggested that there should be some gentleman named on this side of the House to look at the voluminous file which relates to this matter, I shall be very happy if the gentleman whom I name will be willing to act. I would name the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) as three gentlemen on this side of the House who will be prepared I think to undertake that duty.

Mr. PRINGLE. Before this discussion closes, there are one or two things concerning which I would like a little light myself. I think it would be well that the Order in Council of the 8th February, 1896, should be brought down.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is down, that is a recommendation to Council, and the Order in Council is dated the 18th. I have not got the recommendation, I have got the Order.

Mr. PRINGLE. Well, probably this matter will come up for discussion again after the other documents are brought down.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like for my own sake to have one document produced. I acted in reference to the prices on the recommendation of the department and if I remember rightly there is a written report as to the value of the lights. I remember particularly the department inquiring into the cost of lighting in seven or eight places, and that the rate of $63 per horse-power as the value of the energy was arrived at. There was no such thing in the country then as electric light for sale, and I ordered the deputy to arrive at some reasonable rate. There is a report in reference to the lighting at 30 cents per night.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The experts appointed by the government with the consent of the Auditor General say in their report that the price charged for power is perfectly reasonable. That will be found in the report.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a doubt on that, a serious one, I suppose.

Mr. PRINGLE. May I ask if these are the correct figures as to payments under the existing contracts.

125 horse-power at $63..	$ 7,875
100 lights for 121 nights at 30 cents a night..	3,630
250 lights for 244 nights at 30 cents a light, in all..	18,300
A total of..	$29,805

My reason for asking is that I find in discussing this matter in the constituency in which I live that there is a very wrong impression as to the amount which is being paid. The impression abroad is that there is some $52,000 or $53,000 being paid under the existing contract and on looking at the contract I find that the maximum number of lights is 250 lights for 244 days, and 100 lights for 121 days, and the quantity of power in use 125 horse-power, which would make a gross revenue of $29,805. I also find, taking the operating expenses, &c., as estimated by the engineer to be about $20,000, a net revenue of $9,805 at the present time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know what the amount paid is but we ought to be able to ascertain that.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the Auditor General

has had an opportunity of seeing the papers which were laid on the table to-night. My information is that he did not see them or know of their existence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The terms and conditions of the lease ?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know that he has seen them, but the lease which he publishes refers specially to them, so that in order to understand the lease —and I am sure he understood it perfectly well or otherwise he would not have reported on it—he must have read the conditions; he could not have understood the lease without it, and of course I assume he must have seen that document.

Mr. WARD. Early in the discussion I understood the Minister of Justice to say in reply to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) that the Auditor General, in not publishing the terms and conditions of the lease of 1896, had concealed from the public the fact that the lease of 1896 was renewable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend understood me to say that, I fear that these words must have escaped me. It does seem to me that it is impossible to understand the effect of the original lease without understanding the terms with respect to the revenue. If my hon. friend will look at page 7 he will see that it is there stated that it is renewable as is provided and mentioned in the annexed general terms and conditions.

Mr. WARD. My hon. friend will see that the insinuation against the Auditor General was that he had concealed from the public the fact that that lease was renewable at all. If my hon. friend will read that portion of the lease he will find that it says that it is :

To have and to hold . . . from the first day of July, 1896, and ended on the first day of July, A.D. 1917, and thereafter for a term or period of twenty-one years, renewable as is provided and mentioned in the annexed general terms and conditions.

I do not think my hon. friend would wish to do the Auditor General any injustice in this matter and I think he should withdraw what he said about the Auditor General with regard to there not being a clear statement in his report that that lease of 1896 was renewable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am in the judgment of the House as to what I said and I will refer my hon. friend to 'Hansard.' I think he will find that I made the statement before as I make it now,that you could not find in the Auditor General's Report, if you looked at it from beginning to end, a paragraph, clause or line which says that this contract was not renewable. My trouble about it is that my hon. friends opposite, my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) for instance said that this contract was only for 21 years and was not renewable. Everybody says that and it seems to me that somebody must have gathered that impression from somewhere outside and they have not read the agreement. Furthermore I will refer to the Montreal 'Gazette,' a paper of the greatest respectability. I do not always agree with the 'Gazette' but when the Montreal 'Gazette' made that statement I thought it was time to correct it. However, if I made any statement about the Auditor General wilfully suppressing anything I withdraw it. He may be guilty of all the crimes in the calendar but he certaily is not guilty of lack of courage.

Mr. LENNOX. There is another view of the matter that I think has been overlooked. I am looking at section 32 of the Audit Act, which is the only clause governing this matter. It provides that no cheque for public money shall issue except in certain cases and it provides among other things for the overruling of the Auditor General under certain circumstances. Now I think that not only must the Minister of Justice withdraw the implications that he cast upon the Auditor General, but he must also withdraw them as regards the Minister of Finance, if this is the only clause, and I think it is, that provides for the reporting of this matter to parliament in the Auditor General's Report. The concluding clause of clause 32, that is subsection 2, provides :

The Auditor General shall in all such cases——

That is in all cases where he has been overruled as I understand it.

—prepare a statement of all such legal opinions, reports of Council, special warrants and cheques issued without his certificate, and of all expenditures incurred in consequence thereof, which he shall deliver to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to be by him presented to parliament not later than the third day of the session thereof then next ensuing.

It may be that the Minister of Justice will point out to me that this is not the provision under which this statement is prepared, but there seems to be no other provision of the Audit Act which covers the matter and the duty of reporting on this Davis transaction and all other cases of overruling rests not so much on the Auditor General, as upon the Finance Minister and Receiver General. If there has been any omission, and if the Minister of Justice was justified in raising any objection however shadowy against the Auditor General, I think it should rather be transferred to the Minister of Finance. I believe as a matter of fact that the Minister of Finance has always brought down the report.

Mr. J. D. REID. The original contract specifies for twenty-one years, subject to renewal upon conditions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. J. D. REID. I find that the government, by Order in Council on October 15th, 1900, extended it by successive renewals to 1979. That Order in Council makes it imperative on the government to continue the contract for eighty-four years, whereas the original contract was simply for twenty-one years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Renewable.

Mr. J. D. REID. The original contract made it renewable subject to certain conditions, whereas this contract says it is to continue to 1979.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is in the original agreement.

Mr. J. D. REID. This original contract was made in June, 1896, immediately before the Conservative government went out of power. It was not necessary for this government to accept it if they did not wish to do so. If they had said one horse-power or one light, they would have carried out the original contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, my hon. friend will understand that he and I differ on that point.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the Minister of Justice differs with me, I would like to hear his explanation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, I do not think my hon. friend is quite fair to me. He and I get along very well together, and it is not treating me very handsomely to tell me, after I have been trying to explain this one point for an hour, that I have not given an explanation.

Mr. J. D. REID. The very day this government passed an Order in Council indicating 250 lights and 400 horse-power they assumed the responsibility of that contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No doubt.

Mr. J. D. REID. They assumed the responsibility of paying $52,000 a year for lighting the Cornwall canal. The Minister of Justice will acknowledge that I am right in that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. EMMERSON. You do not mean lighting alone. There is the operation of the canal by electricity and many other things included.

Mr. J. D. REID. You pay $52,000 a year for lighting the Cornwall canal and for horse-power to move the gates.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To move the gates and the bridges; and there are the workshops and quite a number of things.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, put it all in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, you might as well include it all.

Mr. J. D. REID. The government passed that Order in Council when they had before them the fact that for the Soulanges canal which is about the same length and has the same number of locks as the Cornwall canal——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Auditor General states that the Cornwall canal has seven locks and two bridges and the Soulanges canal six locks and seven bridges.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend would be amazed to hear that on the Cornwall canal there are eleven locks and on the Soulanges canal there are four locks, according to the certificate of the chief engineer of government railways, dated on the 2nd of July, 1904.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps that may be right, but I quoted from the official record.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not from the official record; you are taking it from the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not know that the Auditor General is trying to mislead us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Cornwall canal is twelve miles and the Soulanges canal eleven and a half miles, and yet for lighting the Soulanges canal and operating the bridges and locks in the same way as the Cornwall canal, it only cost $9,800 per annum.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not correct.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am taking it from the official records.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The official records show that the wages alone, with the cost of operating, is $11,131, to which you must add interest.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Justice says that it cost $11,044.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. $11,131; I want to be strictly correct.

Mr. J. D. REID. To which you add the interest of the cost, $160,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You are again wrong; the cost is $218,175.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is $6,000, so that that makes $17,718 on the Soulanges canal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What about your depreciation?

Mr. J. D. REID. Never mind that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never mind anything.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, I would take it $17,000, interest and all, on the Soulanges canal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What about depreciation of plant ?

Mr. J. D. REID. That would not be 10 per cent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At 10 per cent it would be $21,000, and that would bring you to $38,000 on the Soulanges canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. In ten years you would renew the plant. The Minister of Justice makes a contract for $53,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For double the work.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Justice knows that there is not a depreciation of 10 per cent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You gave the figures.

Mr. J. D. REID. Suppose there were, it would only amount to $30,000 on the St. Lawrence canals.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What would be the depreciation ?

Mr. J. D. REID. It would not amount to 2 per cent per annum.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If you look at the Auditor General's Report, at page 50, you will find that the average depreciation is 6 per cent. There would be $12,000 for depreciation.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does not the hon. Minister of Justice make a contract for $53,000 ? He estimated 250 lights.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, because I put double the work on.

Mr. J. D. REID. He puts double the lights.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is wrong again. On the Soulanges canal the lights are 213 arc and 310 incandescent. If he figures out 13 incandescent to 1 arc light, he will get the exact number.

Mr. LENNOX. I suggest that we leave the matter until we get the information.

Item allowed to stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to give some information with respect to item 98. Some hon. member asked for the number of the operating staff on the canals. I have that here. I was also asked to give the estimate of the cost of the electric lights on the Welland canal and also the estimated cost of the motive power for bridges and gates. In the one case it is $100,000 and in the other case $150,000, the two making $250,000 for the electric lighting plant and for the motive power plant on the Welland canal.

Mr. J D. REID.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have that.

Mr. HAGGART. How many horsepower for lighting ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 500.

Mr. HAGGART. I think we can wait for the rest of the information until to-morrow.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the business for to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. If the clerks have the work ready, we shall ask the House to take concurrence, in accordance with the understanding this evening. After that the Minister of Justice will take up the Railway Bill, and if supply be reached, we shall take up the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 14, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. C. H. PARMELEE moved :

That the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization have leave to sit during the sittings of this House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. That question was before the Committee on Agriculture, but it was held in abeyance. There was no recommendation from the committee. We did not recommend that such a thing should be done ; therefore, the House is not likely to consent to it.

Mr. PARMELEE. I am not aware that there is anything in the rules of the House which prevents us from making this motion directly to the House. It is the permission of the House that is required, and I do not understand that it requires an absolute recommendation from the committee. The necessity of it was recognized in the committee. There was more or less apparent obstruction in the committee this morning, the session is drawing to a close, there is a good deal of work to do yet, and from all appearances that work is going to take a good deal of time. It is simply to gain a day that this motion is made. It is perfectly reasonable and it is not in contravention of any rule or precedent of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. But the committee have not asked it, and precedent to the House granting that privilege there has always been a request from the committee. The House have never done it without a request from the committee. The committee have not requested it.

Mr. F. B. WADE. A resolution to this effect was moved in the committee this morning but before it could be put to the committee some one called out 'eleven o'clock,' and insisted that the committee rise, notwithstanding the earnest protest on the part of several members of the committee that the committee could sit until we heard the call-bell of the House. The committee rose and the chairman did not put the resolution. It is impossible to get through with the business of the Agriculture Committee in a short session from 9.30 to 11 o'clock, because any matter can be debated to such an extent that it will be impossible to arrive at any conclusion as happened this morning and as happened at the last meeting of the committee.

Mr. JAS. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I think that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will conclude that it is the privilege of the committee to debate any question as they think proper. But, to come here when there is no recommendation from the committee which should be the judge whether we should extend the hours of sitting or not is quite unprecedented. The right hon. leader of the government knows well that it is always an awkward thing to have eleven o'clock sittings when there remains some unfinished work to be done by the committees. There is an hour and a half, if the chairman desires to call the committee earlier, in which the committee may sit. Until there is a recommendation from the committee itself that we should absent ourselves from the sitting of this House it seems to me an extraordinary proceeding that any hon. gentleman should propose to have the committee sit during the period that members are obliged to be in their places here. I will not reflect in the least upon the objects that hon. gentlemen have in view in this proceeding, but if I were to do so it would not be very complimentary. I hope the right hon. Prime Minister will not, for the purpose of serving any end on one side or the other, permit such an outrage as to compel, without the recommendation of the committee, members to absent themselves for one duty or another by the adoption of the proposed motion now before the House. I think it would be a perfect outrage to make a departure of that kind.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. When the hon. gentleman moved his motion in the committee it was three minutes past eleven, and the committee had no opportunity of discussing whether it would be a proper thing or whether it is really necessary to extend the time of the Agriculture Committee. Personally I do not think it is really necessary to prolong the time of the committee. I think the committee have arrived at that stage in their work that they will be able to arrange their business within the time allotted. I have never before known that two members could come into this House and ask that a committee's time be prolonged in the absence of the decision of the committee upon the point.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say as seconder of this motion that, as was stated by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade), the committee had no opportunity of passing upon this question at all. The resolution was moved in the committee asking the House to grant power to the committee to sit while the House was in session. The resolution was presented at least a quarter of an hour before the House bell rang.

Mr. INGRAM. No, three minutes past.

Mr. DAVIS. When I came from the committee down here the Speaker had not yet arrived in the chamber, and it took me some time to come from the committee room to the chamber. We were not allowed to press that motion. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) thinks that the work of the committee can be got through without this resolution being passed. If that is the case the resolution will do no harm. If we can get the work through before eleven o'clock we will not have to sit after eleven, but if we cannot it is absolutely necessary that we should have this extended time in order that we may get through with the work. The chairman of the committee complained that a large amount of work had accumulated, he said that a report had to be made to the House, that it was getting late in the session and he appealed to the members to get through with the work. At the last sitting of the committee and at the sitting this forenoon we could get nothing done, and I submit if we do not get this resolution through and have the right to sit during the time the House is in session we will never be able to complete the work, and the House may adjourn without the committee having been able to bring in a report to the House. I do not see that this is an injury to any person. There are enough members who are not interested in the estimates and similar matters to conduct the meetings of the committee. This is not a new suggestion ; I have been in this House for eight years, and nearly every year a resolution of this kind has been passed by the House and committees have sat while the House was in session. The business of the country went on just the same, and in order to facilitate matters and to give an opportunity to complete the labours of that committee I think this resolution should pass.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS. As chairman of the committee, I wish to state to the House as I did to the committee this morning, that a very great deal of business remains to be done by the committee, and the question which at present engages the attention of the committee is one of great importance. The committee has not yet reached that condition of unanimity that would indicate that we shall reach an early conclusion. Personally, as chairman, I am exceedingly anxious that the business of the committee should be got into such shape that we could report to the House at as early a date as possible. This morning I received a motion in the committee, but it was five minutes past eleven, and I had no information from the House that they would not meet until a quarter past eleven, and never decided that I should not press the motion, and so we adjourned at five minutes past eleven. The consequence was that, owing to the obstruction that took place, I was prevented from securing the sanction of the committee in asking for leave to sit while the House was in session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not go so far as to say, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has said, that it would be an outrage if such a motion as that which is now in your hands, Mr. Speaker, were adopted.

Mr. CLANCY. I said 'under the conditions.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Even under the conditions I would not go so far as that, but I must say that, according to my recollection, motions of this kind have always been taken and adopted upon the recommendation of the committee interested. Of course, there may be exceptions to all rules; I do not say that this condition, that they should be privileged reports, should be a condition absolute; there may be reasons perhaps why such a motion should be entertained without the recommendation of the committee. At present I think I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) not to press his motion to-day, in view of what was said by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) a moment ago that they expect that one more sitting would complete the business and settle the differences in the committee; and, under those circumstances, I think my hon. friend would be justified in withdrawing his motion, and perhaps to-morrow the committee can settle their difficulties. If they cannot, the House will see what they can do in order to bring peace and harmony up stairs as we have it here.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). If one, two or three members of the committee would curtail their long speeches somewhat——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid that is too much to expect.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). The time of the committee is occupied to a great extent by hair-splitting speeches that have no sense or bearing upon the subject under discussion. A sub-committee made a report to the committee, and the whole question now before the committee is whether that report shall be adopted or rejected.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I might say, in addition to what the hon. member for Victoria, Nova Scotia, has said, that if two or three members who can only find time to come to that committee at certain periods when they want to have a little trouble, would refrain from coming to it, the committee would be better off. I belong to that committee, and have always taken a great deal of interest in its proceedings and have invariably attended its meetings. If some of these gentlemen who were so anxious to have the committee sit while the House is in session would contain themselves and confine themselves to the business that is in the interests of the committee and not in the interest of their own particular notions, we would be better off. I certainly object to sitting while the House is in session if we can avoid it. It seems to me that if the committee gets together at 9.30 and we have to meet in the House at 11 and sit until after midnight, we are worked quite hard enough, and I hope the Prime Minister will not consent to any sittings of the committee unless the cases are much stronger than the one we have had in the Agricultural Committee for some time. I certainly am quite opposed to anything of the kind, and, as I have said, if three or four gentlemen would stay away from the committee it would be better.

Motion withdrawn.

RELIEF OF ANNIE CHRISTMAN.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155) for the relief of Annie Christman.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. LAVERGNE. On division.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried on division.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

REBATE ON INDIAN CORN.

Mr. CLANCY asked:

1. What rebate, if any, was paid to distillers in Canada for the fiscal year 1896, on Indian corn imported and used in the manufacture of spirits?

2. If so, under what authority was such rebate made?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). No rebate (or drawback) of customs duty was paid by the Customs Department

to distillers in Canada for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896, on Indian corn imported and used in the manufacture of spirits.

Mr. CLANCY. There is another part of the question which the hon. gentleman has not answered, the second part.

Mr. PATERSON. As there was none, that is answered.

Mr. CLANCY. No authority.

ACETYLENE GAS IN LIGHTHOUSES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. How many lighthouses on the waters between Montreal and Kingston have been changed from oil burners to acetylene gas ?
2. Have the services of the lightkeepers, where the change has been made, been dispensed with ?
3. If not all, how many have been notified that their services will not be required after two or three months' notice ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Fifteen, viz.:
   1. Range lights (2) leading through dredged cut into Lachine.
   2. Lachine lightship.
   3. Lake St. Louis lightship.
   4. Chateauguay.
   5. Hamilton's Island light.
   6. Stone House Point light.
   7. St. Francis Middle Ground light.
   8. Range lights (2), St. Regis dike.
   9. Windmill Point light.
   10. Lindoe Island light.
   11. Gananoque Narrows light.
   12. Jackstraw Beacon light.
   13. Spectacle Shoal light.
   14. Red Horse Rock light.
   15. Burnt Island light.
2. Yes.
3. This question is answered above.

THE MILITIA ACT.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the right hon. the premier to the fact that no order was given the other day for reprinting the Militia Bill before its third reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that there were very few amendments to the Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There were a great many.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will see about it ; and if it was the intention to have it reprinted, I shall see that it is done.

DISMISSAL OF LORD DUNDONALD--LETTER OF W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. The hon. Minister of the Interior promised to lay on the table of the House a copy of the communication transmitted to Mr. W. T. R. Preston with respect to his action in writing to the London press on the Dundonald matter. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman is prepared to lay that letter on the table this morning.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON. I will give instructions to have a copy of the letter made, and shall probably be able to lay it on the table of the House this afernoon.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsboro' Bridge, $650,000.

Mr. LENNOX. With reference to the item in connection with the Hillsboro' bridge, I wish to call the attention of the committee to a letter which appears in the Auditor General's Report. I shall read this letter because not only is it important as regards the particular item, but as regards the position which the government has taken with reference to a great many contracts :

Audit Office, Ottawa, February 12, 1904.

Dear Sir,—My attention has been called recently to the many Orders in Council relieving public works contractors from the obligation of completing their contracts within the time limit.

From the wording of the orders it seems that those representing the government in the transactions consider that, while the contractors are accommodated, the government is saved from any loss, because there is not developed by the postponement of the date of completion a means of exacting a heightened charge from the government by the contractor. This seems a manifestly inaccurate conclusion.

When it was determined by the government to have a particular work done, it was concluded that the direct advantage, or the indirect one, or both together, would be at least as great as all the outlay and would, therefore, besides recouping the country for the salaries of the engineers and other servants engaged, reimburse eventually the money paid to contractors, and in the meantime the interest as it would periodically mature.

In the case of a wharf, a bridge, or a railway line, you may have entered into no obligation to provide at a particular time the accommodation to the neighbourhood which the work when completed will afford, but as trustees for the people you came to the conclusion that the completed work would provide to the public an advantage equal in value to the interest on the expenditure.

By the privilege given to the contractor, the country has been deprived of the use of the work for the length of the postponement, while the interest is accumulating each day.

The magnitude of the donations from public funds to contractors will be understood to some extent by considering one of the large works—for instance the Hillsboro' bridge. It was to have been completed on April 8, 1902. The time was first extended to November 30, 1902, later to December 31, 1903, and now to

December 31, 1904. The following is a statement of the interest in this case :—

M. J. Haney, Hillsboro' Bridge.

Estimates 1-10 (inclusive) to April 21, 1902, paid..		$243,714 55
Interest on $243,714.55 from April 21, 1902, to Dec. 31, 1904, at 3½ p. c..	$22,995 95	
Estimates 11-18 (inclusive) to Nov. 30, 1902, paid..		368,319 98
Interest on $368,319.98 from Nov. 30, 1902, to Dec. 31, 1904, at 3½ p. c..	26,877 26	
Estimates 19-28 (inclusive) to Dec. 31, 1903, paid..		313,010 79
Interest on $313,010.79 from Dec. 31, 1903, to Dec. 31, 1904, at 3½ p. c.. ..	10,955 38	
Total payments..		$925,045 32
Total interest as above.	$60,828 59	

Respectfully yours,
J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

Hon. H. R. Emmerson,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

I call the attention of the government to the fact that on this item alone, by the extension of time to the contractor, without any concessions being made in return by him, we paid upwards of $60,000 for nothing. This is not an isolated case. It is one which occurs in many instances, and though the Auditor General called the attention of the government to it, no remedy was applied.

Mr. FIELDING. The House will agree that this is not the most convenient moment to enter into a discussion of the matter referred to, though the hon. gentleman is quite within his rights. It is very desirable we should proceed with the Supply Bill, and as there will be further opportunity of discussing the matter to which my hon. friend has referred, no doubt it will come up again.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think that the hon. minister has any ground of complaint whatever.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not complaining.

Mr. LENNOX. Not only am I within my rights but this is a convenient time, considering the opportunities afforded us, to bring the matter up. We are now asked to concur in this item. I did not notice it when it came before the committee, or else I did not think it well to take the time then to discuss it. The House should be desirous to know what the government is doing and, for that purpose, it is well that attention should be called to the matter. I am of opinion that, that if there is anything that members of parliament on both sides have been conspicuously neglectful of it is in this, that they have not, in the past, given the attention to the various reports of the Auditor General that they should have given. As a young member of the House I have endeavoured to do my duty in this as in other matters. I have failed to do it to the extent that I should like to have done it. But, should this government, by any possibility, remain in power and the Auditor General, by some happy combination of circumstances be induced to remain in the position he occupies, I, for one, shall lose no opportunity to fulfil my duty in this regard.

Mr. SPROULE. I may remind the Minister of Finance that in this case we are voting the whole sum, and not only a proportion of it, and so, if the item is concurred in now there will not be an opportunity for discussion. We are within our rights and this is the proper time to bring the matter forward :

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Railways—	
Intercolonial, working expenses.. ..	$6,500,000
Rental to Grand Trunk Railway.. ..	140,000
Windsor branch....	30,000
Prince Edward Island Railway working expenses..	330,000

Mr. SPROULE. Certain papers were to have been laid on the table before concurrence in this item was asked. I have no remembrance of those papers having been brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware that any papers asked for have not been brought down. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) knows of any, I will call the attention of the minister (Mr. Emmerson), who is not now in his place, to the matter. If it was agreed that the papers could be brought down before concurrence, I have no right to ask the House to concur in this item.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Deputy Speaker tells me that the item 'Rental to the Grand Trunk Railway, $140,000,' was left over to afford an opportunity for discussion on, if desired. But I find that item included in this vote. To concur in the vote would be to shut off discussion.

Mr. FIELDING. We might go on with the other items and reserve that for the moment.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —canals—Galops canal—enlargement, $204,300.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think that this item was carried in supply or it may be that the matter I have in mind can be brought up on item 98, Welland canal. It was understood that information would be given by the minister (Mr. Emmerson) and he was about to give it when we arose last night.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I brought down all the information that was asked for. The deputy Mr. Schreiber, told me that he had gone over 'Hansard' very carefully and had furnished all that had been asked for.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with the minister (Mr. Emmerson) as to the papers being brought down. But I understood that last night the minister was about to read certain information to the House and to deal with the matters involved, but, at the request of some hon. members, and in accordance with what was evidently the feeling of the committee concurred in by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) we did not go on with it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree that it was something of that kind.

Mr. LENNOX. This item should not go through.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may explain that I laid some of the papers on the table without reading them, as suggested by some hon. member on the other side, I think it was the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). But there was one paper, containing a comparative statement of the employees along the canal which, perhaps, was not laid on the table. I started to read it. That is the only document that I know of—

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with what the minister says. But I understood the conclusion reached to be that the item was not finished last night, but there was to be further discussion and these papers were to be more fully dealt with. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will agree with my recollections of the matter. I undertsood him to intimate that he was of opinion that the item should not go through.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understood that the intention was to carry out the agreement that had been entered into with respect to the discussion of items relating to the Cornwall canal. It was the desire of the committee last night that we should not go on after we finished the discussion on the Davis contract. That was agreed upon and I think it was carried out.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the committee to be unanimously of opinion that it was not advisable for the minister to take any other item after finishing the Davis matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It seems to me there was something of that sort.

Mr. LENNOX. I remember that the Minister of Justice joined in saying that the committee should rise. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) intended to make further remarks upon the matter, and I would not like to have the vote concurred in at present. He mentioned the matter to me this morning.

Mr. EMMERSON. We were at item 98, relating to the Welland canal, all the subitems of item 98 having passed except one. I had furnished all the particulars, and proposed to pass the vote pro forma, as it had been very fully discussed at previous meetings of the committee. But there seems to be some objection to sitting any longer, and in deference to the wishes of the committee, I will not press the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. It had better be understood that if the hon. member wishes to bring the matter up later on an opportunity will be afforded, so that he will not suffer any disadvantage.

Mr. SPROULE. I would only suggest that if we desired to move that the item be struck out entirely for certain reasons, we would be precluded from doing so, because the item would have been already pasesd. I am not saying that is going to be the case; but we desire certain information so that we would be justified in passing it.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite realize that we are only carrying these items to-day so far as we can agree upon them without much discussion; and if hon. gentlemen desire that an item be not passed, we will not press the matter. We are only carrying through these things by general agreement.

Intercolonial, working expenses, $6,500,000.

Mr. FIELDING. I called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, who expected some information. He is under the impression that everything is brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we first objected to take the item of $140,000 for rental to Grand Trunk Railway, but that was agreed upon. On the item which was for the purpose, I think, of building the Governor General's car it was agreed that the discussion might take place on that.

Some resolutions concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING. I will ask the House at a later stage to facilitate the further advance of the Supply Bill. The clerical work has to be prepared; so for the present we will resume the ordinary business of the House.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 73) to amend the Railway Act of 1903.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). This Bill has been amended in committee by consent, and it is now understood that so far as the government at all events is concerned, the Bill in its present form is to be reported by the committee to the House. It deals with insurance.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 132) to amend the Railway Act of 1903—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

On section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN. At the suggestion of the Minister of Justice I am going on first with my amendments in connection with this Bill. The amendments I propose have all been before the House and its committees in several ways. The first one is an amendment to the General Railway Act which will make the scope of that Act apply to express companies. When we were discussing this question the other day in another place, the statement was made by a lawyer representing the express companies that they were not owned by the railway companies, that in fact they were separate corporations. I knew that statement was a rather wide one, and I made it my business to look up the records of the companies. That gentleman said he was representing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and all the other railways in this country, and all the express companies, and he asked the committee and the public of Canada to believe that these were separate organizations. Now we all know that the case is different. But that is a sample of the way in which the railway companies and the express companies meet our argument, when we propose to regulate them. Now what are the facts about the Dominion Express Company? I propose to read a line or two from the annual official statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to be found at page 95 of the appendix to the 'Annual Financial Review' for February, 1904. Mind you these gentlemen representing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Dominion Express Company said they were two corporations and that not necessarily were they allied. In this statement marked 'Exhibit B,' being a portion of the annual statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, we have the following:

Details of balance sheet item 'Miscellaneous securities and advances.'

Contained in the list of securities is the following:

Dominion Express Company stock, $113,750. (This company's express, the stock of which is all held in the treasury. Amount paid up represents cost of original equipment and organization.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do you propose to move your amendments to the first clause?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is by agreement.

Mr. MACLEAN. This is by agreement with the minister. There is the official statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway wherein they say that they own every share of the Dominion Express Company's stock; and yet they have the hardihood to come before a parliamentary committee and say that they had no interest in it or that they were two separate corporations. They may be two separate corporations, but as a matter of fact they are not. Turn up Poor's Manual of the American railways and you will find in the list of securities held by the New York Central shares in the American Express Company to the value of $3,000,000. The Grand Trunk Railway Company do own the Canadian Express Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway do own the Dominion Express Company, the Canadian Northern, the Mann & Mackenzie system, do own their own express company and they are part and parcel of the railway. They are doing business, they are carrying freight, they are common carriers in every sense of the term and ought to be under the control and jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. The gentlemen representing the express companies and representing the railway companies are on record as naming the Railway Commission as being a proper tribunal to regulate rates of all kinds, passenger and freight, and if that is so it also follows that they should have the power to regulate the rates charged by express companies. But, we have been told that the express companies do more than carry freight, that they collect freight and that they also make arrangements for carrying it by steamboat, water and wagon on the public highway and that therefore they should not come within the scope of the Railway Commission. As a matter of fact 95 per cent of the express business is done on the railways. It is a growing business, and the principal reason why express companies should be regulated in their charges and tolls by the railway company is that the express company without control can discriminate against and injure one man and build up the business of another. The merchants all over the country are recognizing this fact and the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto is on record as having declared themselves in the direction of the proposal which I now submit. I was told the other day that the Board of Trade of Toronto had rescinded the stand they had taken in that regard. All I know is that on Saturday last I was in a street car with the president and secretary of the Toronto Board of Trade and to both of them, Mr. Ellis and Mr. Morley, I put the question if they had rescinded their position in regard to express companies and they said that the statement to that effect was not a fact. These express companies can discriminate against one man and in favour of another. They can make charges fair to one man but unfair to his competitors and for that reason if for no other reason they ought to be brought within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. Their business is growing every year. They are handling enormous quantities of package freight and sending it all over the country, and I therefore see so reason why the

charges of express companies should not be brought within the jurisdiction of the Railway Act. Therefore I beg to move that :

Section 3 of the Railway Act, 1903, is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'persons' in the first line the words 'and express companies.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The effect of this amendment will be to make section 3 of the Railway Act as we now have it read as follows :

This Act shall apply to all persons, and express companies and railways (other than government railways) within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed, as one Act, with the Special Act, subject as herein provided.

Now if my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will look at section 2 subsection (w) of the Railway Act, the interpretation clause, he will find that :

The expression 'Special Act' means any Act under which the company has authority to construct or operate a railway, or which is enacted with special reference to such railway, and include all such Acts.

So that this provision would be absolutely unworkable in the Act as we have it. My hon. friend is quite right when he says that this subject has been already considered. It was considered by the special committee that was appointed to look into the Railway Act when it was introduced into this House last session. At that time Boards of Trade, among others the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, appeared before the committee and urged upon it the desirability of amending the Act so as to make it applicable to express companies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not catch what my hon. friend said.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the Railway Bill was introduced last session Mr. Blair, then Minister of Railways and Canals, and myself were appointed a sub-committee to hear reports made by different public bodies in the country. At that time Boards of Trade, and among these Boards of Trade were members of the Toronto Board of Trade, appeared before the committee and urged upon us that we should include express companies in the Act as my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) suggests at the present time. The point was then argued out fully, as appears by the report of the proceedings, and the conclusion arrived at then was that in the first instance it was doubtful as to whether or not we had the power to regulate the charges of the express companies and that in any event if we had the power many of the provisions of this Act would require to be so amended as to make them applicable to express companies and that such an amendment would be necessary as would practically require the changing of a great number of the sections of the Act. The amendment in its present form would make the Act absolutely unworkable. When my hon. friend introduced his amendment in this House the Bill containing that amendment was by agreement referred to the Railway Committee of the House. The matter was there discussed and the conclusion arrived at by the Railway Committee was that this amendment could not be applied to the Railway Act as we now have it. It may be, and I can conceive that under certain conditions it would be, desirable that express companies should be regulated in some respects by the Railway Commission but it is a question—I will not say a settled question so far as I am concerned—whether we have the power to regulate the contracts made by the express companies. It is quite true that we have the power to incorporate these companies but as to regulating the contracts which they make in different parts of the country that is a question which has not been settled, so far as my knowledge goes, either by judicial determination or by any opinion expressed in any quarter, which I have been able to see.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the minister to state briefly on what grounds he feels any difficulty, assuming that we have the right to incorporate ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have the right to incorporate but I am expressing my present opinion, with some diffidence because I may say that I have not looked into the matter as fully as I would like to do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no opinion as I have not considered the matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have looked into the case of Parson and the Citizens' Insurance Company, and I would like to give to the committee the result of my reference to that case. The Citizens' Insurance Company was incorporated by the parliament of Canada exactly as the Dominion Express Company was incorporated here. I am not sure whether or not all the express companies were incorporated by us, but I am quite sure that the Dominion Express Company was. The Citizens' Insurance Company was incorporated by the Canadian parliament and the Ontario legislature passed a statute regulating the conditions of insurance contracts, that is the contracts made by insurance companies in Canada. In their reasons for judgment the Privy Council considered the question of the jurisdiction conferred by the section reserving jurisdiction over property and civil rights in the provinces. I shall now read a section from the judgment which can be found at page 113 :

Construing, therefore, the words 'regulation of trade and commerce' by the various aids to their interpretation above suggested, their Lordships would include political arrangements in regard to trade requiring the sanction of parliament, regulation of trade in matters of interprovincial concern, and it

may be that they would include general regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion. Their Lordships abstained on the present occasion from any attempt to define the limits of the authority of the Dominion parliament in this direction. It is enough for the decision of the present case to say that, in their view, its authority to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not comprehend the power to regulate by legislation the contracts of a particular business or trade, such as the business of fire insurance in a single province, and therefore that its legislative authority does not in the present case conflict or compete with the power over property and civil rights assigned to the legislature of Ontario by No. 13 of section 92.

Then on the same page :

It was contended in the case of the Citizens' Insurance Company of Canada, that the company having been originally incorporated by the parliament of the late province of Canada—— .

That is the argument of my hon. friend from Grey :

—and having had its incorporation and corporate rights confirmed by the Dominion parliament, could not be affected by an Act of the Ontario legislature. But the latter Act does not assume to interfere with the constitution or status of corporations. It deals with all insurers alike, including corporations and companies, whatever may be their origin, whether incorporated by British authority, as in the case of the Queen Insurance Company, or by foreign or colonial authority, and without touching their status, requires that if they choose to make contracts of insurance in Ontario, relating to property in that province, such contracts shall be subject to certain conditions.

And further at page 117 :

It by no means follows (unless indeed the view of the learned judge is right as to the scope of the words 'the regulation of trade and commerce') that because the Dominion parliament has alone the right to create a corporation to carry on business throughout the Dominion that it alone has the right to regulate its contracts in each of the provinces.

Now I think that on the whole it would at all events be imprudent for us for two reasons, first because the Act is not so plain as to include provisions which would enable us to give effect to this amendment if it were adopted, and, secondly, because there exists sufficient doubt with respect to our rights to regulate contracts in a province to justify my asking the committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he can see any difficulty in this parliament granting to the Board of Railway Commissioners full power to regulate the rates upon all freight carried upon railway trains, whether passenger or freight trains and whether the people who are conducting the business called themselves an express company or by any other name. It is the freight that is carried upon a railway that is under the jurisdiction of this Dominion parliament with which we are dealing and it seems to me that no railway company, for example, could escape as to its freight the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, by leasing some rights to a train to any other company, whether that be an express company or anything else.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It does appear to me that it is not the freight of a railway company that we are regulating ; it is the freight carried by the express company and whether that freight is carried by an express company on a railway train or by horse car or by steamer or vessel, the effect would be the same, and I cannot see how we are to discriminate between that express business which was done on railway trains and the express business done by the ordinary cartage system in the country, or on vessels. Have we any power to regulate the rates charged by the express companies, for instance, on the express business done in cities ?

Mr. BARKER. Is not the question whether we have power to regulate the charges for freight upon a railway ? Would it be possible for any Dominion Railway Company to take a particular train or particular class of train and say: We will let this out to some company, call it an express company or anything else you like, and then say : 'This is not our freight but the freight of an express company.' Is it to be conceded that an express company, being something else than a railway company, this parliament cannot control what they are contracting to carry upon a railway, the creature of and controlled by parliament ? It seems to me that the Dominion, having jurisdiction over a railway company and over its railway, can regulate all charges for everything that is carried upon that railway, and I do not see any difficulty in that respect whether the railway company is handling the stuff itself or has put up an intermediary between itself and the public.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it the contract between the express company and the railway company that we are asked to regulate or the contract between the express company and the private individual ? That is the distinction. It is with respect to that particular contract between the express company and the individual that I expressed my doubt as to the power to regulate. Would my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) permit me to draw attention to this fact, which I shall illustrate by an example ? Take express freight coming say from Port Arthur to Collingwood, by vessel, then from Collingwood to Toronto by rail and from the railway station in Toronto to the warehouse of the merchants by carts. What part of the express charge which is made upon the freight from Port Arthur to the

merchants' warehouse in Toronto would we be able to regulate ? Can we regulate the express charge from Port Arthur to Collingwood by vessels ? Undoubtedly not. Can we regulate the charge for its conveyance in vehicles in the streets of Toronto ? Undoubtedly not. How can we regulate the matter ?

Mr. CLARKE. Where does the power to regulate these charges lie ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the provincial legislature.

Mr. BARKER. Do we not find every day ordinary freight shipped from Port Arthur to Collingwood by water, thence by rail to Toronto and then delivered by cart in Toronto ? And yet we can regulate freight charges ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the freight is carried by a railway company, that is under our jurisdiction. We say to that company: The charge you make on that freight is determined by us ; you adopt any method you choose to deliver it. But why should a contract made between an express company and an individual be under different jurisdiction from a contract made by any other corporation under provincial jurisdiction ?

Mr. HAGGART. I will tell you the reason. When we give existence to a company, we can give it on any conditions we like. When we give a company the right to carry parcels by express or otherwise, we can say that it shall only charge for carrying those parcels what the commission says is a right charge. Surely that is within our power. If we have a right to give a company its corporate existence, we can give it that existence on any conditions we like. As to freight carried partly by water and partly by rail, we have taken power under the Railway Act to regulate that. The commission can consider what are the proper proportions of the charge to be apportioned to the water, to the railway, and to carrying by horses in a city. That is one of the conditions of our Railway Act. Whether we have the power or not, it was urged upon us by Mr. Blair, who introduced the Act, that that was an essential in the regulation of rates ; otherwise a railway company could apportion so large a proportion of the charge to the water carriage as to do away with all regulations in reference to carrying by rail.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I must say I have not given this question very much study or examination as yet, but I am inclined to support the Minister of Justice. This is a question as to the power of this parliament to regulate the rates of express companies. It seems to me, speaking off-hand, without having given the subject very much consideration, that it is a matter of regulating a contract within the province ; and I really cannot understand, unless there is some power given to us by the British North America Act, how we can regulate the rates of carriage by express companies any more than we can regulate the rate of carriage by individuals within the different provinces. It is not because this parliament has given existence to a company that it has a right to interfere in the contracts made by that company. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat says that we can impose as a condition of giving the charter the regulation of the rates which are to be charged by the corporation. I must distinguish here. I will not say that if, upon the application of certain parties for incorporation, the charter contained the condition that the rates are to be regulated by the charter itself, this would not be within the authority of the granting power ; but to make a general law applicable to all corporations which are to come into existence hereafter by charters of the Dominion parliament, and to say that this should apply to contracts made by them, is a broad statement which I am not at present ready to accept, and I cannot go as far as my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). There is another argument put forward here, which is an argument ab inconvienti. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) says, if I understand him rightly, that we should have the power of regulating the rates charged by express companies, because we have the power of regulating rates upon railways. I do not think that is a conclusion to be necessarily arrived at. It may be inconvenient. It may be that the law or the constitution is not complete on that point. But the line is drawn. We are given by the constitution the power of regulating rates on railways. If a company not being a railway company is called into existence, and does a part of the work that generally falls to railway companies, that is not a reason for extending the powers given by the constitution to this House. It may be for the very reason that the power of regulating rates on railways is given to the parliament of Canada by the constitution, that express companies are created so that the rates may not be regulated ; but I do not see the force of the argument of my hon. friend. Now, this is a question of some importance, and it seems to me that a great deal of precaution should be exercised before we enact such a law. For my part, I have not heard of any great agitation in the country calling for such legislation. It may exist in some parts of the country, particularly in that part from which my hon. friend comes; but I do not think the general public has been suffering to such an extent from the rates charged by express companies that we should legislate in a hurry upon this important question.

Mr. MACLEAN. I might point out for the information of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that the fruit-growers of Ontario feel very severely the charges of the express companies. The shipment of fresh fruit from Ontario to the west is a great and growing business, the people of the west wish to get the fresh fruit of Ontario, and the regulation of these express charges means getting or not getting the market. If what the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) say is true, it means that the railways can evade the whole Railway Act by turning all their freight business over to the express companies. But all these are merely legal quibbles ; they are dodges to help the express companies, and not to have them regulated. Suppose the argument of the Minister of Justice is true, a declaration of this parliament that the railway companies shall do their own express business would bring them under the Railway Act. That can be done in two lines. They can be prohibited from turning over their express business to other companies. It is all an evasion—an attempt to get away from what hon. gentlemen opposite promised the country. They promised a tribunal which would regulate all charges on freights in this country, which would protect the farmer and the fruit-grower, and would see that no unfair discrimination was practised in the matter of charges by these common carriers. If my proposal is unconstitutional, it can be made constitutional in one minute. But I do not believe it is unconstitutional. I agree with the opinion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) given here to-day. I believe these companies are quite within the jurisdiction of this parliament to-day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend might substantiate that statement. I have no doubt that his opinion upon a question of constitutional law is as valuable as a great many other opinions which he expresses in this House ; but I must say that his ipse dixit on this important question does not satisfy me. I would like him to show, by quoting the law, that this is the law of the land.

Mr. MACLEAN. My authority is the late Minister of Railways and Canals, and I have heard my hon. friend say that there is not a better authority in this country. Indeed, I have heard him called the chief justice of this country in regard to railway matters ; and I cite his opinion in regard to this Railway Act as a good opinion. It has not been controverted, and I would ask the hon. member for Montmorency to controvert it. The argument here is rather the argument of the express companies. I say that the express companies can be brought within the Act by two words, by saying to the railway companies, you shall not only be regulated in the matter of freight rates, but you shall not contract yourselves out of the jurisdiction of this parliament. It can be done as easy as rolling off a log, and the Minister of Justice could find a way of doing it if he wished to realize the intentions of this measure, which is to regulate all freight charges, and protect the farmers against discrimination. The fruit-growers of Ontario are an immense interest, the fish interests of the maritime provinces is another important industry. The further away these people can send their products, the larger will be their receipts ; but if too heavy express rates are imposed, their market is seriously contracted. Business can be increased among the various provinces if we will regulate these express charges. These express companies are making enormous profits. Why, therefore should they not be regulated ? Parliament regulates the charges on packages carried by parcel post.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Under the British North America Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, and under this Act we can regulate all these express rates. My hon. friend will not deny that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I will.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do you say we cannot prevent the railways from taking themselves out of the jurisdiction of this country ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Let the doctrine which the Minister of Justice sets up, namely, that the express companies are not within the jurisdiction of this parliament, be accepted, and all the freight of this country will be turned into the express business. I have seen trains leaving Toronto with four or five express cars made up and some trains made up altogether of express cars. If the railway companies could by this means escape the jurisdiction of this parliament, they would turn over the cream of their business to these express companies which they own. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company owns every share in the Dominion Express Company. Your company owns every share——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Whom do you mean by 'your.'

Mr. MACLEAN. The board always addresses its shareholders as 'your company.' Your company owns all these shares. I am not a man of legal quibbles and the people of this country do not want legal quibbles. What they want is the regulation of our common carriers, and that they will get.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether it is his opinion that this parliament, which has the power to create a corporation, has not the power to regulate its business ? It appears to me

common sense that if parliament can create a corporation, it must have power to regulate its rates. There is a great agitation in Ontario, which affect consumers as well as producers, in favour of having these rates regulated. In Eastern Ontario small villages are handicapped by the express charges. They cannot import by the carload and have to get their supplies in by express. People like to get the early fruit from the west and find the express charges very oppressive. The consumer has to pay and not the shipper, because there is no competition. If a man wants a basket of early fruit from the west, he will have to pay the extra freight because of the lack of competition, and it does not seem to me common sense to say that although we have the power to create we have not the power to control rates.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am certainly very firmly of the opinion that we do not get the power to regulate the contracts which a corporation may enter into merely because we create that corporation.

Mr. COCHRANE. How do you regulate the freight rates on railways ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not prepared to say that there may not be some power in parliament to regulate to some extent the rates of express companies, but up to the present I have not been able to find any, either in the shape of judical authority or express statutory enactment. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) has advanced many ideas which have taken root and grown. Let this idea which he has launched take root and grow, and probably next session we will be able to deal with it with greater knowledge of the conditions.

Mr. CLARKE. If you have not the authority now, how are you going to get it before next session ?

Mr. MACLEAN. It will grow.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend has evidently not paid the slightest attention to what I said. I always listen to everything he says and I think that he ought to reciprocate.

Mr. CLARKE. It does not seem to make any impression on you.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not say that there might not be some power in this parliament, but I said there was a great deal of doubt and in view of the cases I have quoted—Citizens and Parsons—my mind leaned against the view that we had authority. At the same time there may exist some power enabling us to deal with this matter. There are of course some people who can come to a conclusion immediately on the most abstruse questions, but for my part I like to have time to consider, and I would suggest that we should allow the matter to remain until we can consider it more carefully and be in a better position to come to a conclusion.

Mr. CLARKE. Then as a matter of policy the hon. gentleman thinks that my hon. friend from East York should not proceed with his motion now but leave it over twelve months ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be more prudent to leave it over. I would like to add that if it were intended to insert this amendment, it would be necessary to redraft several clauses of the Railway Act so as to give it effect. There is no use putting in amendments to a statute which cannot be given effect to.

Mr. CLARKE. It is purely a matter for the hon. member for East York to determine whether he will adopt this suggestion or not.

I always give the greatest possible attention to every remark that falls from the lips of the Minister of Justice, but he is so deeply versed in the law that sometimes it is difficult to follow him. His utterances are so profound at times that I must confess my inability to grasp their full meaning, and probably it is because of that inability on my part that I appear to the hon. minister to be so obtuse. I certainly inferred from what the hon. gentleman said that he had very grave doubts whether this parliament had power to interfere in these contracts, and I ask him if we would be in a better position to deal with them twelve months from now if we have not the power to deal with them now. It seems to me there would be the same doubts.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What I suggested was that I should be in a better position twelve months hence to express an opinion than I am now, and, if doubts existed. I would be in a better position to suggest how they should be removed.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, I understand that, in effect, the minister says to me : I am not clear what the law is, and I desire time to consider the question. If that is the case. I certainly agree that he ought to give the matter consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. We take control of a provincial railway by declaring it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. And, by that means, we get control over their freight rates which we had not before. Does not that suggest that, when we declare it vested in this parliament we give ourselves the power ? We are told that the reason why we take control of a railway in the province of Ontario for instance is that there may be but one law governing cases arising in any part of the Dominion in connection with our business with that road. For instance, freight is sent from Toronto and may be damaged by a railway wreck in Nova Scotia, and the question arises under what law the case

for damages is to be prosecuted, the law of Nova Scotia or the law of Ontario ? If this applies to freight on railways why would it not apply as well to freight hauled on the same railways but under the control of the express companies, companies which, however, their name are really railway companies ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that the distinction, if there is one, is that the railway is either originally or afterwards becomes subject to the exclusive authority of this parliament.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under the section of the Railway Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Now, apart from that—looking at the suggestions that have been made as to what our jurisdiction is, it is, of course, perfectly true, as the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has suggested, that the power to incorporate at all includes the power to incorporate subject to conditions or qualifications. It would be quite possible for this parliament to incorporate an express company and declare that it should make no charge at all. In the same way, in incorporating a company, parliament could declare that that company should not exceed certain charges named in its act of incorporation. That is one thing. But that seems to me to be a different thing from a general law by this parliament fixing the charges for all companies of a particular character. I do not think that it would necessarily follow that we had jurisdiction to pass a general enactment because we had power to grant a charter of incorporation under conditions. Of course a very obvious illustration is this : We pass every day in this House bills to incorporate loan and trust companies and commercial companies of various kinds. These companies must carry on business in the different provinces of Canada in accordance with the laws of those provinces relating to contracts. But as I say, in incorporating a particular company we can impose conditions, yet that does not give us jurisdiction over all contracts. So far as that particular feature is concerned, I should have doubt as to our jurisdiction. But I would not say we have not jurisdiction upon other considerations which I may mention a little later on.

I rose more particularly for the purpose of saying that, so far as the operations of these companies in the maritime provinces are concerned, the more immediate difficulty that has arisen there is in connection with the powers which the government is willing to permit them to exercise on the Intercolonial. The general Railway Act does not apply to the government railway, and, therefore, even if this statute passes, it would not give relief to that portion of the Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN. It would give relief to the western portion of their trade.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But it would not give relief from the principal difficulty which is found in the maritime provinces in this connection at the present time. For example, I had it pressed upon my attention not very long ago that only one express company is authorized to carry on business on the line between Halifax and Sydney—the Canadian Express Company, I think. I had communicated to me a resolution of the Board of Trade of Halifax urging upon the government the necessity of allowing not only that company but other companies as well to carry on business and thus create competition. The Intercolonial Railway is different from most others in that it has no express company of its own. It is thought desirable, therefore, that, upon that railway, not only the Canadian Express Company, but other companies as well should be allowed to carry on business in order that there may be competition. I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson). I might have brought it up on the estimates, but it is as well that I should take this opportunity to mention it. I have no doubt he has received a copy of the resolution to which I have referred. I trust that the considerations placed before him by that resolution will not escape his attention and that he will deal with them in the early future.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not wish to take up a great deal of time on this amendment, as there are others to come on. But I wish to point out to the Minister of Justice that I think his constitutional contention is merely a legal quibble. I believe ways can be found to bring the express companies within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. I have suggested one way, namely, that every company be compelled to do an express business, and be not allowed to contract itself out of its obligations in that matter. That avoids the entire question of law, and all the question of constitutional interpretation raised by the Minister of Justice. But there is another way—and I am glad to see the Postmaster General is in his place at this time. The other way to regulate express charges in this country is by the government taking over the express business and extending the postal and parcel post system. We on this continent are away behind the continent of Europe in the development of the express business. Let me tell you what they do in Germany. I am reading now an extract from the 'Cosmopolitan Magazine :'

While we (the United States) absolutely refuse to accept a package greater than four pounds in weight, Germany has found it good business to extend the limit to 110 pounds. These 110 pounds will be sent by the German

government from one end of Germany to the other for 30 cents, or about one-fourth of a cent per pound.

But even that is not all. When it arrives at its destination, the 110 pound package is delivered at the home.

And that is not all. For from two to six cents extra, the government insures the package and guarantees its safe delivery.

And again, even this much is not all. If, instead of to Germany, a merchant in a city of North Germany wishes to ship a package of one hundred and ten pounds to a city in the southernmost part of Austria, he may do even this for thirty cents, about one-fourth of a cent a pound—that is, the merchants of Rochester pay six thousand per cent more to the United States government for sending parcels from Rochester to Buffalo, than do the Germans even to the extreme limits of a foreign country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Who writes that ?

Mr. MACLEAN. John Brisben Walker, editor of the 'Cosmopolitan Magazine,' who has made a great study of this question. The reason, as Mr. Walker points out, why this parcel post system has not been expanded in the United States is because of the domination and supremacy of the express companies, and I will give my authority for that, namely, Mr. John Wanamaker, recently Postmaster General of the United States. When Mr. Wanamaker was asked why the express system in the United States had not been improved, how it was that the postal department had not been brought up to date with England, with Germany and all these other countries, his reply was as follows :

There are four reasons why we have not a parcel post system like they have in Germany. The first of these is the Adams Express Company ; the second is the American Express Company ; the third, the Wells-Fargo Express Company ; and the fourth, the Southern Express Company.

Now what I charge here is that not only do the express companies seek, and so far successfully, to avoid a control of their rates by some public body, but they are equally powerful in this country as they are in the United States, and to-day they prevent and hinder the expansion of our parcel post system into a system such as they have in England and in Germany. And yet they have been out and out opponents of the parcel post system in the United States, as I believe they are here to-day. At any rate, they are to-day on evidence in our Railway Committee as objecting to a public regulation of their charges. Now my amendment proposes to bring these companies within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. The Minister of Justice says : Wait till next year. I say, No, don't wait till next year, do it now, put it in the Act now, and let us test the Act. I guarantee that I will bring suit myself ; if the hon. gentleman will give me a chance to show where the power lies, I will undertake an action, I can get the Board of Trade of Toronto to undertake an action. But the way to approach the matter is not to put it off until we find out what the law is, the way is to put it on the statute-book now and in that way find out what the law may be. I am not afraid of the result, nor am I afraid of the complications that may ensue in this country by the adoption of this measure at the present time. This is not the first time this question has been raised in the House. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), myself, and some others, last session when the Bill first went through, fought this matter out, and suggested then that the express companies come within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. Now I leave the case to the House and to the country. You can do what you like with me in this matter. I may be successful in committee, and I may not be. At least, I shall be able to divide the House later on on the third reading. I leave the case with you, but it won't end here. The hon. gentleman says the question is growing. So it is growing, and I am going out to the country to grow with it. There is no better question on which to test the country than this one. When I speak of the Post Office Department taking over the express business, I do so because I believe in public ownership, and a man who believes in public ownership must also believe in public control of all these companies that exercise great franchises. At present all I ask is for the public control of a corporation that controls a great franchise, and if that public control cannot be obtained in one way it can in another. If hon. gentlemen cannot find out a way to attain this object, I can, and that is to appeal to the people on this issue, and ask for their endorsation, ask for some kind support that will ensure these gentlemen in parliament finding out a way to bring these companies within the jurisdiction of some public body.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to say that I am in favour of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). I think it is only fair to the public that the Railway Commission that has been constituted at a great cost to the people should have a right to investigate and control the express charges all over Canada. In considering this question, the committee must bear in mind that a much larger proportion of goods that Canadian people now consume are sent by express than was the case some year ago. It will be remembered that in Canada at this moment there is a centralization of business. Manufacturers are centralizing their business, merchants are uniting their small businesses into larger ones, and thus trading places are getting further away from the consumer than they were years ago.

Thus I think it is only fair that some effort should be made by the parliament of

Canada to enable the consumers to get cheaper express rates than they have at this moment. You will bear in mind that the farmers of Canada, particularly the farmers of the older provinces, are engaged almost entirely in a different occupation from that in which they were engaged some years ago. There are many farmers in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec—I speak particularly for the province of Ontario—who send their total output of butter, eggs and poultry to market by express. You will remember also that the creamery industry is largely carried on, and that almost every gallon of cream that is sent to the leading centres is sent by express. I repeat what I said before, that the farmers of the country should get cheaper express rates than they do at the present time. Then the manufacturers are particularly interested in the cheapening of express rates, for the reason that in the summer time, when the farmers are busily engaged with their farming operation, they send a great many of their products, such as binder twine and other manufactured articles to meet the necessities of the farmers, by express. Therefore, the consumers all over Canada are interested in the reduction of express rates. The government have thought it to be their duty to appoint a Railway Commission at a very large expense to the people. This expense the people are not condemning, but they are awaiting the results of the work of this commission, and when the commission are investigating the rates charged for sending freight at a slow rate of speed through this country by the different lines of railway, I cannot understand why the government should not be willing, if it is possible, and I think it is possible, to make such changes in the law as will enable the Railway Commission to regulate express rates and give the consumers cheaper rates than those which they have to pay at the present time. I do not wish to go into a detailed statement of the question. That is unnecessary, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out the facts at some length, not only this session, but last year as well. The government have had at least one year's notice. I do not complain against the hon. Minister of Justice in saying that another year should pass before this question is dealt with, but if another year passes by and we are no closer to the result than we are this year, after having given notice a year ago, I do not think the case is very strong to show that we should wait for another year. I am of the opinion that at this session we should make such a change in the law, either by the adoption of the amendment of my hon. friend from East York, or by the adoption of such a modified amendment as will place the regulation of all express charges on the different lines of railways altogether under the control of the Railway Commission.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, as I am unable to support the amendment moved by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), and as I do not care to give a silent vote on it, because it seems to me that there are several amply sufficient reasons why at the present time the amendment should not be carried, I venture to trespass upon the attention of the House for a few moments. I admit that when my hon. friend was speaking on his amendment he gave us some very interesting information and pointed out some things that my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) might do, but after all the suggestions were something like the flowers that bloom in the spring—they had nothing to do with the case. I understand that the question before the House is whether or not a certain clause in the Railway Act is to be amended by giving power to the Railway Commission to deal with express companies. Whether or not the hon. Postmaster General should take over this branch of the service is another question altogether, and can be considered at another time. But, in the meantime, if, as business men, we apply ourselves to the question before the House, it seems to me there are ample reasons to justify us in declining to support the amendment. Only a year has elapsed since the Railway Act was threshed out to a great extent in this House. In the province of Ontario we have been complaining that there is too much legislation, that a statute is put on the statute-book, and that before the people or the lawyers have had time to understand what has been enacted changes are introduced. I venture to believe that a strong case of necessity should be made out before, the very first year after we have passed an Act to amend the Railway Act and while its provisions are being tried, we should endeavour to change it again. But there is another point. I think it is only fair to remember that in the passing of Bills through this House the Minister of Justice occupies a peculiar position. In one sense he is responsible for all the legislation that passes. If a measure, no matter from what side of the House it may come, is passed by this House and not opposed by the Minister of Justice, who is the head of the legal department in the House, and if afterwards that legislation is held to be ultra vires, it is, to a certain extent, a reflection on the Minister of Justice. It does seem to me that, when an amendment such as this is introduced, when the hon. Minister of Justice says that in his judgment it is very doubtful if we have the power to pass such an amendment, and when, I venture to say, there is not one lawyer in the House who would stake his reputation and say with certainty that there are no grounds for the position which the hon. Minister of Justice takes, a very great responsibility would be thrown upon us if

we were to pass legislation merely for the purpose of promoting litigation in which somebody is very apt to be hurt. It has been said, with perfect sincerity and great plausibility, by an hon. gentleman, and it illustrates the difficulty there is in coming to a reasonable conclusion in these matters, that if this House has the power to incorporate a company, surely it has the power to control that company. That is true if it were to apply to the conditions which should be imposed upon a company when it is applying for incorporation. We have had case after case before the courts which amply proves that we may have full jurisdiction to incorporate a company, and that yet the local authorities may have equally full jurisdiction to deal with the manner in which the company carries on its business. Take the case of insurance policies mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice as a case in point. We can incorporate an insurance company in this House, we can give it power to do business in every province in the Dominion, and yet each province can interfere and impose the terms upon which that business is to be carried on. We can incorporate banks in this House, we can give a bank power to carry on its business in all parts of Canada. The bank is supposed to lend its money and, so far as any legislation we pass is concerned, the bank can lend its money and recover it after the lapse of a hundred years, but in many of the provinces they have passed legislation limiting the power of the bank to collect moneys that have been loaned by it. It is not, therefore, an answer to say that if we have power to incorporate we must necessarily have power to control. That is only true to a certain extent. As long as the matter is doubtful, it does seem to me that it would be unwise on the part of this House to pass legislation that could only end in litigation.

Mr. MACLEAN. It would be a good thing for the lawyers.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If I were as selfish as some people that might appeal to me, but I am speaking as a representative of the people, not as a lawyer or the representative of lawyers, and I think my hon. friend will give me credit at all events for sincerity in occupying that position. It has been said that if this matter is allowed to stand for a year the law will not be changed, it will be the same as it is now at the end of the year, and we will not be any better off. But in the course of a year this matter may be considered. In the course of a year decisions may be given by the courts which will place beyond controversy the question whether we have or have not the power to pass such an amendment as this. In any event, every member of this House will admit, from what we have already seen in the transaction of business by the Railway Commission, that there is ample business, urgent, pressing business, to keep the commission busy during this year, and it will not be necessary that they should remain idle merely because we decline to throw on them this additional amount of business. The passage of such an amendment as that now proposed would compel the commission to leave undone business which is as important and pressing as that which would thus be put upon them.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in the understanding that my hon. friend says that because it is not settled that we have the power, we therefore should not assume that we have the power? I would ask if that was the usual course followed by Sir Oliver Mowat in his provincial legislation? Did he not claim, on the other hand, that the proper thing to do was, where there was a semblance of right, to assume that we had the power, then to legislate on these lines and allow the courts to decide if we had or had not the power.

Mr. NORTHRUP. My hon. friend is confusing two things. It is one thing to assume a power, and another thing, when a piece of legislation is before the House, if the legislature is inclined to think we have not the power, to hold our hands, as we well might do. If the House thought that there was little doubt that we had the power, it would be different.

Mr. SPROULE. Does my hon. friend remember that when the McCarthy Act was passed in this House with regard to taking the licenses from the control of the provinces, very eminent legal authorities, including I think Hon. Edward Blake, held that we had not the power. But Sir John Macdonald, after obtaining the opinions of very eminent lawyers, including Mr. Bethune of Toronto, said that we had the power, and the House proceeded accordingly.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It cost a quarter of a million dollars to find that out.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It was an unfortunate thing for this country that this was done.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the principle, not the Act that I am speaking of.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not without sympathy for the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment. Certainly the proposition is worthy of very serious consideration, and, from a selfish standpoint, any one occupying the position of head of the Department of Railways and Canals would rejoice at the passage of such an amendment as is proposed. It would, however, be a very serious matter indeed if we were to enact this as the law of the land and be met with the difficulties suggested by the Minister of Justice. I think that on general principles it is unwise to tinker with the Railway Act, except in so far as it is absolutely necessary until such time as that Act, especially in connection with the Railway Commission, has been fairly tried.

Reference has been made by the hon. member for Halifax to the question of express privileges on the Intercolonial Railway. He states that he has receivd resolutions from the Halifax Board of Trade. I may say that I have received resolutions, not only from that Board of Trade but from many other Boards of Trade in the maritime provinces and petitions by the score have been submitted to me with a view to having the Intercolonial Railway opened to the Dominion Express Company in regard to all trains. At present the Dominion Express Company have express privileges on certain trains of the Intercolonial Railway. The proposition now made is that we should give them privileges co-extensive with the privileges enjoyed by the Canadian Express Company. This is a matter of serious moment to the Intercolonial Railway. I sympathize with the desire of many towns and villages along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, whose merchants would wish to have a certain amount of competition, but it seems to me that such competition would not bring to them the advantages which they now anticipate. Those places which have that competition have not enjoyed as fully as they anticipated the advantages of the competition which they have secured and I apprehend that those who are now looking towards the accomplishment of the prayer of the petition would perhaps be quite as much disappointed as the others have been. It involves to the Intercolonial Railway serious consequences both as regards its earnings and also as regards the cost of furnishing privileges for all express companies. I think that the Intercolonial Railway is to-day realizing something above $100,000 annually as their share of the profits of the express privileges from the Canadian Express Company. That is on the basis of the Intercolonial Railway securing over its whole line from Moncton to Montreal a percentage of the express rates. Now if a change is made and the Dominion Express Company, a part and parcel, as my hon. friend says, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are granted the privileges of the Intercolonial Railway they can go in and secure their trade without any very great advantage to the people, without any lessening of rates, as I understand it, and they can take that express to St. John and thence over their line to western points. In going the other way, they would take it all to St. John, the Intercolonial Railway would get their quota east of St. John. Under the present arrangement the Intercolonial Railway gets its proportion of the whole rate to Montreal because the Intercolonial Railways goes to Montreal. This amendment would therefore affect very materially the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway in connection with express freight. On the other hand the Intercolonial Railway would necessarily have to provide additional car

privileges at greater expense. The probabilities are that they would have to run an additional express car on each express train, and therefore, from the standpoint of dollars and cents, the matter has to be viewed by the Railway Department. I have listened to a number of delegations during the present session who have appeared before me with a view to emphasize the desire of the fruit-growers and fish dealers to have these additional express privileges along the line of the Intercolonial Railway. The matter is under consideration. I appreciate the arguments that have been put forward in favour of the idea but I must not be unmindful of the conditions prevailing on the Intercolonial. I would like to see all the railways in Canada, including the Intercolonial Railway, open to all the express companies, and if this were made general, if the Canadian, the American, the Dominion and all the express companies had equal privileges on all the lines throughout the Dominion, there would be many advantages. But if one company reserves to itself the right to monopolize all the express privileges in one section, they should not have the right to enter other sections and share with others that which they themselves are not willing to grant in their district.

Mr. MACLEAN. Might I ask my hon. friend how long the contract now existing between the government and the Canadian Express Company has to run?

Mr. EMMERSON. It expired in December.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I hope the Minister of Railways will never surrender to the express companies. I trust that when that contract expires in December, he will establish the Canadian express company belonging to the people of Canada, a national express which he will control. Is it not absurd and the height of impudence for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to come to the Canadian government and say, we want you to let us on your line in competition with other companies, and we refuse to let them on our line? The Dominion Express Company will not allow any other express company to share the cars with them.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me? I neglected to say that on the Prince Edward Island Railway, which is part of the government system of railways, the railway carries on its own express business.

Mr. MACLEAN. And so I would like to see it over the whole of the Intercolonial. As I said before, the Grand Trunk is on record as having refused to allow a competitive express company to have the use of its cars, and it defeated the other company some years ago, although the other company

acted on the advice of the late Dalton McCarthy. The Grand Trunk is so strong that it prevented that competition, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is so strong that it can prevent any other company getting on is lines. It was not the business men of the maritime provinces who asked for this express business from the Intercolonial so much as it was the secret agents of the Dominion Express Company, who went through all these towns and drafted the resolutions which were put into the hands of the boards of trade.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MACLEAN. These companies are trying to get their fangs on the people's railway. These legal arguments may be made by the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Essex. They say there will be litigation. Let there be litigation. There is not a public wrong for which there is not a legal remedy ; that is a good maxim in law, I believe. If there is some legal objection in the way, let it be removed. What is needed is not men to get up here and erect men of straw, and say there is this in the way and that in the way. All these objections can be cleared out of the way if it is the intention of parliament to regulate these companies ; and when you find them contracting themselves out of their obligations and out of the jurisdiction of this House, it is high time that we compelled the express companies to come within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. In Ontario this express business is something enormous, and it means everything to the farmers and fruit-growers. In the city of Toronto nearly all the milk and fruit that comes in every day in carloads comes by express. The price of milk to the farmers is altogether regulated by the express charges. I know of twenty teams in my own constituency which are every day bringing milk to the city of Toronto for distances of twenty or thirty miles under a broiling sun, with great loss to the milk, because the express companies force it on the roads. In the district of Niagara there was built some years ago a powerful electric line which handled a great deal of fruit; and by reason of a connection between it and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the fruit of the Niagara district was put into the city of Ottawa and the city of Montreal, and even further east. It got to be a great business, and the Canadian Pacific Railway was good enough to accommodate it and give it reduced rates. But the moment the Grand Trunk saw this, its agents went out. They captured the Hamilton and Beamsville trolley line which they hold to-day, and the fruit-growers are at the mercy of the Grand Trunk. It has cut out the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when the proper time comes it will jump up the express rates and have control of this trade. If there is any legal obstruction in the way of this parliament controlling these express companies, it can easily be removed. Parliament can by its vote to-day put these companies under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, and by next year, by testing the matter in the courts, we shall know whether they are under the jurisdiction of this parliament or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would say to my hon. friend that in view of the fact that the relation of the express companies to the Intercolonial will have to be determined by the Governor in Council before next session, they might very well at the same time consider the larger question relating to the express companies throughout Canada. There are in my judgment very strong arguments to be advanced in favour of the contention of my hon. friend. I am quite prepared to admit that ; but I do not think it is opportune at this moment to incorporate his amendment into the Railway Act. We might fairly have it stand over until next year, and the whole question could very properly be determined in connection with the proposition relating to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister explain to the committee what success has followed the management of the express business of the government road in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not had an opportunity of personally going into the question ; but from what I gather from the general manager, there are difficulties in connection with that, because the jurisdiction of the railway ends at Charlottetown or Summerside, as the case may be, and when the express companies on the mainland send articles over to the island an additional express rate has to be paid on the island. It is like a double freight rate, and it is a pretty large sum for the recipient or the shipper of the article. It is simply adding the charge of one company to the charge of another. From that standpoint it is very objectionable to the people of Prince Edward Island, and it is not completely satisfactory to the managers of the railway.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether there is a system of express under the government administration of the railway in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have stated that there is a system of express freight on the Prince Edward Island Railway, controlled by the railway management.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. minister says the matter is controlled by the railway management. With respect to parcels going in

there, has not the Dominion Company as good a right as the Canadian Express? Do you pretend to say that you take complete control of this express company on the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are no express companies which have privileges on the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. HACKETT. I understand then that there are no express companies having special privileges on that railway, and that the railway takes full charge of all express business on the island.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is correct as I understand it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Here is another instance where the public get the lean end. The public get the express business in Prince Edward Island, but where that business is profitable it is controlled by private companies. The government has never yet had anything like a fair show. Let the minister take over the whole express business. Let him compel the express companies to give his company as good treatment as they give to each other and there will be a great improvement in the express system in the maritime provinces. We will then have the fish of the maritime provinces sent to the west and the fruit of the west taken down to the sea, and there will be a larger building up of trade between the provinces.

Mr. LOGAN. In my opinion the express companies should be under the control the Railway Commission, which is the only body we have in Canada capable of dealing with their rates and regulations. But while I am in favour of the principle of the motion of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), I think we should hesitate, in view of the doubts expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice, undertaking the serious obligation which my hon. friend wants us to assume. As the Minister of Justice has pointed out, the adoption of this motion would lead to a revision of the whole Railway Act, and this period of the session, when we are nearing its end, does not seem to me the proper time to take up so important a matter. But in the meantime I would ask the Minister of Justice to refer a case to the Supreme Court so that we might get the opinion of that court as to whether the legislation proposed is ultra vires or within our jurisdiction. The importance of this matter demands that some such reference should be made. I do not agree with some gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon, that because certain legislation might be within our jurisdiction, we ought to pass it and then let those who challenge our jurisdiction make good their claim. That, it seems to me, would be an unwise policy. A mistake on our part might involve the country in serious damages. We have had already to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in consequence of legislating beyond our jurisdiction. Before we pass legislation, let us be sure that we have the right to do so, and not force private individuals to contest our right and perhaps be subjected to a defeat in the courts with all the consequences of a defeat of that nature. Just one word with reference to the express business of the Intercolonial. I cannot agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that because the Dominion Express Company has a monopoly in some parts of Canada, we should not allow it to break the monopoly on the Intercolonial. Between certain points of the Intercolonial, for instance between Lévis and Moncton, the Canadian Express Company has a monopoly. Between Truro and Sydney in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, on the island of Cape Breton, the Canadian Express Company also enjoys a monopoly. and it has likewise a monopoly on the short line between Oxford and Pictou. In view of the demands made by the people for better regulations and rates, it seems to me the Minister of Railways should seriously consider the giving to the Dominion Express Company equal rights on the government railways with the Canadian Express Company. As regards the question of government ownership of express companies, it is one which we should take considerable time to consider. There are difficulties that at once suggest themselves. It would necessitate the government becoming the owner of horses, carriages, harness and the general equipment of an express company.

Mr. MACLEAN. How does the government handle the mails?

Mr. LOGAN. By tender and contract, and you could not very well handle the express business in that way. However, I have not given the question sufficient study and consideration to be in a position to express a decided opinion, but considering the facts, I can see no objection to granting to the Dominion Express Company, equal privileges on the government roads with the Canadian Express Company, especially as that would be nothing more than fair to the people of the maritime provinces. In the meantime I trust my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will see his way clear to have the question of jurisdiction referred to the Supreme Court for an opinion.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any documentary evidence to show that we are nearing the end of the session? If so, will he kindly lay it on the table?

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to say to the hon. Minister of Railways that I believe public opinion in the maritime provinces is in favour of free trade in express companies. The legal difficulty I know nothing about at present, but there should be some way of getting around it. We want active competi-

tion in express companies on the Intercolonial, and there is a feeling among the people that they are unjustly treated by having one company given vested rights in the government railway to the exclusion of others. The people of course have to suffer the consequences of want of competition. I would support my hon. friend the Minister of Railways in any fair measure in which he would give free trade to express companies.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) negatived on division.

Mr. MACLEAN moved to amend the Bill by adding a section which will read as follows :

Section 10 of the said Act is amended by striking out the words 'and his opinion on any question which, in the opinion of the commissioners, is a question of law, shall prevail.

He said : This is to remove a difficulty which has arisen in connection with the Railway Commission and which came to the front not long ago. The towns of Port Arthur and Fort William have a municipal telephone service. After a great deal of trouble a year ago we got a clause put in the Railway Act to the effect that every railway company is bound, on the order of the Railway Commission, to give access to any municipal or incorporated telephone system that seeks admission to the stations of any railway company. I secured that amendment by repeated argument last session and pointing out that the Canadian Pacific Railway had refused access to its station to independent companies on the plea that it had made a contract—this old plea of a contract—with the Bell Telephone Company allowing that company and no other telephone company to have connection with their station. Parliament was good enough after a severe fight to put a clause in the Act to this effect :

Whenever any municipality or corporation has authority to construct, operate and maintain a telephonic system in any district, and is desirous of obtaining telephonic connection or communication with or within any station or premises of the company, in such district and cannot agree with the company with respect thereto, such municipality or corporation may apply to the board for leave therefor, and the board may order the company to provide for such connection or communication upon such terms as to compensation as the board deems just and expedient, and may order and direct how, when, where, by whom and upon what terms and conditions such telephonic connection or communication shall be constructed, operated and maintained.

Hon. Mr. Blair, who was then Minister of Railways and Canals and who piloted this Bill through parliament, told the House that this Bill is to meet the emergency which I have stated and to remove the grievances of the people who own independent telephone lines, the grievances of Locust Hill, Port Arthur, Fort William, and other places. With that understanding I accepted that amendment. Time passed and the commission was organized. Hon. Mr. Blair became chairman of the commission. These people of Port Arthur and Fort William, Locust Hill and other places appeared before the commission and asked that the railway should be compelled to allow them telephonic access to the station. The case was argued and the permission given. The majority of the commission of three members —Hon. Mr. Blair, ex-Minister of Railways ; Hon. Mr. Bernier, ex-Minister of Inland Revenue, and Professor Mills, who had been selected on account of his business capacity, I believe—ruled that under this clause these local telephone companies had the right of access to these stations under the provisions of the Act. But the chairman of the commission, Mr. Blair, said : You may be in favour of giving these telephone companies access to the station, but there is another clause in the Act which makes this a legal issue and so brings it wholly and solely within my jurisdiction.

Mr. EMMERSON. Section 10.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is section 10, which reads as follows :

Not less than two commissioners shall attend at the hearing of every case, and the chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and his opinion upon any question, which in the opinion of the commissioners is a question of law, shall prevail.

Now, if there was any justification for the Bill passed last session establishing a railway commission it was that the people of Canada were at last to have a tribunal that would control these railway companies and regulate their charges, and this would be done by business men in a business way, without the long-drawn-out system of the courts. It is on that ground that hon. gentlemen opposite are justifying the Railway Act before the public. They make it their boast that at last they have established a tribunal that will deal with these questions speedily. But, instead of having such a tribunal it now turns out that it is to all intents and purposes a court of law, and that the chief justice of that court is supreme and can override his two colleagues. And to show that I do not go outside the record, let me read a few lines from what Mr. Blair said. This is in a despatch dated Ottawa, March 22nd, and gives an account of the speech made by Mr. Blair at the opening of the Railway Commission :

I think I can say for the board—I certainly say it for myself as being responsible for the legal conclusions that may be arrived at.

So, he has the right to say what is the legal issue and to tell his colleagues to sit aside. Never was such a lecture delivered in any legal tribunal before as that given by Mr. Blair to his colleagues. In effect he

said: Now, you two get off the bench; I will occupy it myself; this is a question of law and I will decide it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. From what section of the law is that quoted?

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the substance of what Mr. Blair told these good little boys who had been sent to accompany him. He told them to sit down and he would interpret the law. And his interpretation is to the effect that the people of Port Arthur and Fort William, and the farmers of Locust Hill, and the local companies in Quebec and the Northwest, who want telephonic connection with these stations, can only have it by paying enormous damages to the Bell Telephone Company. That is the sum and substance of his decision. That is the barren verdict given the people by the chairman of the Railway Commission. But we propose that this Samson shall be shorn of his locks, that he shall be made only co-equal with his colleagues and that all three members of the commission shall be judges of the law as they are judges of the facts. I do not believe in putting the great commercial interests of this country absolutely in the hands of a lawyer. In many cases under our law we summon a jury and the jury becomes the judge of both law and fact. That is the system that should be followed in this case. The business men and farmers of this country do not want to be left at the mercy of a lawyer at the head of this court.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the right to appeal, is there not?

Mr. MACLEAN. He says there is the right to appeal to the Privy Council and the Supreme Court, and these people have been sent there. They came down the other day to make some motion in regard to it and they were told that the commission was going west and it would take a long while to get into the Supreme Court. And the chairman of the commission is on record as saying in effect: You had better not go to the Privy Council. He warned them not to go.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GOURLEY. Mr. Blair is a good lawyer, and——

Mr. MACLEAN. This is what he said:

> I think that an appeal to the Governor in Council would not be desirable in that case. It is a question of law purely and simply so far as it now stands. And—I say it with all respect—the Governor in Council is not a tribunal to determine questions of law.

Mr. GOURLEY. When the hon. gentleman speaks of the Privy Council he does not refer to the judicial committee of the Privy Council?

Mr. MACLEAN. No. This is the position taken by this new Czar. He says, in effect: My colleagues' opinion does not count when it is a matter of law, and I do not think that you litigants should go to the Privy Council, though you have a right to go. The people of this country do not want law, they want service, they want the simple, common right to put their telephone lines into the station of these great railway corporations that they have created. And, as I said before, who are the people who ask for this accommodation—it can be called accommodation—for the railways? They are the clients of the railway companies. All that they want access to the railway station for is to be able to ask if their freight has arrived, if the train is on time, when they should send goods to the station for shipment, and so on. They are all anxious to do business with these railways and they find that this Bell Telephone Company, by a contract, has got between them and the railways and they cannot get into these railway stations.

It is the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada to whom we are giving $150,000,000 to build a transcontinental railway that we propose to empower to enslave the people; it is the Canadian Pacific Railway to whom we have given millions and millions of dollars, and to whom we propose further to give power to enslave the people by preventing them from having telephone access to railway stations. I believe that the contract by which this railway company contracted to keep rival companies out of their stations is bad in law, I believe it is against the public interest, and would so be declared by the courts if appealed to. Therefore under these circumstances I come here with this little amendment asking parliament to change the law so that the supreme jurisdiction now vested in the Chairman of the Railway Commission may be taken away, and that the questions which come before him may be tried, both as questions of business and as questions of law, by some other men, by two lawyers if you will. You may not have two, but don't make monkeys of the colleagues of the chairman. Both of these men were seized of this case, both of them gave excellent judgments. I have asked the Minister of Justice to read the judgments that were given by the Hon. Mr. Bernier and Professor Mills. They are both sound, practical judgments that appeal to every one. They said: These people are entitled to go into these railway stations under this Act, and we make the order forthwith. But the Czar stands up and says: You shall not do so, this is a question of law, and I take it out of your hands. So the people are denied this privilege of going into railway stations.

Mr. WADE. The commissioners must agree that it is a question of law, then the chairman has power to decide.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not find the word 'Czar' defined in the Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, but here is what he does find. In a statement given out by the Chairman of the Committee on March 22 last, Mr. Blair, the Chairman, said : 'I certainly say it as being responsible for the legal conclusions that may be arrived at.'

Mr. WADE. But we have section 10 of the statute and here is what it says :

> Not less than two commissioners shall attend at the hearing of every case, and the chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and his opinion upon any question, which in the opinion of the commissioners is a question of law, shall prevail.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know that is the case, and it was on the strength of this that he immediately acts without these two men. But of course they should have stood out and asserted themselves. The defence that will be offered here to-day will probably be that there should be no such clause as that in the Act. Take that out and let us make these two men co-equal. Do that, and I believe that the business men, the farmers of this country will have some confidence in these men who will proceed to grant relief in many cases.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that about seven-tenths of all the cases that come before that commission involve questions of law ? A man's right is generally determined by his legal right. It is true that he may have a moral right, but if a man has a legal right and one that can be fairly defended in law, it gives him a different status from that he would otherwise occupy. In nearly all these cases there is a question of law involved, and if questions of law can be decided by the chairman, surely the other two commissioners might as well stay at home. We know that when the Railway Commission was contemplated at first, it was contended strongly that it should consist of three men, one a lawyer, one a railway expert, and one a man who should be a man of common sense, a man who would be versed generally in matters of trade and commerce. It was set forth that it was essentially requisite to have a commission composed in that way so that they might bring their varied intelligences to bear on the different questions that would come before them. It was never contended that the legal mind on that commission should control the others on any question, whether of law or of fact.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think the position is this : This commission must necessarily have a lawyer among its members. Whatever government appoints these commissioners will endeavour to get the best men obtainable. The salaries paid them are probably based on that principle. I do not think any one will dispute the ability of the present Chairman of the Commission, as a lawyer. It was to be expected that we should find such a section as section 10 in this Act. Necessarily, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, questions of law enter into nearly every dispute that will come before the commission. Now a layman, be he ever so clever, be he ever so good a business man, be he ever so well versed in railway matters, is not as competent to judge of the legal effect of an argument, or of an existing condition, as is a trained legal mind. Therefore, it is only reasonable to expect that when the commission has to decide upon a question where a legal point is involved, the decision on that legal point belongs and should be vested in that member of the commission who is a legal gentleman, in the present case in the chairman. Now they have got to agree, and it is by virtue of section 10 that they have first to agree that there is a legal point involved. Then which of the members of that commission, the trained legal mind on the one hand, or the member who may have no legal knowledge whatever, is the better judge of the question of law, or the better able to decide what law should apply to the point in dispute ? That is altogether outside the numerous questions or circumstances that may arise that are not of a legal character.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment ? Are not these colleagues of the chairman who are constantly engaged in construing the various clauses in the Act, by that fact qualified to engage in the business of interpreting the law ?

Mr. GALLIHER. That does not affect my argument at all ; they may or may not be so. The other two commissioners, no matter how able they may be in every respect from a business point of view, in their commercial knowledge, in their technical railway knowledge, or in their general intelligence, are not as capable of construing a legal point as is a trained legal mind. But we do not rest there. There is an appeal. The Hon. Mr. Blair, Chairman of the Commission, in the case mentioned, says there is an appeal, if I remember correctly, even to the Privy Council. These parties have their right of appeal, first it is to the government. Then there is a section which specially provides that either party to a dispute may, on his own motion, and upon giving such security as directed by statute, ask for the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada upon any question which, in the opinion of the board, is a question of law. A reference can be made at the request of the Governor in Council. Either party may do so, or the board may do so. Surely that is all the protection any one wants. You may say that the board won't do it because they won't stultify themselves. Then it is open to you, the privilege is granted to you. But at all events, I think that meets one of the objections raised by my hon. friend. It is not as if the Chairman of the Railway

Commission was the Czar in the matter, and his decision was final in all cases, because it is not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as all matters which do not involve some question of law are concerned, the majority of the board must determine them. As far as questions of law are concerned, they will eventually have to be decided by some person. If the board should proceed without regard to the statute under which it is acting, and by which it is controlled, of course there would be a remedy outside, because its acts would be beyond its jurisdiction and inoperative, and would be so declared by the courts. If the chairman of the Railway Commission could himself decide that a particular matter is a question of law, and therefore arrogate to himself everything that came before the board, there would be good ground for making some alteration in the law, but the point that has been more particularly urged by my hon. friend from East York is that the other two members of the board were rather weak in yielding when they should not have yielded. That is not due to a defect in the law, but it is due to a defect in the constitution of the board.

Mr. MACLEAN. No; it is due to the bulldosing of the chief, who says: I am responsible for the legal conclusion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the ultimate view it would be due to the weakness of the gentlemen who did not assert themselves as members of the commission in the way they were entitled to do under the law. I think this court ought to be a speedy court, but at the same time when the court has to consider legal questions, it must have regard to legal principles, and it must be bound by the terms of the statute which it has to consider and by the law under which it is acting. Under these circumstances, it would appear to me to be a little dangerous to remove this provision from the statute until we have had a little more experience and until we have found some real injustice resulting from it, because the injustice which is said to have resulted does not seem to be due to anything in the Act, but rather to the fault of the two junior members of the board, who did not take the position which they should have taken.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and also my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals whether they know of any other court in the world so constituted?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. What court?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the ordinary courts of the country, where the jury determines questions of fact, the judge always determines questions of law. The jury are the absolute judges of the facts. They can determine the question of fact against the charge of the judge, but when it comes to a question of law, the judge must determine that, subject to the same appeal as that which is created by this statute.

Mr. MACLEAN. The case is not apposite. What I want to know is where you will find a court in which the chairman of the court says to his colleagues: This is a question for me to determine, not you. Take the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the United States, which is dealing with similar matters, and which was appointed for the very same purpose; do you mean to tell me that the chairman of that commission has any more power than his colleagues have? We all know about the judge and jury, and I admitted that some time ago, but here is a commission appointed by parliament at the request of the people of this country, of the merchants and the farmers, to deal with these questions and to deal with them speedily. Now we are told that these questions are practically all questions of law, and the Chairman arrogates to himself the decision of these questions of law. We are getting back to the old thing. Everybody who is a lawyer in this House is getting up and saying that there is a legal obstruction in the way. It is always a case of contract. Somebody must interpret contracts, and now we have the railway companies contracting themselves out in connection with express companies, we have the railway companies contracting themselves out in connection with the telephone companies, and when the people come here for relief we find the lawyers one after another getting up and saying: This is a question of law, it has to be taken into the courts and there has to be litigation.

Mr. SCOTT. Would passenger rates be a question of law?

Mr. MACLEAN. No; of justice.

Mr. SCOTT. But you have no confidence in the commission now.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will come to that. I want to tell my hon. friend that there are a good many people in the Northwest Territories who want to have telephone communication with the railway stations there. The farmers want to have it, and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), if he were in his place, as he ought to be, to back up what he said the other day, would be helping me to fight this battle against this frightful monopoly of the Bell Telephone Company and that great railway company out there, who are trying to perpetrate an injustice upon the people. The people of the Northwest are pretty tired of the present conditions, they want telephone communication with the railway stations in the west, and, while, they are anxious to secure it, the Bell Telephone Company are busy every day building lines, getting into possession and placing themselves in a position to prevent any independent company from

gaining access to the railway stations. Down in the province of Quebec, according to the statement of a gentleman who came to see me the other evening, they are building hundreds of miles of independent lines. but the one thing that blocks them is the contract between the Bell Telephone Company and the railway companies, and the one thing that justifies this contract is the clause in the Railway Act which allows the chairman of the commission to take the position he is taking, when he claims that this is a matter of law and that his colleagues are not judges of the law. After his colleagues had considered this case and had said that these independent telephone companies were entitled to enter these stations, they turned around, for what reason I do not know, and allowed the chairman of the commission to arrogate to himself the decision of the case. If there had been a genuine farmer on the commission, as the right hon. Prime Minister promised there would be, he would not have consented to have had it interpreted as a question of law. But the chairman of the commission said that it was a question of law, and there it remains. It is now in the courts ; go there ; go to this court ; go to some other court ; make it a legal question ; talk about contracts ; talk about the constitution, but all the time humbug the people and give no relief ! It is relief that is wanted. This commission is one that should afford relief. If there is a grievance, and this country has a fair grievance in this matter, there should be a tribunal to remedy that grievance, and in the old days the public men found a remedy for public grievances. They had that remedy in the voting of supplies, but in some way things have changed now, all kinds of public grievances are permitted, and the duty devolves upon two or three men to make the fight in this parliament for public rights. Sometimes I have to carry it on, sometimes other men have to carry it on, and it is carried on as well as it can be, but it has come to this that supplies are voted while these public grievances continue. Hon. gentlemen in this House pledged themselves on the platform all over the country that, as Liberals, they were the friends of the people, and that they believed in constitutional progress, but they forget that constitutional progress in Canada has consisted in the remedy of the grievances of the people. I am sorry to say there is no effort being made now to remedy these grievances in connection with the voting of supplies. We are voting supplies, we are paying salaries to this commission, $10,000 to one and $8,000 to two others, with a company of clerks and servitors of one kind and another added, and they are doing nothing to remedy these grievances but giving the public a lawsuit. Go to another court ! We did not create this court, we did not put this country to this great expense, we did not find these places for public servants, to be told, when we bring a grievance before it, that it is a matter of law, and that we must go from one court to another. If that is to be the answer, all well and good ; the public have to be met, and the public have to be met by hon. gentlemen who sit in this House. The public will be seized of this question, they are being seized of it, and they expect different answers from legal quibbles and contentions to the effect that you must go from court to court, and that no remedy is to be given.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is not quite consistent in the argument which he makes. If I understand his amendment rightly, it is only an amendment to section 10 of the Railway Act, which says that when, in the opinion of the chairman of the commission, it is a question of law, the decision of that question must be left to the chairman of the commission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. 'When in the opinion of the board.'

Mr. CASGRAIN. Of the commissioners, yes. My hon. friend says that you should not force people who go before this court to go before another court, but his amendment does not go far enough to secure that end. What does he want ? He wants this commission to decide on questions of law, he wants this commission, which is composed of one lawyer and as the case is now, one notary public, and another gentleman of no legal attainments to decide between railway companies and persons who go before this commission, sometimes in cases involving questions of liability and enormous amounts of money without any appeal to a higher court. I would put this question to any reasonable man and would be willing to discuss it before an assembly of reasonable men and ask them if they would submit to the danger of being judged in the last resort by this commission.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not propose to refuse an appeal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If my hon. friend does not propose to abolish the appeal granted in section 43, his amendment falls short of the argument he has just given. The whole argument of my hon. friend was that you must give the people of this country a tribunal of last resort before which they can go and not send litigants from one court to the other. His amendment then falls short of this argument ; he does not propose to amend section 43 which gives the right of appeal. Now, I ask, what will be the ultimate result of the amendment which he proposes ? Supposing that the majority of the commissioners decide a question of law. Does my hon. friend think that even if two commissioners were of the opinion that

they should reverse the opinion of the chief commissioner on a question of law that the railway company interested or the other party litigating, if it was an important case, would not go further and take an appeal ? Does my hon. friend think that for a moment ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then I say his amendment does not go far enough if he is really sincere in his desire to attain this object. He should go a step further but if he goes that step further he is trying to legislate not only against the interests of the railway companies who have to go before the Railway Commission, but also against the interests of any litigant whose case comes before the gentlemen for adjudication. It is no use making speeches to the effect that this is a cheap tribunal before which the people can go, a tribunal which would decide in the last resort so that they would not have to go from court to court. Unless he proposes also to abrogate section 43 of the Railway Act, which gives the right of appeal. I again repeat that even if two commissioners were of a different opinion on a question of law from the chief commissioner, an appeal would still be taken, and the public would not have the cheap court of which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) speaks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To supplement what my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has said I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, (Mr. Maclean) to the fact that the system we have here is the same as that which prevails in England. My hon. friend is aware that in England there are five railway commissioners, two appointed and three ex officio. There is one ex officio member for England one for Ireland and one for Scotland. Three commissioners constitute a quorum of the five, but one ex officio commissioner must always sit and he must always be a judge appointed by the Chancellor in England or the Chief Justice in Ireland, or the Chief Legal Authority in Scotland and the chairman we have here is, as in England, always a judge.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the definition of his jurisdiction is it set forth that he is the judge of the law ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That goes as a mere matter of common sense. There you have three commissioners two of whom are laymen and one a judge. Invariably in a commission of that kind the judge's opinion would prevail on a question of law.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is too good a logician not to see that it would be absurd that on a question of law two laymen would decide as against a trained legal gentleman put there practically to decide legal questions. My hon. friend sees how absurd that would be.

Mr. MACLEAN. No he does not ; he sees the quibble.

Mr. GOURLEY. This discussion is valuable as giving to us some idea of the Railway Act. The difficulty which I think my learned friend——

Mr. MACLEAN. Pardon me, I do not want the honour.

Mr. GOURLEY—that the hon. member for East York has is with these two farmer members of the commission. He asks that we should have at least three farmers but the difficulty is that with the two farmers they would first have to agree that it was a question of law before the legal man has any right to say a word. Therefore it shows me that farmers are very poor men to put upon a court.

Mr. MACLEAN. But there is no farmer on it.

Mr. GOURLEY. You are speaking of farmers' decisions and I assume that these two gentlemen who are not lawyers would give farmers' decisions. The remedy for my hon. friend's difficulty is to have two other lawyers, and I would suggest that he move that the two farmers be struck off and two more lawyers be put on.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not agree there.

Mr. GOURLEY. And then you would get justice.

Mr. COCHRANE. You would get plenty of law.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am bound to say after considerable experience, and the committee will agree with me that I do not promote the interests of my trade very much, that three lawyers on a commission would give more justice in half an hour, than a dozen farmers would in a thousand years.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not object, provided the three are co-equal.

Mr. GOURLEY. A lawyer goes at a thing right ; he looks at it from all sides, he sums up and does justice. I am surprised that we have not three trained men on this commission, because the commissioners are constantly dealing, under this Act, with vested interests, with rights of property, and I cannot imagine how a man would protect these rights of property unless he had legal training.

Mr. HEYD. Do you think that with more than one legal gentleman on the board they would ever agree ?

Mr. GOURLEY. They would never disagree. They might start to disagree in the morning but they would agree at noon, or if they did not agree at noon, they would

agree at night. A good lawyer has no pride of opinion. I may have a strong opinion now, but I may change it at once and within the next hour I may change it again. The only thing about which a lawyer is anxious is that the sun shall not go down upon him having a wrong opinion. He may change his opinion a thousand times a day, but will never let the sun go down upon him holding a wrong opinion if he can help it. A layman on the other hand may have a wrong opinion in the morning but through pride, conceit and personal bullheadedness will hold to that opinion be he right or wrong.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He does not care about the sun going down.

Mr. GOURLEY. He does not care about the sun going down upon his wrong opinion. With regard to Mr. Blair I may say that when I first entered this House I was rather prejudiced against him, coming from the maritime provinces, being a Tory and not having personal acquaintance with him; but after being here for two or three years I learned to have for him a great admiration. He was strong and clear, always understood the facts and had a firm grip of the whole circumstances of any case under consideration. If there is any man in Canada who should have the right of settling these matters and should have the confidence of the people in doing so, he is that man. I have a kind of sympathy for my hon. friend here (Mr. Maclean). There should be three farmers on this commission, or three lawyers. The great thing is not to mix up good material like a lawyer with alloy like farmers. You will always have a base metal when you mix gold with bronze; you will always have difficulties with a mixed tribunal. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) should amend his Bill so as to have either three lawyers or three farmers.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). I am sorry that the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has such a poor opinion of laymen generally.

Mr. GOURLEY. No, I have a very high opinion.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). Of farmers. It is not long since I heard him saying that every elector in Colchester was equal, if not superior to everybody in this House.

Mr. GOURLEY. More than equal, I say.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I did not altogther agree with him at that time, and I do not agree with him now. I think there are plenty of farmers in the country who are quite as capable of judging the merits of a case if it does not become a question of law as any lawyer in this House. I do not want to discredit the ability of lawyers in their profession, and it is almost charming to see how they agree in this instance, because the Act gives them greater power than they had before. They always want to climb up and get more influence by Act of parliament than they had before. That is generally the aim of lawyers. I have expressed my opinion in this House of the chairman of that committee before, and I have not changed it since. I am not going to repeat it now; but I would not withdraw to-day a single word that I said about that gentleman at the time he tendered his resignation:

Mr. PUTTEE. I am sorry to see that the weight of legal argument this afternoon is so strongly against the hon. member for East York, because behind all this there is this fact, that the intention of parliament as expressed last year has been absolutely frustrated, in connection with giving rights to independent telephone companies to connect with railway stations. When the Bill was up here last year, and even before, the towns of Fort William and Port Arthur were very prominently before the members of the House and the country with their grievance against the Bell Telephone Company. They had a municipal system of telephones, which was refused connection with the railway stations in those two towns. While we were discussing the matter, the mayor and councils of those two towns came down here and put their position before the Railway Committee. The Minister of Railways was altogether opposed to the Bell Telephone Company being interfered with in their monopoly in the railway stations of the country. After the matter had been thoroughly discussed both here and in the Railway Committee, the minister became aware that the opinion on both sides of the House was overwhelmingly against him, and he finally brought in an amendment to meet their wishes. The amendment was thought by the minister himself and the members of the House to give independent companies the right to put their instruments in the stations of the railway companies, and the clause passed in that way. We did not know then that the Minister of Railways of last session was to be the chairman of the Railway Commission this year; but so it happened, and this very clause was the first important one to come before the commission. The result, whether right or wrong, was to completely frustrate the intention of the majority of the members of this House last year. Now, something should be done to put us in the position which we thought we occupied. Perhaps the hon. member for East York is wrong in proposing to strike out this part of this section. Perhaps he ought to have taken another section. At all events, some proposition should be brought forward under this Bill to put us in the position which we thought we were in with respect to independent telephones last year.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Just a word. I understood that this Railway Commission was to decide all questions between the railway companies, the farmers, the travelling public, and every one concerned. I had no idea that we were to have a one-man power on that commission; but it seems that is what it is down to. Then we might as well save the expense of the other two, and allow the one-man, if he must have a legally trained mind, to decide all questions. The other two men might as well be dispensed with. The first thing we want to know in regard to this matter is, what is law? I always understood law was common sense. Some of the greatest minds in Britain that the world ever saw knew nothing about law; they were not trained in law. Men may have great minds and never study law. I do not think we are obliged to fall back on a man who has been to college and studied and learned to quibble on words—because that is what lawyers generally do. What we want are facts—whatever is true and right. Whom do we find getting up and defending the Czar of the commission? Every lawyer in the House, while the farmers are ignored. If the amendment of the hon. member for East York is not made, we shall have trouble of this kind every year. We had better settle it now for all time, that whatever that committee decides to do shall be the law in this matter.

Mr. MACLEAN. I regret that there has been only a farmer on this side of the House to take the side of the farmers in this issue. The farmers all over this country are asking for this relief. They are simply asking that these railway companies, who are enjoying immense subsidies of the people's money, shall allow the people's telephone lines, which are struggling against a great monopoly, to have access to these railway stations to do business with them. I believe that under the common law of this country, that contract is against the public interest of this country, and is illegal; I believe these railway companies could be compelled, irrespective of the railway commission to give that access; but as it is they are denying it. The farmers are refused this relief, and there is not a farmer on the other side of the House to get up and say a word for them. The Postmaster General, who used to make my own province ring with the complaint that in this matter the farmers were being bled white, is not in his place; hon. gentlemen who represent the farmers have not a word to say in their interest; and the men from the Northwest who are threatened with this Bell monopoly, have not a word to say, although if a decision were given in the Port Arthur case, the matter would be settled in all parts of the country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him whether any appeal was taken from the decision of the Chief Commissioner? When was the decision given?

Mr. MACLEAN. The decision was given on March 22. Representatives of the town of Port Arthur came to Toronto. I had an interview with the mayor and several representatives of the two towns. They said they were on their way to Ottawa, and they had incurred great expense to have the case argued, but they did not want more litigation. They wanted relief first of all. If we cannot get it in this way, I have another amendment to meet the case which may command the support of my hon. friend from Montmorency. They sent an agent here the other day to get an appointment for them, and they were told the old story, that the commissioners were going to the coast, that they would be back some time in September, and that they would then make a reference to the Supreme Court.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Between the month of March and now there must have been time for them to have lodged an appeal. If the decision was really not right and there was an injustice done, they surely would have had time to put in an appeal and have it decided.

Mr. MACLEAN. And the matter would have gone to the Supreme Court. The chairman of the commission was good enough to say he would make a reference to the Supreme Court. That court would probably construe it to be a question of law, and these farmers would have had to pay enormous damages to the Bell Telephone Company in order to have this telephone connection.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Supposing section 10 did not exist at all and the chief commissioner would not have the decision on a question of law, and suppose the three commissioners decided against the telephone company, does the hon. gentleman not think that, under section 43, there would have been an appeal by the company against that decision?

Mr. MACLEAN. I grant that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then your amendment does not meet the case.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a bastard court which gives one man more power than his colleagues.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is a good English word.

Mr. BLANCHET. But not used in good English society.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I am not using it in any wrong sense. It is a very fitting word to describe a court in which one judge decides everything and tells the others to

sit down. The jurisdiction should be co-equal. I am willing to accept the suggestion made that the three judges should be lawyers, but at any rate they should have equal powers. The questions that come before them are almost altogether questions of fact. They are such questions as ordinary business men can decide just as we decide them in this House. Why must the judge of necessity be a lawyer if the man who makes the law is not a lawyer ?

Mr. GOURLEY. That makes the necessity greater.

Mr. MACLEAN. An ordinary man has the right to assist in making the law, but once it is made, we are told that it must be interpreted by legal men. I object to that. The ordinary business men of the country could very well decide these questions. Such men to decide them across the line, where they have an Interstate Commission, and where substantial relief is given the public by the decisions of that commission.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to express myself in favour of some change in the law so that the different telephone companies in Canada shall have the right to connect with the larger corporations. I had a conversation with a leading business man of the town of Port Arthur the other day, and he told me that the telephone system between Port Arthur and Fort William was a perfect success. The business men of both places were well satisfied with the local service, but they had a strong complaint that they were unable to get outside connections with the Bell Telephone. I do not think that parliament should pass any legislation which would interfere with the rights of the Bell Telephone Company. That company has done very much for the people. It has done good service in many cases.

Mr. COCHRANE. They make you pay for it.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think this constitutes any very great grievance, but I do not think it is in the interests of the people that one or more than one very large corporation should have the monopoly of sending messages to different parts of Canada. If a local company is established in any locality, it should have the right to connect with the long distance telephone service, so long as it is willing to pay. I am in favour of legislation which will allow the different local companies to connect with the larger telephone companies and thus have the privilege of sending messages to different parts of Canada. We must bear in mind that the telephone is an increasing business. Men who years ago never went near a telephone office are now its daily visitors, and a considerable portion of the business of the country is transacted by telephone. This is the case, not only with banking and commercial institutions, but with farmers. Parliament should therefore provide such legislation as will give local telephone companies access to the long distance service, provided they are willing to pay a reasonable rate.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always held the view that when we incorporate a railway company we bring it under the Railway Act, and that the Act contemplates that every part of the public should have equal rights in doing business with the railways.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. SPROULE. In this case a patron of the Bell Telephone Company has the advantage of enjoying conveniences which are denied other men who want to do business with it. That is not equal rights to all. It is discrimination in favour of one as against another, and the law does not contemplate any such discrimination. We are told over and over again that when we give railway corporations the right to build railways, they become common carriers and must treat all alike, but the Bell Telephone Company are doing just the opposite and we are supporting them. It should be the duty of parliament to break down that injustice and put all on an equal footing. If a railway company is to be allowed to give the Bell Telephone Company a monopoly in its stations, all those who are not patrons of that company are discriminated against. It may be that the law as it stands would justify the Bell Company, but that certainly never was the intention of parliament. Parliament has declared over and over again that its intention was that railway corporations shall treat all alike ; and if the law enables them to avoid that obligation, this parliament should amend it, and if parliament fails to do its duty, the people will have a just complaint against the government of the day and those members who refused to secure to the public equal rights. If this be allowed, you can take any part of the country you like, and for one who will enjoy the privilege you will find fifteen or twenty denied it. That is not meting out equal treatment to all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Lest I should be misunderstood in anything I have said, I desire to explain that the amendment I was considering was simply this—to strike out from this section the words 'and his opinion on any question which, in the opinion of the commissioners, is a question of law, should prevail.' The point which has been discussed by the last two hon. gentlemen who have spoken is one which arises more particularly on the next amendment. I was expressing no opinion on that. The only thing I desire to point out is that the question of law must be decided by a tribunal

of some kind which is supposed to possess the knowledge requisite for the construing of statutes. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) argues that the chief commissioner should not have that power, being a lawyer. Of course, I am disposed to give every possible weight to everything the hon. gentleman urges in that regard. But the case that has been brought forward as an illustration is one which, whatever might be done with this amendment, would, in the end, be decided by the Supreme Court, it seems to me. Under the law as it stands, the chief commissioner has decided a point of law. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court. If it were otherwise, if the two gentlemen not members of the legal profession had decided this case in the opposite way and had overruled the opinion of the legal member of the board, undoubtedly the board as a whole would permit an appeal to the Supreme Court. So, in the end the Supreme Court would decide the question of law. That is altogether apart from the merits of the question whether or not the decision of the chief commissioner was right. If it was right the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) proposes to so alter the law that the decisions hereafter shall be otherwise. In that connection we must consider the justice of the decision pronounced by the chief commissioner. Upon this amendment, I am not expressing any opinion upon the desirability of altering that law in that regard. When we come to consider that amendment I shall be prepared to express an opinion. I desire to make it clear that I have not said anything that can be construed as opposed to the amendment which we shall be called upon to discuss in a little while.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When we do come to the discussion of the next amendment of which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has given notice, I shall have an opportunity to show that the statement made as to the effect of the judgment rendered in the Port Arthur case is incorrect. Because, one commissioner did not overrule two. The hon. gentleman will see, if he considers the effect of the judgment, that the chief commissioner and Hon. Mr. Bernier are, in effect agreed, and that the dissent is on the part of Mr. Mills. However, we will deal with that on the next question.

Mr. MACLEAN. My position is that when a court is established its members should have equal jurisdiction, power and weight; that one ought not to be superior to the others. And I still stick to that. I propose to do away with all distinctions in the court in this respect. All I want is a court constituted of men of authority in deciding all matters that come before them. I think that is a good rule and it has never been departed from in any case that I know of. Certainly no instance put forward here to-days shows a tribunal composed of men of unequal power, one being given the authority to overrule the others.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. MACLEAN moved:

Section 193 of the said Act is amended by adding the following words:—'And such compensation shall be limited to the direct and immediate local damages actually suffered by reason of such construction, operation and maintenance by the railway company at such station or premises, and not from any cause, matter or business extending beyond the same.'

He said: This amendment is to meet the case of Port Arthur and Fort William. The object is to provide that independent telephone companies shall have the right of access to these stations and that the only damage they shall pay is the actual damage incurred by the intrusion—that they shall not pay any damage that the Bell Telephone Company or the railway company may plead that they have sustained under any contract. The clause was drawn by some legal gentlemen who are interested in the Port Arthur decision. If the point were made clear, as I believe it will be by this amendment, there could be no such decision——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has the decision, would he be good enough to explain it for the benefit of some of us who are not as familiar with the case as he is?

Mr. MACLEAN. I am sorry to say that I have mislaid the decision. But the substance of it, as I understand it, was that these independent companies would have to go to court to have it decided whether they should not pay large damages to both the telephone and the railway company. The Canadian Pacific Railway and Bell Telephone Company pleaded before the Railway Commission that this right of access meant hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage to them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could they plead that?

Mr. MACLEAN. The contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Bell Telephone Company provides that, in consideration of the Bell Telephone Company being granted a monopoly in the Canadian Pacific Railway stations, the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be supplied free with all the telephone instruments needed in connection with their business. I have read the contract in this House, and it is on record in 'Hansard.' The Grand Trunk has a similar contract with the Bell Telephone Company. Hon. gentlemen ought to read the equipment called for even in the city of Montreal in the way of free telephones. There can be no doubt that, if independent telephone companies were allowed access to the railway stations, the loss to these other

concerns would be very considerable. But to avoid that being counted as damages against the independent companies, this amendment has been drawn. Under it these companies can plead only the actual damages incurred by the intrusion of the wires into the railway station.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It might be of some use to the committee for me to state the circumstances of the reference to the Railway Commissioners arising out of the Port Arthur and Fort William case. These two municipalities, the town of Port Arthur and the town of Fort William, owned and operated a telephone system within the limits of the two towns. They applied to the board of Railway Commissioners, under section 193 of the Railway Act, for an order as follows :

> Directing the railway company to allow the installation of telephone instruments in the railway stations of the Canadian Pacific Railway and for leave to connect the same with their telephone system.

That is to say, for leave to connect the station with the telephone system with the town of Port Arthur with the telephone system of the company. Now prior to the enactment of this section 193——

Mr. GOURLEY. Has the Canadian Pacific a telephone system in connection with their railway ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A telephone system in the station.

Mr. MACLEAN. But it is only to connect with that system, it is only to get access to the station.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Prior to the enactment of section 193, in May, 1902, an agreement was made between the railway and the Bell Telephone whereby the latter company for valuable consideration, had granted for a period of ten years, the exclusive privilege of placing telephone instruments, apparatus and wires in the several stations, offices and premises of the railway in Canada where the telephone company had, or might during the continuation of the agreement, establish telephone exchanges. That agreement was then in existence, under which the Bell Telephone Company had an exclusive right to the Canadian Pacific Railway stations, limiting it to these particular stations. When application was made to the Railway Commission, the Railway Commissioners, that is to say Mr. Blair, held that they were entitled to access. The only question in dispute was as to whether this exclusive contract was a valid contract, that is to say, the exclusive contract between the telephone company and the railway company ; and whether or not, it being an exclusive contract,—the compensation provided for by this section had to be considered from the standpoint of that exclusive contract—whether or not they were obliged to pay compensation for damages that might result to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a result of the violation of that exclusive contract. Now, Mr. Blair held that that contract was not a contract in restraint of trade, that it was a good contract, and that if the municipalities of Port Arthur and Fort William desired to get access, in estimating the compensation, the damage resulting from the violation of that contract would have to be taken into account. The right of access was not denied, the only dispute was as to the question of compensation.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the light of this clause.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the light of that clause. Now it might be well to quote the words of the judgments of the commissioners. Mr. Blair held :

> That the said agreement was valid and not void or voidable as being in restraint of trade or against public policy, and that an order made under section 193 should provide for payment of compensation upon just terms for all lawful rights and interests injuriously affected thereby.

Mr. Bernier held :

> While the agreement is valid, and compensation should therefore be allowed, the question of compensation should be reserved for future consideration, and determined after hearing any case that might be presented by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other railway company in support of damages.

'After hearing any case.' Mr. Bernier and Mr. Blair decided the railway had a right of access. As to the right of access there is no dispute. But they both held that this exclusive contract is to be taken into account in estimating the damage. Mr. Mills held :

> That the agreement is in restraint of trade and against public policy, and that compensation should be awarded only for the use of the premises occupied by the applicants' telephones and the expense of operating them.

So you see what the result of this judgment is, merely that two commissioners held this agreement good and an other held it bad. and that the two commissioners who held the agreement good and as not being in restraint of trade, say that that agreement must be taken into account in estimating the damages. That is all that is decided in that case, and nothing more.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then will the Minister of Justice say whether he will accept my amendment ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot accept the amendment, I do not see why I should. I do not think my hon. friend's amendments, if accepted, would carry him very much further. If the object he has in view is, as I presume it is, to enable the telephone company to obtain access to the railway station

in violation of an existing agreement and without compensation. I am opposed to such legislation as that. If there is a legal contract that is to be violated as a result of the enforcement of section 193 in regard to these rights, any damage that may result in violation of that contract must be admitted. If that is what he has in view I am opposed to it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Cannot this House declare what is in restraint of trade ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that would be rather a dangerous thing to do, in view of the fact that our courts have been engaged for the past twenty-five or thirty years in construing contracts made in restraint of trade.

Mr. GOURLEY. Surely the telephone company did not want access without paying damages.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what my hon. friend from East York wants.

Mr. GOURLEY. But the telephone company itself would not want that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It wanted access on agreeing to pay compensation for locating their telephone system, but without regard to the violation of this contract.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think there must be some misunderstanding.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let the hon. gentleman read the judgments.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am sure they would make an offer to pay damages.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. GOURLEY. Could not the commission have made an order allowing access upon the payment of damages ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The order has gone, the question of compensation being left open to be determined.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the telephone company complaining about ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I don't know.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot agree with the argument that this agreement between the railway company and the telephone company is a good agreement, that it should be respected, that it should be considered, in view of this condition, which is a general condition—general at least in my part of the country—that the Bell Company has no telephone in the railway station, but that it has a right under that agreement to have a telephone there and to prevent anybody else from having a telephone there. The argument means that when a local telephone company wishes to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway stations this local company would have to pay damages because of the violation of an agreement between the railway company and the Bell Telephone Company, when the Bell Telephone Company had not done anything under that agreement and had suffered no injury whatever.

Mr. GOURLEY. If there was no injury there would be no damage.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Exactly.

Mr. GOURLEY. And if it were not installed I can see the damages would be merely nominal.

Mr. OLIVER. I maintain there should be no admission of any damages in such a case, and if the argument is that there are damages in such a case, then I for one say that the law should be amended, and that no such a thing should be permitted ; that where the public interest or the public use requires the entry of the telephone system which is established in that part of the country, into the railway station, no agreement between the telephone company and the railway company should be held good which would prevent that free access.

Mr. GOURLEY. You would not want us to steal your property would you ? Neither must you ask us to steal other people's property.

Mr. OLIVER. Whose property is being stolen ?

Mr. GOURLEY. By the Bell Telephone ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all, they have no property. If the argument is that the railway company's property is being stolen or being taken or used without their consent, I can understand it, but that is not the claim. The telephone company is prepared to pay for the use of the railway company's property, or for any inconvenience to which the railway company may be put. The question is as to the Bell Telephone Company's property, and I say that the telephone company has no property in such a case, even though they have an agreement, or if that agreement is good in law, the law should be changed so that it shall not be good.

Mr. MACLEAN. And the hon. Minister of Justice by a single amendment could introduce into this House a declaration that a railway company enfranchised by this parliament, given all these powers and subsidies shall not discriminate against any of its patrons or the public in the use of its stations for the furtherance of the trade and commerce of this country. We could pass that law in two seconds here, we could reach that grievance, we could declare that these railway companies shall not do that, but instead of that we allow them to do anything they like, we allow them to entrench themselves behind these contracts and when an effort is made to get some kind of remedy for the people these contracts made by companies enfranchised by this parliament against the public interest are pleaded. We have

given enormous subsidies to these companies, we have given them land and money and for every one million dollars represented a third of it came out of the pockets of the people, not to mention the lands ; yet these companies have the effrontery to make this agreement and when the public ask under the law to have telephonic communication with the stations they say to them : You must do your business through the Bell Telephone Company, another monopoly allied with us in keeping our yoke upon the necks of the people. This is an infamous contract. It should never be allowed in any country and the people ask that it be rescinded. The Liberal party should rise up and declare that any contract that is against the public interest, is against the advancement of trade, is against the welfare of the people but instead of that it is pleaded : Contract, contract, go to the courts ; no remedy can be had here. If we have any vestige of regard for the duty for which we have been sent here, let us approach this problem earnestly. We are not here to get through with our duties so that we may get away on our holidays ; we are here to try and cure this grievance and I appeal to the government, if they have no remedy to suggest. Will they not say to these creatures that we have created, to these railway companies : You must treat the people fairly ? if you let one section of the community into your railway station you must let them all in. You must give the same privilege to all these telephone companies and you must give an interchange of traffic with the Bell Telephone Company provided they pay you a reasonable compensation. A year or two ago the hon Minister of Justice promised the people that he would bring down a general law dealing with all these telephone companies. The telephone is the greatest public convenience to-day. The people want to use it. We want to extend its use to every one, to increase the comfort of all by extending this line to every man, to every farmer ; but, while this should be our desire, the use of the telephone is almost prohibited by reason of the infamous and unfair agreement which is at present existing between these great railway corporations and the Bell Telephone Company. The Grand Trunk Railway to which we have given a credit to the value of $150,000,000 are parties to this agreement. If we had had any of the instinct in us of the men who have fought the people's battles in former days we would have said to this Grand Trunk Railway Company : Not one dollar of public money shall be given you, not one piece of legislation shall we give to you until you cancel that infamous agreement. Sir Thos. Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, has practically confessed in public that if he were forced to do it he would withdraw this agreement. If the right hon. Prime Minister would sit down in his private cabinet and say : My dear Shaughnessy, the contract which exists between you and the Bell Telephone Company is against the public interest, it is a tyranny, it is a matter of slavery as far as the people are concerned and if you do not cancel it we will have to introduce legislation declaring it to be against the public interest. The remedy would be found. But, nothing of that kind is being done. No remedy is granted. It is the old story of pleading contracts, pleading vested rights, and telling the people to go to the courts. They have created this court at an enormous expense, they have provided situations for all these men, the farmers and the people generally are taxed to pay the salaries of these men and I would call the attention of my hon. friend the Postmaster General to the fact —I do not want him to turn away from me now—that the people are paying these taxes are providing these salaries, are granting these subsidies, are giving these railway companies franchises, are giving them lands, are giving them money and are giving them further powers to borrow money, making them greater and stronger than they are to-day, allowing them to pay immense dividends as the Bell Telephone Company is, while we have not the courage to tell these corporations that they must treat the people fairly, and that they must deal out equal justice to all. What does my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) say about it ? The people of Brantford have decided on a municipal telephone system of their own. Brantford is a great city. It is one of the finest cities in Canada, a city the export trade of which is next to and almost exceeds the export trade of the city of Toronto. It is a city composed of enterprising men, factories are built, fine houses are being erected, great business houses are being put up and all that the men of Brantford say is : Let us have access to the railway station for our municipal telephone system. The answer to that is : You cannot put your municipal telephone system into the Grand Trunk office ; you cannot put it into the Canadian Pacific Railway office. It is a regrettable fact that the late Minister of Railways and Canals, having given his solemn pledge to this House that the clause now under discussion would practically meet the grievance that I have raised, when he came to interpret it as the judge in the case, should place upon it an interpretation differing from that which he led me and others to think would be the result of the amendment. But, I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. I appeal to this House. I do not want to make an issue of politics out of it, but I do appeal to this House to sit down and see if we cannot find a remedy for this grievance by which we can compel these companies not to do anything wrong, not to lose any money, but to treat the people fairly and to give them justice. These companies are our creatures.

They are not greater than parliament, and above all things they are just as much committed to treat the public justly as any one else. We want justice for all—fair treatment, no discrimination. We want this section so changed as to permit access to the railway station by every section of the community. If one telephone company can get in, all telephone companies should be permitted to get in. We have passed a law providing that every railway company shall grant equal express facilities to all companies. Why is this provision not extended to telephone companies? I leave my case there. I put it before the House. Personally, it is a very small consideration to me, but it is a very great consideration to the hon. Postmaster General who proposes shortly to appeal to the voters of Markham whom I have the honour to represent and it does mean something to my hon. friend from Brantford.

Mr. HEYD. You asked me what I say. I say that the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Bell Telephone Company is in restraint of trade.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that and probably some good is coming out of this discussion. I believe it is in restraint of trade and I believe it is the duty of the House forthwith to declare that the agreement is in the restraint of trade. It is not our duty to send it to the courts. Why send everything to the courts? What is this parliament for? Is a parliament not for the remedy of grievances? I have said in this House before and I say it again, that the whole history of British constitutional progress is made up of the rectification of all kinds of grievances by parliament, not through courts so much as by the acts of parliament, a change in the law, a violation of contracts that may have been entered into and an interference with vested rights. The men who had the monopolies in the time of Queen Bess all claimed that they had these monopolies under their franchises but the public interest was declared to override these rights and one after the other the monopolies were removed. This was the course of British constitutional progress. But we in this parliament say now that there must be an end in the way of legislation; it must be a question for the courts to interpret, and any such thing as special relief must not be afforded. Let us stop that. We have the facts, these towns have the grievances. It is the old case of the citizens, the burgesses, coming to parliament for relief, asking in this case simply that their own municipal system, which they bought with their own money, shall be allowed to have access to the Canadian Pacific Railway station. Is the Grand Trunk Railway, which we are creating, to turn against the people of Canada too? Is Mr. Hays's new Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Transportation system which is to be built with $150,000,000 of the credit of the people of this country to close its stations to any kind of access to municipal telephone systems? What would happen to-morrow if the Postmaster General decided to nationalize the telegraph and telephone systems of this country? Would he for one moment allow that contract of the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway to stand?

Mr. GOURLEY. He could not help himself.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes he could help himself, he could declare that contract at an end, taking the line that it was against the public interest and he would force these roads to let him into their stations. They could not bar him out, and the whole people of Canada would support him. I say it is a matter of negotiation. We have these companies at our mercy. The Bell Telephone Company are here every day seeking legislation and we could say to them: You must abandon this iniquitous contract and must treat every one fairly, equitably and without discrimination. There are a dozen ways of getting at that; what is wanted is the determination to do it, to rectify the grievance. I leave my case as I have tried to present it. Perhaps I have presented it with some heat but I have tried to present it in the interests of the public and without doing any injustice to these companies. I do not propose to do any injustice to them. They are making money and they can afford to treat the people that created them, fairly, equitably and without discriminating against one in favour of the other. No harm is done by making them play fair.

Fair play is bonnie play.

You can do it by legislation or in a dozen other ways, but in some way immediate relief ought to be granted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat that fair play is bonnie play, but fair play means fair play to all parties.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not that the strong man should take the weaker man by the throat. But let us see now what my hon. friend wants. What he calls fair play is for parliament to authorize a railway company, the Canadian Pacific Railway—to deal with the specific case under discussion—to violate its contract and to violate it with impunity, in spite of the fact that that contract has been declared by this court, the Board of Railway Commissioners, a valid and legal contract. He wants us to do that and calls it fair play.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no fair play in giving authority to one party to a contract to violate it. That is not legislation which this House would sanction; no body of men would sanction such legislation. My suggestion is this: It is important first of all to see to it that all telephone companies in this country have equal facilities on equal terms with respect to access to all railway stations. That is important undoubtedly. Now the Canadian Pacific Railway have an exclusive contract with the Bell Telephone Company by virtue of which the Bell Telephone Company have arrangements with this company which practically gives them a monopoly, and as a result other telephone companies are excluded from the Canadian Pacific Railway stations. If the judgment of the Railway Commission is a good judgment, that is the present condition of affairs. As I said before when this question was up that judgment, as I understood, was being appealed from to the Supreme Court. Some doubts have been expressed on that point and having made inquiries I find that it is not at all certain that steps have been taken to that end. I would advise, subject of course to conference with my colleagues, that the question should first be settled, whether or not, under the existing agreement of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway with the Bell Telephone Company, that company have an exclusive right to the use of these railway stations. They have not that exclusive right if that exclusive contract is not a good contract, and if it is so declared by the Supreme Court the matter ends, because the legislation we now have is quite sufficient to give all the facilities required to any telephone company. If, on the contrary, the Supreme Court decides that the contract is a good contract, that a violation of that contract would mean that one of the parties to it would be placed in the invidious position of having the right by statute to violate its contract, I say that we should take pains to carefully take what steps are necessary. I admit that that would be serious, but not so serious or intricate that this parliament could not deal with it. We could find a remedy for such a condition, but let us find out first where we stand. Let us find out if it be true that this Bell Company have an exclusive monopoly of access to these stations. If the municipality has not taken an appeal from the judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners let the government undertake to do it, and have the question settled once and for all. After all there is not very much out of the way in this course because this is the only contract of the sort in existence in this country, and it is of importance, I admit, that at this present time equal facilities should be given to all telephone companies, to all express companies, in fact to the whole general public in the use of our great means of transportation. All of our railway facilities must be put at the disposal of all persons and corporations on the same terms. That is a correct principle and to that extent I go with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). There is no necessity in the assertion of a correct principle to do an injustice, and it would be doing an injustice to give one party to a contract, a statutory right to violate that contract to the detriment of the other party and to such legislation as that I cannot give my consent.

Mr. MACLEAN. It has been done; bad contracts have been declared bad contracts.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let this contract be declared a bad contract, but not by parliament. My hon. friend will not get any thinking man in this House to sanction any undertaking to substitute parliament for the courts in the construction of contracts.

Mr. MACLEAN. But this parliament will declare that it is a wrong contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a vicious principle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that the Minister of Justice has not quite given my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) credit for the way in which he approaches this subject. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) desires to interfere with the sanctity of contracts. I do not understand his position to be exactly that. I understand his position to be neither this, that these two companies, which may be said to exercise to a certain extent monopolies, with regard to transportation of passengers and freight on the one hand, and with regard to the transmission of intelligence on the other hand, should not be allowed to make a contract between themselves so as to impose an undue restriction, virtually a tax, upon access to the station of the railway company. That is a position which commends itself to some of us in the House. We must respect the sanctity of contracts; but with regard to these virtual monopolies, we interfere so far with their unrestricted rights to make contracts that we do not allow a railway company to charge more than a certain amount, and, so far as telephone companies are concerned, we require their tariffs of tolls to be approved by the Governor in Council. While we must respect the sanctity of contracts, we at the same time say that no arrangement ought to be made between two corporations possessing these monopolies by which the people through independent companies are restricted from that means of communication with the railway stations throughout the country which is so desirable in the public interest. For my part, I am very sorry that the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William did not go on and have the

Railway Commission determine what compensation is really payable. It strikes me that if I were sitting on that commission, I should not fix the amount of compensation at any very large figure. I have looked over the report which the Minister of Justice has been good enough to hand me, and I find the following claims put in by the counsel of one of the companies :

The results to the benefit of Canadian Pacific Railway :	
Passes and franks over Bell Company's long distance lines, valued at..	$18,297 00
Exchange service, 774 instruments free to railway company, valued at..	22,652 00
	$40,859 00

On the other side of the account we have:

To the benefit of the Bell Company :	
Trips, annual and periodical passes over Canadian Pacific Railway, valued at..	$22,258 00
Refunds..	200 00
	$22,458 00

It seems to be on such a statement as this that the idea of large compensation was based before the commission. I do not myself see how access by the two municipal corporations to that railway station would interfere very much with the condition of things that prevailed between these two companies, and I would be inclined to think that if the railway commission came to fix the amount of damages, it would have to be merely nominal. I agree with the idea put forward by my hon. friend from Toronto and with what has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice as well. I agree absolutely that we must abide by the sanctity of contracts; but when we come to deal with great corporations exercising what are virtually monopolies, we must at the same time in the public interest restrain these corporations from making contracts which are not in the public interest. On the one hand, they get very great privileges from parliament, and on the other hand, they must be content to have those privileges so controlled as to give the public its full rights in every respect.

Mr. OLIVER. Those of us who are not learned in the law are at a very great disadvantage in discussing this question, now that it has become a legal question. But at the risk of getting into deep water, I will say that it appears to me that possibly as much injustice is done in the name of law as is done against the law ; and it seems to me that in this particular case, when the question is between the sanctity of contracts and the jurisdiction of parliament, there is a parliamentary view of the case which may be taken as well as the legal view. It is a possibility, and a reasonable possibility, that a contract may be so palpably improper as not to require any reference to a court in order to have it ignored by parliament. If parliament is to abdicate its authority to such an extent that whenever a question of any intricacy comes up, no matter what injustice a certain view of the case may do to the people, a decision upon that question may be postponed, and postponed practically indefinitely by reference to the courts, then parliament is aiding and abetting injustice, instead of preventing injustice. Now, I submit that this agreement between the Bell Telephone Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, if interpreted in the light of the judgment of the Railway Commission, is so far beyond and outside of anything that is reasonable, is so absolutely and utterly unreasonable, is so greatly in restraint of the liberty of action by the people and the liberty of legislation by this parliament, that parliament would be more than justified in absolutely ignoring it. Take the case as it stands. The judgment of the Railway Commission says that the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William may have access to the railway stations on payment of the costs of installation, the costs of operation, and damages to the Bell Telephone Company for the breaking of their contract with the railway company. The Bill of damages presented by the Bell Telephone Company, which, if their side of the case is to prevail, the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William must pay, amounts to the value of the transportation which that company has secured in times past from the Canadian Pacific Railway—many thousands of dollars ; because that is really what the breaking of the agreement means. That means simply that the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William cannot have that access to the railway stations by their municipal telephone system to which they are entitled. It simply debars the possibility of justice in the matter. If the interpretation of the railway commission is correct, that agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Bell Telephone Company is such a trespass on the rights of the people that parliament would be doing less than its duty if it did not take measures to ignore it and to secure the people in their rights. This question appeals to me very strongly. The Calgary and Edmonton Railway runs lengthwise of my constituency, three hundred miles, and the town of Cardston is forty miles south of its southern terminus. There is a string of towns along that railway each large enough to have a telephone system of their own, some fourteen or fifteen in number and in every one of them access to the railway stations is the essential feature of a useful local telephone system. If the local

system cannot have access to the railway stations, it is practically useless. When the question was up before, I drew attention to these facts. Since then the Bell Telephone Company have strung a wire from Cardston to Edmonton along that 300 miles of railway, and I presume are in a position of entrenched monopoly in every railway station. If those fourteen towns now existing and fourteen more rapidly growing wish to have a local telephone system, they will find themselves in this difficulty, that they will be debarred from access to the railway stations. The question thus comes closely home to the people. We are simply in the hands of the Bell Telephone Company, and that company has the monopoly in the district of Alberta from end to end. There is no doubt that the people there could establish a local service which would give very much cheaper rates than can any company which looks to a profit; and to prevent their getting access to the railway stations is to prevent their spending their own money in providing their own telephone accommodation. It is evident, therefore, that the agreement between the Bell Telephone and the railway companies is a trespass on the rights of the people, and this parliament will be doing less than its duty if it does not take measures to relieve the people from that injustice.

As regards precedents, let me call attention to the fact that not many years ago the whole grain trade of the Northwest was in the hands of a ring of elevator owners because of an agreement between them and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway refused to handle any grain except through these elevators. They refused to give sites at railway stations except to elevators of a certain capacity, and the result was that the people were robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. When that question was brought up in this House I remember that those of us who demanded the free right of shipping grain were denounced as socialists; but to-day there is a law on the statute-book which enables every farmer to obtain shipping of his grain at any railway station in his turn.

Mr. MACLEAN. And that was brought about by an Act of parliament, and not by a decision of the courts.

Mr. OLIVER. There was no decision of the courts annulling the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the elevators. There was no change in the conditions, but parliament, in its wisdom, decided that that agreement was a trespass on the rights of the people and annulled it.

Mr. HEYD. I desire to say a word or two, as I did not have the opportunity of fully explaining my position. I have said that in my opinion the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Bell Telephone Company is an agreement in restraint of trade. I am quite willing to take my law from the Minister of Justice; but when it comes to determining what is right as between man and man, I propose to exercise my own intelligence. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Bell Telephone Company have the legal power to make the agreement they have entered into, and there is nothing to prevent the Bell Telephone Company making just such an agreement with every other railway in the country. But if that is legally right, it is morally wrong; and if anything else of the kind be attempted, I shall vote against it; and if any proposition be made to declare that this agreement, no matter what the law may be, is in restraint of trade and injurious to the general public, I shall certainly support it.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. If the contention put forth by some hon. members be correct, then there is no use of parliament meeting at all. If these contracts entered into by different corporations are sacred and cannot be touched, no matter how much they may conflict with the interests of the people, then there is no use in parliament sitting and we had better disband at once. But I contend that parliament is not helpless in this matter. When the people are suffering from an injustice, parliament has a perfect right to apply the remedy. Here is a grievance brought before us by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). It is a grievance of which we all have knowledge. Yet we are told that the courts are the only one to decide, and that parliament is helpless. If that be the case, what is the use of bringing the representatives of the people together every year?

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to put myself right. I sympathize thoroughly with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) in his zeal, and likewise with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Robinson) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Heyd). If there is a wrong, we must endeavour to correct it, and correct it in the proper way. It would be very strange indeed if in the attempt to remedy one wrong we should commit another and a greater one. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) need not think that this discussion has not been useful. It has been of value, because it has brought before the members the facts

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I did not say the discussion was of no use.

Mr. GOURLEY. My hon. friend seemed to think that because we all did not agree on a solution of the difficulty therefore our discussion was of no value. But I think that although we do not all agree on the remedy proposed by the hon. member for East York, it is well that the facts should be brought before us, because in my opinion there is sufficient ability in the House to arrive at a conclusion within the four corners of the law which will do justice to everybody. The Minister of Justice, I think, appealed to the sound sense of every

man when he said that parliament should not be asked to violate contracts. I agree with the hon. minister in this : Parliament, Sir, should be the preserver of contracts. We must set an example to the whole of Canada by preserving contracts and doing the right. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said that he was willing to compensate the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, the trouble is, that the Canadian Pacific Railway have assigned their rights to the Bell Telephone Company, as I understand the matter, and so, compensation must be made to the Bell Company. I will meet the difficulties as I come to them but I am free to say this that it would be an awful thing if we had no control over these corporations. We have control over them, and we will master them, every one of them ; but we must do it according to the principles of right and justice.

Mr. COCHRANE. How ?

Mr. GOURLEY. The thing is as clear as daylight. But we must go at it intelligently. To ask parliament to strike down contracts is revolutionary. We ought not to be permitted to sit for twenty-four hours, if we do that. Recollect, the Bell Telephone Company have acquired property from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for that property they have given value. Are we to steal that property ? Why, I would as soon break into a bank to-night, as agree to a proposition of that kind. If I were to agree to such a proposition, I would be a public thief—neither more or less. But there is a way to do it, and that way has been pointed out. I admire the zeal of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. MACLEAN. But you say I am a pirate.

Mr. GOURLEY. No, I will restrain my hon. friend from being a pirate. He is too good a man to be a pirate.

Mr. COCHRANE. Tell us how to control the corporations.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has pointed out the way. It is perfectly simple. The court has decided that this is a legal contract. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says it is not. Well, let them appeal the decision. If the court decides that this is a contract in restraint of trade, then, it will be void and the whole thing will be settled at once. But, if the courts say that this is a valid and legal contract, would you propose to steal the property of the Bell Telephone Company ? For, that is what you would be doing, just as much as if I were to ask parliament to take away my hon. friend's (Mr. Maclean's) property in 'The World' newspaper and give it to me, and parliament were to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) one question ? If a man were to steal a horse and sell it to another, would the sanctity of contract allow the purchaser to hold the property ?

Mr. GOURLEY. That will not do ; give me a parallel case.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a parallel case to this. The Canadian Pacific Railway have stolen the rights of others and sold them to the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. GOURLEY. If that is so, the Supreme Court of Canada will decide, at once, that this contract is against public policy, and, therefore, void. If the hon. gentleman is right in his facts the court is the place for him.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GOURLEY. Before dinner I was endeavouring to show why we ought not to adopt the remedy that is proposed here, and as I was closing some of my friends on this side asked me. Well, what is the remedy ? I think it is very simple. Here is a judgment, declaring that the Bell Telephone Company have a vested interest in this contract. Then how do you deal with vested interests ? The case is not different from that of a man owning land by title deed ; he is not in a better position than if he owned property under contract. Supposing this judgment stands, you must face the position that this company holds property under a contract. If you want the property and must pay compensation, and the compensation is too heavy for the private corporations, of the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William to bear, then you come to parliament and say : Here is a case arising under a contract under which the damages have become so heavy that it is improper to ask a private corporation to bear them. Declare that these contracts are void, but declare them void in the same manner as you would if you wanted land of any other property for the public use ; say that while you rescind that contract it must be done upon compensation, the same as if you were taking any other man's property. That is one way. If you do not appeal from this judgment you must take that position. But I think the member for Halifax hit the mark pretty well when he said : Why did not these gentlemen have the damages assessed ? It is true that the telephone company put in an extravagant bill before the commission for damages. But you know how these things are trumped up. If these damages had to be assessed, the commission might have introduced a measure of damages that would in the end make the amount very small, they might have given the telephone company very small damages for an abridgment of their rights under that con-

tract. Therefore I think what the company should have done, what the town should have done, would have been to go before the Railway Commission and have the damages assessed. Then the company would have been in a very good position, and small damages would have been paid them. But if the damages were large and onerous, or if it were likely that this same principle or measure of damage would extend to all the towns in the community, then you would have an excellent ground upon which to come to parliament and say: Owing to the legislation of this parliament, owing to the fact that you have created companies in this country and given them rights which interfere with the public weal, therefore this parliament must deal with them, and this parliament must rescind those contracts, but do it by giving them compensation.

That would be one position to take, and my hon. friend would be right in taking it. But I am sorry to differ with him, because he is so anxious for the public welfare, and on this occasion he made a strong appeal to my sympathy and I would be glad to support him in almost any scheme. But I could not support him in a scheme that would lead to a breach of all that was right and proper. Now then if you appealed, I think that would be a proper course to pursue. Some hon. gentlemen have alleged that it would be too onerous to compel these towns to carry on heavy lawsuits. That will be a good ground for asking the Minister of Justice in a case of this kind to assume the work of settlement, and have the appeal borne by the Crown. I think the Minister of Justice would accede to that if he thought it would be too onerous for these towns to carry on these appeals. Let the minister appeal and have the principle settled whether that contract is sound, whether it confers rights or whether, as one hon. member has said, it is against public policy and should be forfeited. If it is settled that the contract is void, then all our difficulties are over. If on the other hand it is settled that the contract confers rights of property, we would have to deal with it again, and these people would have to come to parliament. If the appeal is taken, they should first go before the commission in order to get the damages settled so that both the question of damages and the principle should be settled on the appeal. Then if the damages were held to be of a serious character, and I understand this difficulty extends over the whole country, that would be an excellent ground on which to come to parliament and say: As a result of your legislation private rights are being sacrificed, and no private individual should be called upon to suffer loss, therefore, come to our aid with a Bill of indemnity. But if, as I have said, the case were appealed and the expense borne by the Crown, we would know what the measure of damages were and whether the contract was a good one. If the contract was void, there would be an end of the matter. If the damages were trifling, the town could pay them. If the court sustained a measure of damages that was likely to lead to serious consequences that would be a ground upon which gentlemen could come to parliament and say: Owing to the legislation of this parliament, private corporations have thrown upon towns in this country, a burden too onerous for them to bear. In that case I would gladly vote with my hon friend to take such a course as the wisdom of parliament would seem just to the town as well as to the corporations.

Mr. SPROULE. We hear a good deal in this House about vested rights and very little about vested wrongs. It does not matter what wrong is perpetrated on the public by a corporation. As soon as they acquire a foothold then vested rights begin. Now if a man goes and squats on your property, what will you do? You will eject him at the earliest opportunity. If a corporation does the same thing, and acquires or becomes improperly vested in what belongs to you, have you not a right to resort to the same remedy? Is there any justifiable reason why you should pay money for a right that has been improperly acquired? You might as well tell me that if a man steals your horse and goes and sells it to another man, you have no right to go and demand it back. It would be as reasonable to say that you must pay for that horse as to say that the Bell Telephone Company must be paid for the rights which they improperly secured and which, according to the policy and intention of parliament, it was never intended they should have. The clear policy and intention of parliament has always been, so far as I have understood, that a corporation such as a railway corporation, must give equal rights and equal facilities to all doing business with that corporation. We give it a franchise, we give it great power, we give it a subsidy and many other valuable considerations for the purpose of enabling it to serve the public. But it must serve them all alike, and each one is entitled to the same consideration in doing their business with that corporation. These railway companies become common carriers, and every member of the community who does any business with them has a right to equal treatment. All who travel over their railway or who send freight over it, have a right to be dealt with in the same manner. We have over and over again provided by law, and by amendments to laws, that there shall be no discrimination in favour of one as against another, in favour of one locality as against another locality. That principle is so well understood in parliament that it is almost waste of time to talk about it. It has been adopted over and over again by

both parties. To-day, we are dealing with a railway company that is not giving every individual in the community the same chances to do their business over that line. That railway corporation we create, and according to our policy, and according to the intention of parliament, that railway corporation is required to deal equitably with all and extend the same rights and the same privileges to all.

They have sold rights belonging to one portion of the community to another portion of the community for consideration. Then you ask those who have been precluded from the enjoyment of these rights to buy out the individual to whom the railway company have improperly sold them. These are the vested rights which they claim and these are the damages which the railway company must be paid. To whom ? Not to the railway company for the privilege of putting the telephone line into their station but to the Bell Telephone Company which have improperly become possessed of rights that belong to every other member of the community. Suppose there were one hundred people living along the line of the Bell Telephone Company. Every one of these individuals enjoys the advantage of being able to communicate with the railway station for the purpose of doing business, inquiring about the trains, inquiring about trade and inquiring about many other things, but there are hundreds who have not the advantage of being on that line. The other line upon which they are located runs right to the railway station, but they are deprived of putting the telephone into the station because this other corporation have been sold the sole right to do it. Those who use the new line are deprived of the privilege that parliament intended they should enjoy, they are deliberately discriminated against and then to add insult to injury they are asked before they shall be allowed to put their telephone into the station to pay damages ? To whom? Not to the railway company who might be expected to grant some consideration but to the other corporation who have taken away the rights that properly belongs to them. Is that fair or reasonable ? Was that what this parliament gave that charter to this and other railway companies for ? Was that what parliament intended when it gave the right to the Bell Telephone Company to plant lines all over the country ? It was not. Parliament reserved to itself the right to control their rates for fear that they might be unreasonable. They have a limit up to which they may go, but they cannot go beyond that. So it is with the railway company. We control both of them, but now we are asked, when they have stolen rights belonging to the community, to turn around and pay for the goods which have been stolen from us. Is parliament prepared to sanction or support that ? I do not think so. As I said before if our efforts were as much directed towards the redress of vested wrongs as they are towards the protection of what are called vested rights, but which are in reality vested wrongs we would be more appropriately doing our duty to the great mass of people. The Bell Telephone Company have become a very great monopoly to-day and a very onerous one. They have been acting of late years as if there were no authority in the land to control them and almost—I was going to say—in an insolent way as if they felt that they were masters of the situation. They are strengthening themselves in every direction, and if they continue in the future for a reasonable length of time at the same rate that they have been progressing in the past in the direction of infringing upon the rights of the people, they will soon be an uncontrollable monopoly which will respect no person's rights or interests in the country. To give an idea of what they are aiming at, I wish to draw the attention of the committee for a short time to an item which appears in to-day's papers. I have the Toronto 'World' before me, and it contains the following :—

Independent Companies warned they must sell out or be driven to the wall.

The threat is thrown out.

Chicago, July 13.—A gigantic $20,000,000 telephone trust is being organized by the Bell Telephone Company to control lines in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio.

And I presume elsewhere because they are not going to stop at these states.

Independent telephone companies operating within the district will be bought up or driven to the wall.

They have their opinion as to which alternative to accept.

The Indiana Independent Telephone Company at Laporte, representing the telephone systems in operation in Indiana and Michigan, received a private report to-day apprising the officers of the plans for the formation of the trust and warning them that the blow is directed against that and all other companies.

It is said on good authority that the sum of $20,000,000 has been placed at the disposal of the men interested in forming the trust and that more can be secured by them if necessary.

The Bell Telephone Company, it is alleged, is determined to drive out of existence in one way or another every competing company in the states that interferes with its monopoly.

What they are doing in the United States to-day, they are doing in Canada as well. Their plans are being laid. They are operating along the same lines ; they are throwing out their lines in every direction. They are becoming possessed of one right here and another right there, and the greater

the value of the rights which they become possessed of the more difficult it will be to dislodge them in the future. Will parliament now be equal to the occasion when the rights of the citizens are invaded by this gigantic monopoly and stop them when they are on the threshold of their operations? This is the time to do it. If we do not do it now it will be found that delays are dangerous. We are told to take this matter to this court or to that court, to take to the Supreme Court and if the Supreme Court does not decide according to our wish, to to take it to the Privy Council. That is just what they want. Delay from month to month suits their purpose. If it passed over for another year they have secured the advantages to be gained in that time. They are strengthening their hands in the meantime, they are making more difficult the task that we have to perform at some time. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) said: They should be compensated. We want the damages assessed. What damages? Damages for that which they stole from the people, damages for stolen rights? That is what they want. These rights belong to all of the people. The Canadian Pacific Railway have no right to dispose of the privileges which parliament said all the people should enjoy, not a portion of the people but the whole people, not the parties enjoying the advantages of the Bell Telephone Company's service, but every one who utilizes the services of the railway company. Then, we shall assess the damages in the interest of whom? In the interest of the parties who are in possession of the stolen property to-day? We must pay them for that which they have got from us. It is a strange principle to advocate. It is not a view that will commend itself to the common sense of the people of this country. I say that we have no reason to respect these rights. This measure is not a confiscation, it does not interfere or take away any private vested right because there are no vested rights that they should enjoy or be paid for. It is said that if you take away a man's land in the work of building a railway you have to pay him for it. Yes, but that man got his land honestly when he bought it from the Crown or from some one else. He bought it in a proper and legitimate way, he gave value for it and he has the right that the state concedes to him in any part of the country. But this is a corporation right of an entirely different character. This corporation have become possessed of rights that belong to other members of the community and that parliament has declared to belong to other members of the community. Yet we are asked to buy them back. Why should we buy them back? I say the country cannot understand that. As long as we tamper with it, as long as we allow this corporation to feloniously take possession of our rights, so long will we be held as slaves in the matter. There is a growing feeling against corporations in this country because of their infringements upon the rights of individuals and of the impossibility of getting any redress. It is said that there are the courts in the country, but the individual is too weak to fight them. It is impossible for him to carry this fight from court to court. He cannot employ lawyers that charge large fees and he has to suffer under the wrong inflicted upon him if the state will not come to his assistance.

The state has the right to come to his assistance. It is for that purpose that parliament is convened; that is one of the duties of parliament and if parliament fails to do its duty then the great tribunal of the country must be appealed and the education of the people will go on until such a sentiment is reached in the country that no parliament can withstand it, or if they attempt to go they will be driven out so quickly that they will not know what has happened to them. I hold that when the Act was passed we did an improper thing in inserting that clause which gave that colourable right which they enjoy to-day and which prevented that commission from taking away that right. Now we are told that under that clause of the Act we have not the right to interfere. The country thought that we were to enjoy that right under that Act. Parliament said that we were to enjoy that right yet we find now by the interpretation of lawyers and of the courts that we do not enjoy it. Then I say it is our duty to amend the Act so as to give to the people of the country the enjoyment of that right which parliament intended they should enjoy and this I submit ought to be the policy of both parties in this House at all times.

Mr. MACLEAN. During recess, I went to the library to see if I could find an authority in regard to the jurisdiction of parliament in this matter. I found this most excellent authority which I shall read to the House:

> The principles of parliamentary government are such that we are bound to believe that the people through their representatives will deal with every grievance; and the attempt to get behind the people's representatives, to create some other tribunal, to take the place of parliament, especially in matters of money, and to give that body power independent of the government and parliament, to deal with these matters, is a step in the wrong direction; and we on this side of the House are not prepared to take it.

That is excellent doctrine; that doctrine was declared in this House yesterday and it is the doctrine of the Minister of Finance. Yesterday this House was told that parliament was the instrument to remedy the grievances of the people, that we did not want these grievances sent to Exchequer courts but that they were to be settled in this House. Only yesterday was that doctrine laid down here; it is good doctrine and I adhere to it.

Mr. FIELDING. Did you vote for it yesterday ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I accept it as a general principle ; it was the application to a particular case that I disagreed with but the principle is sound and I stand for it to-night. We have heard a great deal about the sanctity of contracts ; there is also another of public rights and the sanctuary where they are protected ought to be in parliament. We have heard a great deal about this agreement of the company and I am going to read the agreement. We have heard of preserving the sanctity of contract. Is it not a fact that every raid on the public rights has been made by a corporation ? Every corporation has tried to sanctify its monopoly by an agreement and the consequence is that every monopoly in this country first organizes and incorporates itself and then entrenches itself behind an agreement. Having got the agreement, if any one proposes to interfere he is at once charged with interfering with the sanctity of contracts. The consequence is that the Standard Oil Company, for instance, is entrenched behind sacred agreements and yet they have inaugurated a law in the United States against these trusts and are trying to enforce it to-day. We, in this parliament, have adopted in the interests of the public—and the Minister of Finance still preserves it on the statute-book a law against combines. If combines are found to be against the public interest the Minister of Finance is charged with the duty of imposing upon them the penalty which the Act provides. Yet these combines have so-called sacred agreements with themselves. The members of these combines make contracts one with another and these are good contracts but because they are against public interest the parliament and government of this country have charged the Minister of Finance with the duty of imposing a penalty. So it is all over the world, these combines, these conspiracies against the public, are within the jurisdiction of parliament here, are within the jurisdiction of congress in the United States and the only way to cure them is by legislation not by sending them to the courts. The contract is as follows :

This agreement executed in duplicate at the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, the first day of May, 1902 : By and between the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, Limited, a body corporate having its principal offices in the said city, hereinafter called the Telephone Company, and

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a body corporate having its principal office in the said city, hereinafter called the Railway Company, Witnesseth :

That the said parties have covenanted and agreed as follows :—

1. The Telephone Company will furnish to the Railway Company, at all points in the Dominion, and where it may now or hereafter have exchanges, telephone connections between the offices and stations of the Railway Company and the exchanges of the Telephone Company free of charge. It will also issue to the officials of the Railway Company annual passes of franks good over the long distance lines of the Telephone Company and free telephone exchange connection and maintain during the term of this contract a local exchange in the head office of the railway at Windsor street station, Montreal, affording communication with the different offices, as well as with the said local exchanges of the Telephone Company in the city of Montreal.

2. The Railway Company will furnish annual passes to the officials of the Telephone Company over its own railway and telephone lines, and lines leased or controlled by said Railway Company, and will also furnish free transportation to the employees of the Telephone Company over said railway lines in Canada.

3. The Telephone Company shall have the exclusive right of placing telephone instruments, apparatus and wires in the several stations, offices and premises of the Railway Company throughout the Dominion of Canada, where the Telephone Company has or may during the life of this contract established telephone exchanges, it being understood in connection with new exchanges being established that the Railway Company will be given a fair service, sufficient for its business.

4. And each company, so far as it may properly do so, without prejudice to its own business, grants to the other company facilities for carrying its wires and lines through or over the poles, subways, bridges and other premises, on equitable terms, to be agreed upon. And the Railway Company will not grant similar facilities to any other telephone company.

5. The number of annual passes or franks, free telephone connections, and extent of free transportation shall be determined from time to time by the president of the Railway Company and the president of the Telephone Company, as the expansion of both companies may require, and such passes, franks and telephone connections shall only be issued on written application of an officer of either party, as designated by the president of each company.

6. The terms and conditions of this contract, as applying to the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall also apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company, and it is further understood and agreed that where telephone connection with local exchanges is required for an office of either of the above, the agent for which carries on any other business, or acts as agent for another company, he shall pay one-half the regular exchange rates, and the company or companies represented herein by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall pay nothing for their services.

7. This agreement shall remain in force for a period of eight years from the date hereof.

In witness whereof——

And so on. There is the agreement and the substance of it is that the Bell Telephone Company give certain services to the railway company in return for certain services. Now if we declare, as we ought to declare, that that contract is against public interest, no harm will be done. We

will be interfering only with two companies which we have created. We will be doing nothing prejudicial to the public; we simply say to these two creatures of parliament: In the exercise of the powers which we gave you, you have done something contrary to the public interest and we declare that what you have done in that connection is illegal and is null and void. No damage is done to the companies; instead of exchanging services they give money to one another. The cheques cancel one another and no injustice is done. That is a reasonable proposition. But instead of that, we have all this lecturing about sacred rights and the sanctity of contracts, and men who stand up for the public rights are charged with being pirates and robbers. When hon. gentlemen talk about the sanctity of contracts, I ask them, what about the sanctity of public rights, which is above the sanctity of contracts any day. There is another way out of the difficulty, and that is by negotiation. These two railway companies and this telephone company are suppliants for legislation of some kind or another at every session of this parliament. The Grand Trunk is a petitioner here to-day; the Canadian Pacific Railway is here every session as a suitor, and so is the Bell Telephone Company. They are all getting something, and the government can do with them what it did in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company came and asked for a franchise and a subsidy, and the government said to them: When we give you these, you must abandon a certain right in regard to your rates which you claim to have to-day; we will give you the franchise and the subsidy on that condition. And the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did it at once. The government is in a position to say to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Bell Telephone Company: You must abandon that contract; and there is a saving clause in it by which they can effect a settlement and remedy the grievance. As the Minister of Finance said last night: Parliament is the place to remedy the grievances of the people, and not the Exchequer Court or any other court. What is happening in Toronto to-day? There is a company there with a charter which the Attorney General considers is doing something against the public interest, and he is moving to cancel that charter. The company is pleading vested rights, and a judge of the High Court of Ontario gave judgment yesterday that the Crown as represented by the Attorney General had a perfect right to cancel a charter which it had given to a company because that company was doing something against the public interest. And the Crown, as represented by the Minister of Justice, could send for Sir Thomas Shaughnessy of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Senator McKay of the Bell Telephone Company, and say to them: Gentlemen, you are doing something against the public interest, and if you do not rescind those contracts, I shall have to cancel your charter; and he would be well within his right if he did so. If we only cancelled one of these charters in this country, you would see a much more humble attitude assumed by the companies than they assume to-day. They would realize that the people are more their masters than they thought they were. Now, I am through with the discussion, and what is to be done must be left to the judgment of the committee. I must tell my hon. friends that later on, when we come to the third reading, I shall have to divide the House on the issue.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think we are advancing our cause by abusing the Bell Telephone Company, accusing them of exercising stolen rights, and all that. We ought to look at this question from a business standpoint. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Bell Telephone Company have both been chartered by this parliament, and I think parliament is able to control them. If they do what is wrong, or exceed their powers, this parliament will be able to take care of itself, and will see that that is done. As for the fear that they are going to spread out and control all the other telephone companies throughout the country, I do not think there is any danger of that. This question has arisen quite recently, and I think there is a good deal in the contention of the hon. member for East York that there is a grievance. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Bell Telephone Company have entered into an arrangement that is mutually satisfactory to themselves. They both concede rights to each other. The arangement has also been of great advantage to the public by enabling them to have the use of telephones in the railway stations all over the land. The Bell Telephone Company has done a great deal of good for the people of this country. If it were wiped out of existence to-morrow, we would find ourselves in a very bad mess indeed. But within the last year or two new conditions have arisen. New companies have started up, controlled largely by municipalities and private citizens, who have invested their money in them, and they desire access to the railway stations. Under these circumstances, it is for us to consider what is best to be done. In my opinion, so far as the agreement between the Bell Telephone Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is concerned, it is nothing to us, so long as it does not interfere with the rights and privileges of the people. But the interests of the great public must be paramount over all others; and this parliament is here, above everything else, to protect and guard and defend the rights of the people as a whole. These new companies are branching out in all directions; they are becoming quite numerous. They are serving people who have not been served by the

other telephone companies, and it is in the interest of the public that they should have access to the stations not only of the Grand Trunk but of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This agreement stands in the way. Under the arrangement made between the two companies, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company cannot give these new companies access to its stations. Now, let us look at the facts. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made this agreement, which I think runs for six or seven years yet. Suppose it is renewed at the end of that time for eight or ten years longer. The vested rights of these companies continue; and so it goes on, and the people are prevented from exercising their privileges and from getting the benefits they ought to have. I think therefore that the time has come when we should declare that this agreement is not in the public interest. The hon member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) suggested as a remedy that we should appeal this case to the Supreme Court for a decision. That would perhaps be the best course to pursue just now; but I do not see that that is going to end the difficulty. Suppose the Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Railway Commission. If so, we would be just where we are to-day, and legislation would have to take effect after that. It seems to me that we might as well face the difficulty now as to wait for one or two or three years longer. There is no question but that the public will demand that this parliament grant these concessions which the public interest requires; and it seems to me that instead of referring this matter to the Supreme Court the government should take immediate action and amend the law so as to enable all telephone companies to have the right of access to railway stations.

Mr. BLANCHET. If I understood well what has been said this afternoon on both sides, the whole discussion may be summed up in a few words. We all admit that if this contract is legal, the Act must be amended. As my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) says, the contract is legal or it is not. But my hon. friend asks this House to decide that it is legal and take immediate action. Why, he asks, should we wait the decision of the Supreme Court? Why not amend the Act at once? That is a very practical way of putting the question. It is the way employed by the Yankees when they hang a man without giving him the benefit of a trial. But the Minister of Justice says that the proper means to take to decide whether the contract is legal or not is to refer the question to the Supreme Court. And he asks us to wait the decision of the Supreme Court before acting. That seems to be perfectly reasonable. Should the Supreme Court decide that the contract is not legal, then there will be no need to amend the law, because the law is sufficient as it is. Should that court decide that the contract is legal, then we can proceed to amend the Act. And, as I have always stood by the law, as I have always had that respect for the law which every good citizen, and particularly every member of the legal profession, should have, I propose to stand by it now, and wait for the decision of the Supreme Court. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot at all agree with the position taken by so many legal men of this House, that the case as between parliament and these companies is the same as it would be if between a private individual and these companies. Parliament, I submit, occupies an entirely different position. If there is a dispute between a private individual and these companies, if the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William have a grievance against the Bell Telephone and the Canadian Pacific Railway companies, they must go to the courts. They did go to the Railway Commission and got judgment, from which judgment I presume they are entitled to appeal. But that has nothing whatever to do with our action, nor should it govern our action in any degree. We are responsible for the law under which that decision was rendered and under which the decision in appeal will be rendered. And if that law, for which we are responsible, does not give justice, the time and place to deal with the question is here and now. Plenty of evidence has been placed before this parliament to-day to show that injustice has been and is being done and may be continued interminably. As to the charge that all those who desire to see justice done the public are law-breakers, or wish in any way to contravene the law, or infringe in any degree on the rights of any one, that charge is utterly unfounded. I am not a lawyer, but I will venture to state a first principle of law which will not be denied by any legal gentleman in this House, and which entirely covers this case. It is this, that a contract between any two parties entered into against the interests of a third party cannot be binding on that third party. I would like any of the legal gentlemen to say whether that is a correct statement of a correct principle or not. In this case these two parties have entered into a contract which is subversive of the interests of a third party, namely, the public. I say that no such contract is good in law; and when we demand that it shall not be recognized, we are not infringing in any degree on the legal or moral rights of any one. There is no necessity for a reference to any court for a decision on such a point. There are cases of right and wrong which are so plain that the duty of parliament is clear, no matter whether by one quibble of law or another it be possible to carry the case to the courts. This parliament is here to make the law, to establish courts and, above all, to see that justice is done.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says the law is on the statute and the proper thing to do, is not to question it, but let the courts determine whether it is legal or not. But is it not very common for us to say that the law is and always has been so and so, and that that is what the law was intended to be? When we have made a law and we find that, in the carrying out of that law, an interpretation is put upon it which is not according to the intention of parliament, parliament very often steps in and explains that Act, and says that the law was intended to be so and so, and is so and so. That is what we could do without doing any injustice to the people, or parliament, or vested rights.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has drawn attention to something that may be called a grievance with respect to the telephone question. But the remedy for that grievance will not be found in the usurpation by parliament of functions which do not belong to it. There are some gentlemen in this House who, when they discuss a question of this sort, call it legal quibbling to speak about the sanctity of contracts. Well, my hon. friends may call it what they like, so far as I am concerned—and I believe so far as the great majority of thinking people are concerned—one of the fundamental principles of parliamentary government is that we must hold sacred by our covenants and see that other people do likewise. I think that a scheme may be devised, before this Bill is disposed of, by which we may arrange that, with respect to the future, no contract such as the one now at issue between the municipalities of Port Arthur and Fort William and the Canadian Pacific Railway and Bell Telephone companies can be made which will be binding on the outside public. But with respect to the contract already in existence, I will be no party to the violation of that contract or to the protection of any party who desires to break his engagements.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the Minister of Finance said last night that parliament was the proper place.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we can avoid further discussion, I will withdraw what I have said.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) negatived on division.

Mr. MACLEAN moved the following amendment:

4. Section 264 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsections:—'The tolls charged in any standard passenger tariff shall not exceed the following, namely:—for all companies the gross earnings of whose passenger trains, as reported to the Minister of Railways, under the provisions of section 304 of this Act, equalled or exceeded the sum of $3,000 for each mile of road operated by the said company, two (2) cents per mile; and for all companies, the earnings of whose passenger trains, reported as aforesaid, were over $2,000 and less than $3,000 per mile of the road operated by the said company, two and one-half (2½) cents per mile; and for all companies whose earnings, reported as aforesaid, were less than $2,000 per mile of road operated by the said company, three (3) cents per mile.'

He said: I do not wish to delay the committee on this matter. It also will come up on the third reading, and there will be opportunities for further discussion then. At the beginning of the few words I wish to say on the subject now, I would direct attention to section 264 of the Railway Act of last session, which reads as follows:

A standard passenger tariff shall be filed, approved and published in the same manner as required by this Act in the case of a freight standard tariff.

We have, here, provided for a standard passenger tariff; my amendment is to define that tariff. I have considered the subject for a number of years, I have read a great deal about it, I have listened to a great many objections to the proposals I have submitted, and it seems to me that the remedy most opposite to the situation is the one I submit here—a graded passenger rate on the same basis as that of the state of Michigan. Under that system, a road that earns over $3,000 per mile may charge not more than two cents per mile; a road that earns more than $2,000 per mile may charge not more than two and a half cents per mile; and a road that earns less than $2,000 per mile may charge not more than three cents per mile. That system has proven highly successful in Michigan. It is true that representatives of the railways doing business in Michigan came before the Committee on Railways and Canals and opposed my amendment there. They evaded the issue. They said that the system applied to only a small mileage in Michigan. As a matter of fact 90 per cent of the passenger traffic in the state of Michigan is done on the basis of two cents per mile. And 90 per cent of the passenger traffic of the state of New York is done on the same basis. Ohio, Illinois and, I believe, other states have recognized the two-cent rate by compelling the railways to sell a 1,000-mile ticket for $20. The travel between New York and Boston is all on the basis of two cents per mile. Wherever the reduction of passenger rates has taken place it has been as the result of legislation. The legislature of the state of New York imposed a two-cent rate on the New York Central, and the result is that they have two-cent travel throughout the state. The same result has followed in Michigan. If Canada adopted the Michigan law, the New York Central,

which owns the Michigan Central—the old Canadian Southern—would have to give the people the two-cent rate. Under this amendment, the Grand Trunk Railway would have to give a rate of two and a half cents per mile; and, in a very few years, judging by the increase of its traffic, it would have to come down to a two-cent rate. Those portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway that are outside of the original agreement between the syndicate and the government would have to give the public the same rate by reason of the law of competition. The supreme reason I give for this amendment is this: That all these roads, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Michigan Central, are to-day carrying all the traffic that originates in the United States and passes over their lines, whether east or west, at a rate of two cents per mile or less, and yet they charge Canadians riding in the same cars three cents per mile and over. I say this is most iniquitous conduct on the part of these great railroads that have been so heavily subsidized by the Canadian people. I have already laid all these considerations before parliament. The House is seized of the facts. So also are the public, who, I believe will insist on this reform being carried out.

Furthermore, it has been proven—and the facts can easily be given—that wherever there has been a reduction of railway rates the earnings of the railways have been increased. No company in the United States that has passed under the regulations of these laws governing rates can show that it has suffered in the least; on the contrary the facts all go to prove what the experts, especially those connected with the Interstate Commerce Commission, declare, that the results are favourable to the railway. The same principle has been established in connection with the post office; it has been established in connection with the telegraph system of various countries, it has been established above all, in connection with the railway systems of Europe—that if you reduce the cost, the public use the service so extensively that the earnings are actually increased. It is clear, therefore, that parliament would be doing no injustice by compelling these roads to reduce their passenger rates. As I have said, all I ask is to define the standard passenger tariff for which provision has already been made in the statute. If the government think well to make a four-cent rate for the roads that earn very little money, I shall have no objection. This law will have the effect of reducing the rates upon those great roads that have plenty of traffic. If there is any company doing a good business in this country, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific are doing a good business in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Their trains are crowded, and they are constantly increasing the number of their trains. They did an immense business when they reduced the rates some time ago by reason of competition, and the same result will follow if the rates are reduced by statute. We have already carried out this system in connection with the Intercolonial. To-day the people's railway gives the people a two-cent rate. And, in the province of Manitoba the people have a three-cent rate. Yet, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec the Grand Trunk is actually charging from three and a quarter cents to three and a half cents per mile for a considerable proportion of the travel. The Canadian Pacific Railway is charging four cents per mile between here and the St. Lawrence on one of its branches. Surely the time has come when the standard passenger rate should be fixed. I have produced a great deal of evidence before the House and before the Committee on Railways and Canals in support of this amendment. I have not, so far, met with anything that seems to me to justify a change in the opinion I hold on the subject. It seems clear to me that no injustice would be done to the railways if we compelled them to reduce their passenger rates. I therefore submit this amendment in the hope that parliament will adopt it and that the Minister of Railways will assist me in defining the maximum passenger rate of this country.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is entitled to a great deal of credit for having brought this question before parliament so persistently, both in this and previous sessions. I think it must be generally agreed that if passengers can be carried profitably at a two-cent rate under similar conditions in the states, it is a fair proposition that they might be carried at the same rate in Canada. There is no doubt that in Canada we are entitled to all the benefits that come from the operation of railroads which exist very largely by reason of public moneys paid them by the people of the country. At the same time I think it would be fair to consider that last year parliament established a Railway Commission empowered to deal with the question of railway passenger rates, and given almost unlimited powers in this matter. I think it would be well to wait and see what the Railway Commission will do in this matter before parliament takes action directly. While I have no doubt that the hon. member for East York has gone very carefully into this subject of railway rates and is probably satisfied in his own mind of the correctness of his contention, a large majority of us have not done so. At any rate, it must be admitted that the members of the Railway Commission are in a position, and it is part of their duty, to inform themselves on this subject, while many in this House have not been able so to inform themselves; and I am

prepared to say that if the Railway Commission does not in good time take action on this question it will be necessary then for the House to take action. Certainly circumstances look in that direction. At the same time, the danger of taking drastic action without due consideration is evidenced in some degree by the results on the Intercolonial. We have a two-cent rate on the Intercolonial, and we have a deficit of half a million dollars on the Intercolonial. Therefore I think the rate on the Intercolonial is rather an argument against the proposition of the hon. gentleman than in favour of it.

Another point worthy of consideration is that there are different classes of rates, there is the first-class rate and the second-class rate. I do not know how the reduction of the first-class rate to two cents might affect the second-class rate. At the present time people who can afford it pay the high rate, those who cannot afford to pay the high rate pay a lower rate. I do not think it would be right that those who could afford the higher rate should be permitted to travel at the lower rate, and those who get the benefit of the still lower rate at the present time be compelled to pay a higher rate than they do now. That is, however, a question that could be dealt with by the commission, and it is one that I do not consider myself in a position at the present time to deal with to the extent of endorsing the hon. gentleman's proposition. Another thing that inspires me with doubt in regard to this matter was the remark made by the hon. member that if proportionate reductions were made on roads of heavy travel he would not object to a corresponding increase of the rates on roads where the travel was proportionately light. Representing a part of the country where settlement is sparse and where the travel on newly constructed roads is likely to be light for a few years, I am afraid I could hardly follow him in that proposition.

Mr. MACLEAN. Don't you pay four cents there now ?

Mr. OLIVER. We used to pay five cents, but it is reduced to four, and in Manitoba it is three cents. At the same time, if the rate is fixed according to traffic, it is perfectly clear that a new road through a lightly settled country would possibly have to charge a much higher price.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not if it is owned by the same corporation.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that the basis is perhaps hardly fair when you work it out to a conclusion and apply it under all conditions all over the country. Therefore, I cannot for the present take the responsibility of voting for the amendment of the hon. member, although I think he is entitled to a great deal of credit in his effort ; and if a remedy is not found by the Railway Commission in due time it will be necessary for parliament to take even the direct action he has suggested, even perhaps without as full information as is desirable. But we must all agree, in line with the discussion we have had, that a public grievance requires a public remedy.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) introduced this subject some time ago and proposed to make a general two-cent rate all over the country, I refused to support him on the ground that in my judgment the railways in sparsely settled parts of the country where the earnings are small, could scarcely be expected to give a two-cent rate. At that time the suggestion was made that provided the railroads east of Port Arthur gave a two-cent rate, west of that, which was a new country, where the traffic was comparatively light, they might charge whatever rates the law allowed them to charge. But I was always of the opinion that it would be an injustice to the railways to make them carry passengers for two cents a mile when the earnings were small and the passenger traffic was light. The experience of railways in the United States, and the experience of the American people in compelling railways, especially in Michigan and the west, a country similar to Canada, to carry passengers at two cents a mile when their earnings were $3,000 a mile or over, has been fairly successful, and it has wrought no great injustice to the railways and has been a concession to the people. When this subject was discussed in the Railway Committee some time ago, we had representatives of the railway companies before us, and I did not understand from any of them that they seriously complained because the roads were compelled to carry passengers at two cents a mile where they were earning $3,000 a mile. But their contention was that the member for East York had misrepresented the facts that really existed in the eastern states, or in the state of Michigan, because he had said that all the railways there carried passengers for two cents a mile. They contended that that was not the case, and they gave us a list of those railways that did carry passengers at two cents a mile and those that did not. The railways that did carry passengers at that rate were compelled to do so by virtue of the Michigan law, but they did not contend that the law was doing a great injustice to the railways. Now, if the experience in Michigan, a country similar to eastern Canada, is that passengers can be carried at two cents a mile when the earnings reach $3,000 a mile, it can be no great injustice or hardship to ask railway companies to do the same here, because, we have given a great deal more money to assist in building railways than the Michigan people have done. We tax them lighter in ordinary municipal taxation, and we give

them many concessions that the American people do not. Now, the hon. member for East York proposes a graded tariff, and I think no great injustice would be done to the railways provided parliament adopted that proposition.

The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says that the Intercolonial Railway gives a two cent rate per mile, and as a consequence it has a deficit of nearly half a million dollars last year. If I could reach the conclusion that the deficit was due to carrying passengers at two cents a mile it would be to me an argument, but there are many elements in the situation that effect it, and which help to make a deficit of half a million other than the carrying of passengers at two cents a mile. In my judgment it is other elements in the situation that have brought about this deficit in the earnings of the road and not the carrying passengers at two cents a mile. I do not think that seriously affects it in any sense. But then we are asked to wait for the action of the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission have extensive powers. I assume that the Railway Commission are not likely to ask the railway companies to carry passengers at a very much lower rate than that which they are charging to-day. It may be said that it is generally conceded that three cents a mile is a fair charge and that they are not likely to ask them to carry passengers for very much less than that. I do not think we would be doing very much injustice to the Railway Commission, or that we would be curtailing their powers in any way or interfering with their functions if we laid down the salutary principle which has been found fairly satisfactory in Michigan and asked the railway companies, when their earnings reached a maximum of $3,000 a mile as the case may be, to carry passengers at a graded rate in proportion to their earnings. If we did that I think we would be doing them no injustice and therefore I am inclined to support the amendment of my hon. friend from East York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As this matter has been very fully discussed both in this House and in the Railway Committee I do not think the time of the committee can be very usefully taken up with a lengthy discussion of the subject. But I would like to direct attention to section 264 of the Railway Act which says that the Railway Commissioners shall adopt a standard passenger tariff for the whole of Canada. No passenger rates can be collected by any railway company in Canada which comes under the operation of this Act except under the standard passenger tariff which has been fixed by the Railway Commission. Let us give the Railway Commission that was established under the statute passed last session, time to do something under the provisions of that Act before we proceed here to determine what they are to do. It seems to me that having created this Railway Commission for the purpose of regulating this question we should give them an opoprtunity to do it. I think it is not only important to draw attention to that feature of the law as we have it to-day, but it is also important to disabuse the public mind of the impression that exists that a two cent rate is now in force in the state of Michigan and in the state of New York. That is not correct. I will state the law as it is in Michigan and as it is in New York and I will show that the law in the state of Michigan does not apply to more than one-third of the railways in Michigan.

Mr. MACLEAN. And to how much of the traffic ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Allow me. On the Michigan Central a two cent rate applies only to the main line between Detroit and the Indiana state line, a distance of 221 miles, on the Toledo division between Toledo and the Ohio state line, a distance of 46 miles and on the Grand Rapids division between Jackson and Grand Rapids a distance of 95 miles, or altogether a total of 362 miles out of 1,137 miles in the state. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that under the terms of the statute which I read to him when this matter was before the Railway Committee the law is only applicable to those railways which are within the limits of the southern portion of the state of Michigan. It does not apply to the railways in the northern part of the state of Michigan. The railways there operate to a large extent under the same conditions as those which exist in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Why does it not apply to Alpena or the Peninsula ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say why, because it is for the legislature that passed the law to say and not for me. They have found it proper not to apply the law to the northern part of the state.

Mr. SPROULE. The representative of the railway company said before the committee that it was because their earnings did not come up to $3,000 a mile.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know what was said before the Railway Committee. I am stating what the law is in the state of Michigan. That law applies simply to the railways in the southern part of the state, which I have mentioned. In respect to the state of New York there is no general statute fixing the two cent rate but a two cent maximum rate was fixed on that portion of the road between Albany and Buffalo and that rate was fixed forty years ago for the purpose of impeding the construction of the New York Central which at that time was competing for business with the Erie canal, the Erie Canal being owned by the state. As a mattter of fact the general rate in force in the New York state is 3 cents a mile.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman state that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. I say he is misinformed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I endeavour as far as posible not to make reckless statements here. I say now to my hon. friend that the two cent rate was fixed by the statute forty years ago, that statute can be found in the consolidation statutes of the state of New York, and I repeat that that rate is only applicable to the line between Albany and Buffalo.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is only applicable to the line between Albany and Buffalo. There is no general rate of two cents a mile in the state of New York.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not under the law but in the practice of the companies.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am talking of something we are sure of, something we can control. We cannot control statements as to what the practice is in reference to these roads. I do not wish to say that my hon. friend would lead us astray, but we have to take the statements of those who are interested in the management of the traffic on these roads and as these statements are not at all times accurate my hon. friend may be under a wrong impression. In respect to the state of New York, there is no law fixing a two cent rate except that which I have mentioned and it is only applicable to the portion of the line between Albany and Buffalo. I heard it suggested this afternoon by some one that we were obstructing our own legislation on this side of the House and to avoid following the bad example that has been given I will not say anything further.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am only going to say two or three words in answer to the hon. Minister of Justice. I repeated to-day and I repeat again now that under the legislation that exists in the state of Michigan ninety per cent of the passenger traffic is carried for two cents and less than two cents, a mile and that the result of the legislation in New York state is that more than ninety per cent of the traffic in New York state not only on the New York Central but on the Erie, the Lehigh Valley and a portion of the Pennsylvania system is carried at two cents a mile. My contention is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, when they give to the people of Michigan a rate of two cents a mile, ought to do the same thing in Canada because we have here a country of a similar character. The New York Central Railway Company are carrying people in Michigan for two cents a mile and I contend that they ought to carry them in Ontario for two cents a mile. In the province of Manitoba they have a three cent rate over the whole of that province. Why? Because the Canadian Northern have to give that rate by reason of a little agreement that they have with the government of Manitoba. Then, we are asked to wait until we see what this commission do. What are the facts? Until I put a question on the order paper the other day asking what railways had complied with this law which ordered them to file their standard passenger tariffs, not one road had done it, and to-day not one road has done it and they have had to go to the commission, by reason of the agitation that I have carried on, and to ask an extension of time until November to enable them to file their passenger tariffs. That is what we will get if we leave it to the Railway Commission. There will be no standard passenger tariffs filed, the commission will say that they are too busily engaged with other things and nothing at all will be done. I accept what the hon. Minister of Justice has said and I close the discussion as far as I am concerned, but on Tuesday next I propose to divide the House on this very issue of a regulated and reduced passenger rate.

Mr. HENDERSON. It has been asserted, as an argument in favour of a two-cent rate, that with a rate of two cents a mile for passenger traffic the railways would earn a great deal more money than with a three-cent rate. It is a surprise to me that men like Sir Rivers-Wilson, C. M. Hays, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and other great railway men never discovered that fact. I think if they really believed that this was the case, they would no doubt at once offer the people of this country a lower rate for passenger traffic. My position is this. I have voted for a two-cent rate in this House perhaps almost before the hon. member for East York came into parliament, at any rate, before he became as prominent in railway legislation as he is now, so that this is not a new question to me. My desire is to see the people of this country get the cheapest possible railway travel, and I desire to proceed along that line which will secure a reduction in railway rates at the earliest possible date. Whichever plan is likely to succeed the better and to bring about a modification in the direction of cheaper rates at the earlier date I am prepared to adopt. If the hon. member for East York can show me that the plan proposed by his amendment is likely to give us better rates in the near future than we can possibly get through the Railway Commission, to whom this matter is to be submitted, then I would fall in line with the suggestion made by him; but if I realized that through the Railway Commission a reduction in rates could be secured at an earlier date than under the system proposed by this amendment, then I would be willing to wait

and see what the Railway Commission would do.

I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in 1896, earned only $766 per mile by passenger traffic on their entire system. In 1903 their earnings from this source amounted to $1,460, an increase in round numbers of $700 in seven years, or at the rate of $100 per year. At the same rate of increase it would still require fifteen years for the Canadian Pacific Railway to reach the $3,000 per mile mark. That is a long time to wait for a good many of us. If the Canadian Pacific Railway earnings do not increase more rapidly during the next period of seven years, or the two next succeeding periods of seven years, than they have been increasing in the past, then we cannot at all expect that we will arrive at the goal of $3,000 per mile inside of fifteen years. Have we any reason to anticipate that the Canadian Pacific Railway earnings for passenger travel will increase more rapidly in the next fifteen years, or in the next seven years, than they have done in the past seven years? We have had seven years of what the Finance Minister calls unprecedented prosperity in this country. We have had a prosperous seven years. Is it likely that the same condition will continue during the next seven years? Periods of prosperity and adversity usually come in cycles. Some years ago the Finance Minister told us that we were on the crest of the wave and that we must prepare for adversity. All the arguments we have heard in speeches from various sources would lead us to assume that we must not expect a continuance of the same prosperity in this country during the next fifteen years as we have had during the past seven years. We have often been reminded that in the United States, whilst a wave of prosperity has been felt over the whole world, a period of adversity has even now set in there, so that the United States railways would not reasonably expect, under conditions of that kind, to earn as much money, because they share in the prosperity or adversity of the country; they make more money during prosperous times than during times that are not prosperous. The same thing would apply to Canadian railways. During prosperous times people would travel more and the earnings of our railways would be greater than in times of hardship. Therefore, I say we have no reason whatever to hope that the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be greater per annum during the next seven years than they have been in the past seven years, and at the rate of increase that they have had during the last seven years, it would take fifteen years to reach the goal of $3,000 per mile.

So much then for the Canadian Pacific Railway; let us take the other great railway system in Canada, the Grand Trunk Railway. In 1896 their earnings were $1,600 per mile. In 1903, after a period of seven years of prosperity in Canada, when, no doubt, the Grand Trunk Railway earned every additional dollar that the prosperous times would bring to them, their earnings were $2,200 per mile, an increase of $600, not as large an increase as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, an increase of only about $85 per year. Now, the railway would have to continue to increase its passenger earnings until it reached the goal of $3,000 per mile before the general public would have the convenience of a two-cent rate, and at the same rate of increase it would take about nine years to reach the $3,000 per mile so as to give the public the two-cent rate. Even nine years is a considerable time to wait, but we have to consider the fact that we have had seven years of prosperous times, with the possibility that the next seven years, or the next nine years will not be so productive of results as the past seven years have been. Therefore, instead of being nine years it might possibly be ten or twelve years. We have no guarantee that it will be brought about in nine years. Now, let us look at the two positions. Shall we legislate along the lines indicated by the hon. member for East York, or along some other line that would compel the railways to give transportation at a reduced rate, and fix that rate if we thought fit to do so? Having committed the whole of this matter within the past twelve months to a Railway Commission, who would have power to deal with the matter, to look into all the circumstances and decide as to whether the railways were entitled to give cheaper transportation or not, should we leave it to that commission? Two plans are before us, and it is for us now to decide which of these two plans is the more likely to bring about the result we desire at the earlier day. I have no hesitation in saying to-night that I think we have reason to expect that through the Railway Commission we will get relief at an earlier date than we would by adopting a measure that would postpone the reduction to a period so very remote. That is my impression, and I would be very sorry to place on the statute-books of this country a law which would establish a rate that could not come into operation for ten or fifteen years, when I have hopes that through the Railway Commission better results would be obtained in a much shorter period of time. Nothing is to be lost by allowing the Railway Commission to deal with the matter during the next year or two, and see how they can work out this whole matter. The proposition of the hon. member for East York—and he has put his case forcibly and intelligently before the public—cannot come into operation for from ten to fifteen years.

Mr. MACLEAN. It would come into operation to-morrow in connection with the Michigan Central and the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not with regard to the two-cent rate.

Mr. MACLEAN. The two and a half cent rate is my proposition.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no great hardship at present on that account, because any man can travel on the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway for two and a half cents a mile by purchasing a return ticket. It may be said that that compels a man to return by the same route. Well, I have no doubt that ninety per cent of the people who go from home on a journey come back again. So that there is not so much to be gained by the hon. gentleman's proposition for a two and a half cent rate as perhaps the general public might think without looking fairly into the matter. If a man has a great deal of travel to do as a commercial traveller, he can do so at two and a quarter cents a mile ; or any man or woman who has considerable travelling to do in this country can travel at two and a half cents a mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway and I think on the Grand Trunk Railway by purchasing a thousand-mile ticket for twenty-five dollars. It would not take very much travelling to use that up, perhaps only from Toronto to Quebec and return. But suppose a man were travelling around the country on some business that necessitated his going one way and returning another, he could travel at two and a half cents a mile by purchasing a thousand-mile ticket for twenty-five dollars, and he is allowed twelve months in which to use it up. In all probability he would use it up in that time, and perhaps a good deal more. Even in the state of Michigan, I understand that for a short distance, even where the rate is fixed at two cents a mile, the actual rate is three cents. However, that is not a matter of very great importance. I trust I have made myself plain to the House. I am prepared to adopt whatever plan is most likely to bring about the desired result at the earliest period. If I did not believe that through the Railway Commission we could realize the goal of two cents a mile or a reduced rate at an earlier date than we could by placing this amendment on the statute-book. I would fall into line readily with some such plan as that suggested by the hon. member for East York. But I realize that we can lose nothing by waiting for a year or two for the result of the Railway Commission's investigation, before we take action of this kind; because, even if we passed a Bill this week fixing a rate of two cents a mile on railways earning $3,000 a mile, it would not come into operation on the great railways of this country for a considerable number of years. I have an impression that under the Railway Act the Railway Commision have power to give a reduced rate in certain parts of the country where railway passenger traffic is very much greater, while not reducing it in other sections of the country where the pasenger traffic is more moderate.

Mr. MACLEAN. Under what clause is that ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Under clause 263. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice on that clause read in connection with clause 264. It does seem to me that the words are broad enough to give the Railway Commission power to take all the circumstances into consideration, and in a thickly settled portion of the province to give a reduced rate, while allowing the rate to remain as it is, or fixing a higher rate, in other and more sparsely settled portions of the province. Knowing that through the county I have the honour to represent there is about as much passenger travel as through any other county in Ontario, I would be sorry to fix the lower rate at a figure that would not come into operation for ten or fifteen years. I have hopes that the Railway Commission inside of a year or two will give us relief that we could not obtain in the other way except by waiting a very long time. These are the views I hold. The hon. member says he will divide the House on the question. I hope to be here when the House is divided upon it. It is a question which I have no fear to meet, and I am going to vote upon it in accordance with the views which I have expressed and for what seems to me to afford a most reasonable hope of securing a lower rate, and securing it at the earliest possible time.

Mr. HEYD. My views on this question are so well known that it will not be necessary for me to repeat them. But I desire to draw the attention of the House to the unsound business principle that underlies the resolution. This reduction of the railway rate to two cents a mile is supposed to apply to railways earning $3,000 a mile. The only railway in the country that is earning $3,000 a mile is the railway that is the least able to reduce its passenger rate. On an invested capital of $35,000,000 in the Canadian Southern Railway, the actual net earnings last year amounted to $111,000 or less than one-third of one per cent.

The presumption that where a railway is earning $3,000 per mile, it is in a position to reduce its rates, is entirely fallacious. It does not follow that because a railway company is earning $3,000 or $2,500 a mile, it is more able to reduce its rates than a company which is earning less than one-half that amount. The largest earner in the country per mile is the Canada Southern, yet the actual amount of its net earnings was $111,000 or less than one-third of one

per cent. Take the Grand Trunk Railway, the only one to which the two and a half per cent would apply, and we find that on an invested capital of $335,000,000, the actual net earnings are $8,000,000 or less than three per cent. Although apparently a wealthy railway company, it is not able to reduce its passenger rates, because its net earnings give less than three per cent on the capital invested. It does not follow that because railways are large money earners, they are better able to reduce their passenger rates to two cents per mile than other railways which earn less. Therefore the very foundation of the hon. member's resolution disappears because the railways to which it would apply are those least able to stand a reduction.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) negatived.

On section 1,

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Railway Act, 1903, the Governor in Council shall have, and shall be deemed to have had since the date upon which the said Act came into force, power, authority and jurisdiction to sanction, confirm, rescind, change or vary, or to take other action upon, any report, order or decision of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council made before the said date under the Railway Act of 1888, or any Act in amendment thereof, in as full and ample a manner as if the Railway Act, 1903, had not been passed, or had not come into force, and as if the said Railway Act of 1888 and the said Acts in amendment thereof had not been repealed; and any order or decision so sanctioned or confirmed shall have the same validity, force and effect as if the said order or decision had been so sanctioned or confirmed prior to the issue thereof.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we not proposing to do what very eminent authorities on that side have said we should not do, and that is attempt to say what the law was intended to be and what it is?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Nothing of the sort.

Mr. BARKER. I want to draw the attention to the fifth line. I understand that the object of the section is to enable certain orders of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to be confirmed. Owing to the change made by the Act last year, there are some orders of the old Privy Council Committee which have not been confirmed and which the Governor General in Council cannot now confirm without a new Act. But I do not see why the minister should take power to the Governor General in Council not only to sanction and confirm these orders, but should continue in him the right for all time hereafter to rescind, change, vary or take other action upon them. I would submit that the proper way would be to take power to sanction and confirm them, when confirmed that they should be under the same provisions as if they had been enacted by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

I would suggest therefore that you strike out the words 'rescind, change or vary or take other action upon' from the fifth line, and after the word 'effect' in the third line from the bottom of the clause insert the words 'and be subject to the provisions of the Railway Act of 1903' and strike out the words 'issue thereof' at the end of the clause and insert instead 'passing of the last mentioned Act.'

I have given the minister the section altered as I propose. I think that would answer his purpose. It would enable the Governor General in Council to make valid all the orders and regulations that have not yet been confirmed, and after they are confirmed they would then come under the ordinary jurisdiction.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has very correctly stated the object of this legislation. But I would like to draw his attention to this point. The attention of the government is to restore the powers of the Governor General in Council with respect to orders made by the Railway Committee so that these powers may be the same as they were previous to the repeal of the old Act. At present there is but one order of the Railway Committee to deal with, the order with respect to the Yonge street crossing at Toronto. That is the order we have in our mind, and I think it is important we should restore to the Governor General in Council all the powers he had previous to the new Act which repealed the old Railway Act of 1888. These powers are all conferred not only by section 187 of the Railway Act, but also by section 21—I am speaking now of the old Railway Act. If my hon. friend will look at section 21 and read that in connection with section 187, he will see that the Governor in Council had the authority to sanction, confirm, rescind or vary. It might be important that the order should be changed to a slight extent to meet altered circumstances, and in that view we desire to have the old jurisdiction restored. With respect to the other words 'to take other action upon' it might be found desirable to refer the matter again for further consideration to the Railway Commission. That is the reason these words are in the section. With respect to my hon. friend's amendment, its last part is, I think, an improvement on the terms we use.

Mr. BARKER. Have the parties to the particular order to which the hon. gentleman refers approved of this?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. The only party that has been consulted is the city of Toronto. The amendment was submitted to them and they approved of it. They approved of the concluding words, but I take the responsibility of making the change because I think it is an improvement without altering the sense.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice contradicted the statement I made that the object of this was to declare what the Act was intended to mean. It seems to me the words mean nothing if my interpretation is not correct. What else can these words mean—' notwithstanding anything contained in the Railway Act, 1903, the Governor in Council shall have and shall be deemed to have had since that date '—and so on, if they do not mean to interpret the law and declare what it is.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 187 of the Railway Act of 1888 provided that the Railway Committee, if it appeared to them expedient or necessary for the public safety was empowered, from time to time, with the sanction of the Governor in Council, to authorize or require a company owning a railway constructed upon, along or across any street or other public highway at rail level or otherwise, to carry such street or highway over or under the said railway by means of a bridge or arch, instead of crossing at rail level, or to divert such street highway either temporarily or permanently, or to execute such other work and take such other measures, as, under the circumstances of the case, appeared to the Railway Committee best adapted to remove or diminish the danger arising from the then position of the railway. It will be observed that an order made under that section required the approval of the Governor in Council to have validity and effect. The Railway Act of 1903, abolishes the Railway Committee. And section 310 of the Railway Act of 1903 repeals the Railway Act of 1888. So that, while the committee has passed the order, the order had no validity and effect because the Governor in Council was without power to deal with the matter. This is, therefore, not to interpret, to construe, but it is to restore the power of the Governor in Council with regard to these orders to what it would have been if there had been no repeal.

Mr. HAGGART. It is intended to apply to something that has not been completed. What is it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Yonge street crossing in Toronto, in which the city of Toronto, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway are all interested. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council made an order authorizing the construction of an overhead bridge or some other form of crossing and determined the share which each of the parties interested should contribute toward the construction and maintenance. And, of course, that order of the Railway Committee has no validity because the Governor in Council has no power to deal with it.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Briefly, this section is intended to apply to railways that are situated entirely within the limits of one province and that would be under the exclusive jurisdiction of that province were it not for the fact that they have been declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada and to provide that they shall be subject to the Sunday legislation of the province in which they are.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand it, this is to place them under the control of the legislature in reference to Sunday observance alone.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Exclusively. And, in order to make that absolutely clear, I propose the following amendment :

This section shall not apply to any railway or part of a railway which forms part of a continuous route or system operated between two or more provinces or between any province and a foreign country or to any railway or part of a railway between any of the ports on the great lakes and such continuous route or system, nor shall it apply to any part of a railway which the Governor in Council may by proclamation declare to be exempt from the provisions of this section.

The intention is to exempt from the operation of the law the Canadian Southern which forms part of the through system of the Michigan Central with respect to its traffic and also part of the Canadian Pacific which, I understand, operates between a port on the great lakes—Owen Sound, I believe—and the city of Toronto, and other railways that are part of through continuous systems and which are not, properly speaking, local enterprises at all and which we think, should not have this law applied to them.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the minister how far this section will apply to many of these short lines now forming part of the Grand Trunk corporation, but which were originally local railways and declared works for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a difficulty that I mean to meet by this amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. There are several such lines in Ontario.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call the attention of the minister to subsection 2. It seems to be very unusual and extraordinary legislation. It reads :

The Governor in Council may at any time and from time to time by proclamation confirm, for the purposes of this section any Act of the legislature of any province passed after the passing of this Act for the prohibition or regulation of work, business or labour upon the first day of the week.

That looks like giving a power of attorney to the ministers to get the local legislatures to pass Acts which the ministers will make into law. A local legislature may hereafter pass laws upon this subject and

we authorize the Governor in Council to make them valid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will point out our difficulties. Under the first paragraph we approve of the Sunday legislation now in existence. We know the legislation, and knowing it we declare it unobjectionable and we approve of it. Now, with respect to future legislation that may be passed—because after all these laws affecting Sunday may be changed by the local legislatures at any time—with respect to them, it seems to me it would not be wise for this parliament to say that we approve in advance of any legislation which may be passed by any province. The only other alternative is to give to the Governor in Council authority by proclamation to declare that any Act respecting the observance of Sunday passed by a local legislature should be confirmed and ratified, so far as that Act may be within the limits and powers conferred upon the province. We have either one or the other thing to do, either to confirm in advance legislation of the character of which we must necessarily be in ignorance, or else to give to the Governor in Council authority and power to ratify and confirm that legislation when it has passed.

Mr. HAGGART. Can we delegate that power to the Governor in Council ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. We could not delegate it, but we give the Governor in Council power to adopt. It is not a delegation, it is an adoption of the legislation of the province and making it our own.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely it is delegating power to the Governor in Council to confirm an Act which we do not know the effect of.

On section 3,

Mr. BARKER. I have given to the Minister of Justice a copy of an amendment that I propose to suggest on this section. I propose to add some words after the words 'An Act to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act' in the fifth line. The section as it is now printed is limited to the purpose of ascertaining the true net earnings of the eastern division of the leased portion of the Transcontinental Railway. But in drawing the section it seems to me the fact was overlooked that so long as the government is guarantor of the bonds upon the western division, it is equally interested in seeing that the Grand Trunk Pacific should receive a proper portion of the through earnings as regards the whole of its system. It is just as much interested in seeing that the Grand Trunk Company gives the Grand Trunk Pacific a fair proportion of the through rate for the whole of the railway as it is interested in seeing that we shall get a fair portion as regards the leased or eastern division. So I propose to add these words :

Mr. BARKER.

And in order to the ascertainment of the true net earnings of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon its system of railways at all times while the principal or interest of any bonds made by the said company and guaranteed by the government of Canada shall be unpaid by the said company.

Then I propose further on to add at the end of line 19, the words :

Or as guarantor of any such principal or interest.

Then at the end of that first section I propose to add further words. The clause provides for a fair apportionment of the rates, but before the question of determining can arise, the rates will have been divided, and the Grand Trunk Company, or the other carriers who are interested in through rates, will have received their share, and the clause does not provide for the payment or repayment to the Grand Trunk Pacific of what it has been short of in the division. I propose that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall make that good, whatever the shortage is, because the Grand Trunk Railway Company is given absolute control over the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if it allows them to receive too little of the through rate, the Grand Trunk itself should make good what the Grand Trunk Pacific may lose. I therefore propose to add that :

The Grand Trunk Railway Company shall pay to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company such sum and sums of money as, by the said board, from time to time may be ascertained to be necessary to make good the true net earnings upon the basis aforesaid of the said eastern division, and of the said Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's system of railways.

Provided always that either party to any such question may appeal from any such determination to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Act was up for consideration it was pointed out that under the Railway Act as we have it now there was no power vested in the Railway Commission to determine the question of a joint tariff between the two companies, that the two companies were free to make such a joint tariff as might suit their own convenience and that as a result of the powers so vested in these two companies the Grand Trunk Railway Company might be in a position to practically divert all the traffic down by North Bay, make a through-rate and send the whole of the traffic to Portland as at the present time. In order to prevent that I promised to introduce legislation which would enable the Railway Commission to deal with this question of a joint tariff. That has been done and accomplished by the amendment as I now introduce it. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is anxious to go somewhat farther and to give the Railway Commission power to make an investigation in respect to the ascertain-

ment of the true net earnings of the western division so that the government may know in respect to its obligation as guarantor what the true obligations are. I argued at the time the question was up before that these powers were already vested in the Railway Commission under sections 45 and 309 of the Railway Act and that it was not necessary to have that amendment, but, I think, to be strictly logical, having advanced the contention that these powers were already vested in the Railway Commissioners and as there will be no objection to our reaffirmation of it in this legislation in respect to the amendment of my hon. friend to that section I accept it, but in respect to the last part of the amendment imposing an obligation on the company to pay over so much I think that would be a departure from the original contract and I cannot accept it.

Mr. BARKER. The reason I ask it is this: The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will not be in existence in the operation of the road. It will be a mere name. The Grand Trunk Railway Company itself will make the rates, collect the rates and divide the rates. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will never be heard of in the practical operation of the road. The Grand Trunk Railway Company can give itself for its own line more than is fair or reasonable and it may have an object in view in making, as to the eastern division, the line not pay its interest in which case it would not have to pay the rent. It might have an object in making the whole line, including the western division, not paying because it might be interested at some time in putting the bonds that this government has guaranteed in default. It may be no injustice to the Grand Trunk Railway proper which has the whole control and which makes the unfair apportionment of the rate to compel it to make it good so that the company which the government has guaranteed may receive its due share of the through-rate. I will add that it means more than what the hon. Minister of Justice has said as to a diversion of the traffic to North Bay. It is equally important that there should be a fair apportionment if the traffic that goes to Quebec and thence to some point on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, that is quite right. I had not thought of that.

Mr. BARKER. There is no question about that. I may say again that the general Railway Act cannot apply practically because these sections in the general Railway Act are intended to apply where there are two companies with an opposing interest and one complains that it was not getting a fair share, but nobody ever supposes that there will be any complaint between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company when they get into operation. It is only one company and the section of the general Railway Act will never be brought into play at all. There will be no complaint. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will never appear before the Board of Railway Commissioners to complain that its parent, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, is not doing it justice. You will never hear from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at all. Therefore, these sections in the general Railway Act cannot apply and it is for that reason that the greatest care has to be taken in the interest of the government that it should have the power to see that the rates may be fairly apportioned and that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall make good to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the loss occasioned by an unfair apportionment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have faithfully lived up to the pledge I gave at the time the National Transcontinental Railway Act was under consideration by the introduction of the Bill in its original form. The suggested amendment of my hon. friend in respect to an investigation into the accounts of the western division I accept because it is practically putting to the test my good faith, when I submit that it is already covered by the Railway Act, but I do not think my hon. friend could ask me to go farther.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Mr. Barker moves to add the following words in the eighth line after the word 'Act':

And in order to the ascertainment of the true net earnings of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon its system of railways at all times while the principal or interest of any bonds made by the said company and guaranteed by the government of Canada shall be unpaid by the said company.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Then, again at the 19th line after the word 'railway,' Mr. Barker proposes to add the following words:

Or as guarantor of any such principal or interest.

Amendment (Mr. Barker) agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Mr. Barker moves to add at the end of the clause the following:

The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall pay to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company such sum anl sums of money as, by the said board from time to time may be ascertained to be necessary to make good the true net earnings upon the basis aforesaid of the said eastern division, and of the Grand Trunk Pa-

cific Railway Company's system of railways.

Provided always that either party to any such question may appeal from any such determination to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Lost.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the amendment is considered I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice whether the initiation of any proceedings for the purpose of ascertaining the due apportionment between the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies may be made without the consent of either of the parties?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, by the amendment.

Mr. BARKER. It can be done at the request of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This last amendment is lost.

Amendment (Mr. Barker) negatived.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I beg to move to amend that clause 3 by adding the following words :

Provided always that either party to any such question may appeal from any such determination to the Supreme Court of Canada.

On section 4,

Mr. BARKER. When this section was before the committee on a former occasion, it was suggested, I do not know whether by myself or by some other hon. gentleman on this side of the House, that this clause should read :

The majority of the directors and of the executive committee of any company, &c.

I would suggest that that should be added.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I must confess that in so far as I am personally concerned, I have absolutely no sympathy with legislation of this description. I think that if foreigners choose to come into this country and invest their money in our railways they are entitled to have some control over the railway system which is created by their capital. It seemed to me that the sense of the House then was in favour of a change in the law along these lines, and I have as a consequence introduced an amendment which will require that all railway companies, aided by the parliament of Canada, shall have a majority of their directors British subjects. With respect to the executive committee, it would appear to me that we would be pushing the matter very far if we insisted upon the executive committee coming under the same rule. These executive committees are usually composed of five members ; I think I know of one case in which the committee is composed of only three members, with the president as an ex-officio member. If we should require that a majority of this small committee shall be British subjects, it seems to me that the result would be that we would have dummies placed upon this board by the people who control the stock of the company, because, after all, the men who control the stock control the board, and the men who control the board control the executive committee. If the House would allow me to have the Bill go through in its present form, I would put my view before my colleagues, and when the Bill comes up for third reading, if it is found desirable to make an amendment we can do so.

Mr. HAGGART. Is anything known as an executive committee recognized by the law ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In several special Acts provision is made for an executive committee. That is the case in the special Acts of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern and two or three Acts passed last session. In fact, in the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill there is provision for such a committee. However, I do not want to commit the government on the subject, and I would like to have an opportunity to discuss the matter with my colleagues.

Bill, as amended, reported ; amendments read first and second time.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if the House would again facilitate the passage of the urgency Supply Bill, as to which some explanations were given both yesterday and to-day. We have been waiting until the various items were collected and put in proper form. I now move :

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion, agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. The items with which the Committee of Supply has dealt in detail in the estimates for the new fiscal year amounted to $21,585,073.78. Then, in addition to that, we have taken one-fifth of the remaining items, the amount of that one-fifth being $4,288,332.69, making the total of the sums for this coming fiscal year which have been dealt with by the committee $25,873,406.47. Accordingly I move:

Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1905, the sum of $25,873,406.47 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I have not verified the clerical work ; I am taking the hon. gentleman's statement and the word of his officers for it.

Mr. FIELDING. I may say that I also have to rely on the officers of the House who have done this work, and I have no reason to doubt that it is correct.

Resolution reported; read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 156) for granting to His Majecty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1905.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is rather late for us to resume the consideration of the estimates in Committee of Supply, and I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the business for to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Some of the Bills on the order paper will be taken first, and if we reach supply, the estimates of the Minister of Railways will be taken up.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 15, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

MONTREAL TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Marcil, of Bonaventure:

That Bill (No. 120) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

He said: In respectfully asking the House permission to refer this Bill back to the Railway Committee, I hope I will be allowed to give a few words of explanation. When this Bill was printed the name of Mr. Demers, of Iberville, was by error put on the back of it. I was asked by the promoters of the Bill to take charge of it. When I left Ottawa for camp, it was agreed and understood that this Bill would not come up in the Railway Committee before Thursday, July 14. I returned from camp on Monday, was called down to Montreal by telegram on Tuesday, and much to my surprise when I returned Wednesday afternoon I was told that the Bill had been thrown out on Wednesday morning by the Railway Committee. I was not present in the Railway Committee, but I have heard that strong objection had been taken to the Bill on account of the further and extensive powers asked by the company, and that if the promoters had been satisfied with asking an extension of time to enable them to go on with their work and carry out the powers already granted them by parliament there would have been no objection. I have had an opportunity of seeing several members who voted against the Bill in the committee, and they have told me that they are now prepared to support any motion for further consideration, provided clauses 1, 2 and 3 are dropped, and that the only clause submitted for consideration will be that referring to the extension of time. I have every reason to believe that if the House is good enough to grant this motion, it will meet with general approval.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN. I took part in the discussion of this Bill in the Railway Committee, and I may say that I have since met several of the gentlemen who are interested both for and against the Bill. I believe that an understanding has been arrived at by which this Bill is to be referred back to the Railway Committee with the distinct understanding that the only clause to be taken into consideration is the fourth clause, extending the time for carrying on the work.

Mr. TALBOT. That is the understanding.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is the agreement between the parties?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred back to the committee.

RELIEF OF ANNIE CHRISTMAN.

Mr. W. S. CALVERT. In the absence of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) I beg to move:

That Bill (No. 155) for the relief of Annie Christman be placed on the orders of the day for second reading on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

THOROLD AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I beg to move:

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 22nd report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, all rules respecting private Bills be suspended in reference to Bill No. 150 to amend the Act passed during the present session to incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company; and that the said Bill be placed on the order paper this day among private Bills for consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to know from the government when we shall have all government legislation and all government estimates before the House ? I brought the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister three of four weeks ago, and I was then informed that a statement would be made. I believe that statement was made some time afterwards, but I am not quite sure it has been actually adhered to, and possibly there are other government measures which were not contemplated at that time, although I do not think any should be brought down which were not then announced. However, no doubt the Prime Minister is able to make a complete and accurate statement to us now. It is certainly time that all government measures were brought before the House ; it is certainly time all railway subsidies, if any, were brought before the House ; and it is certainly time that government estimates, whether for the ensuing year or the present year, were before the House—that is, if we propose to finish the session at any reasonable date. It is for that reason that I now bring the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When my hon. friend called my attention to this matter some time ago, I stated that it was not the intention of the government to bring any more legislation this session, except perhaps a few matters of purely departmental character. I may say to my hon. friend that it is not contemplated by the government to introduce any more legislation of any kind whatever, except what is to-day on the order paper, with this exception: that as I have already stated, it is the intention of the government to bring some legislation with regard to the acquisition of the Canada Eastern Railway. That has not yet been given notice of, but everything else contemplated by the government has been given notice of. The Bills which are contemplated to be introduced have all been given notice of and stand on the order paper for first reading, which I expect will be given them either on Monday or Tuesday. With regard to railway subsidies, as at present advised and I think I can safely say, it is not the intention of the government to bring any railway subsidies this year ; perhaps some legislation may be introduced with regard to existing subsidies, but no new subsidies at all. With regard to the estimates, my hon friend is quite right in saying that it is time we should have them, and I hope to have them probably on Tuesday next without committing myself absolutely ; certainly Tuesday or the day after.

Mr. SPROULE. The order paper instead of growing smaller appears to be growing larger. There are five Bills to be introduced by the government and five resolutions, which mean five Bills more to be founded upon them. One of the most important Bills of the whole session will be, I have no doubt, the Canada Eastern Railway Bill. In my judgment a Bill of that importance should not be brought into the House at the tail end of the session, because it makes it utterly impossible for members of parliament to institute such inquiry as they ought to, in order to enable them to deal with it intelligently. They have not time to do it because it is rushed through in a few days. This is too important a measure to be allowed to pass this House in this way, and I respectfully submit that if it is the intention of the government to deal with that question it should have been brought down at an earlier date. It is an injustice to the House and to the country as well, that we are called upon to deal with a Bill of that importance, at a time it is utterly impossible to do so with the care that we ought to exercise in the interests of all.

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH. I desire to bring to the notice of the government a matter in connection with Newfoundland. It is rumoured that the British and Newfoundland governments have reached an agreement regarding the Fisheries Regulations, under the provisions of the Anglo-French Colonial Treaty, and that a compromise has been made by Newfoundland. Will the government kindly inform the House if it has any knowledge of such an agreement, and if so, as to what is the nature of it. My disposition is to ascertain to what extent it will affect the fishermen of the maritime provinces visiting Newfoundland in the prosecution of their industry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend that I am not aware that we have received any communication on this subject, but I shall make further inquiries. If we have received any communication I see no reason why it should not be brought down.

WITHDRAWAL OF MILITIA AT SYDNEY.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Might I ask the Prime Minister if he can give to the House any information as to the causes which led to the withdrawal of the militia forces from Sydney and the substitution of the regular military forces of Canada in their place ? Would he also inform the House if there has been any concerted action by the government and the naval authorities in sending a man of war from Halifax to Sydney ? Reports to this effect have appeared in the newspapers during the past week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the reports are not exactly accurate, but I would

not venture to make any statement now. I shall ask the Minister of Militia and give the information later on.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I inquire whether I correctly understood the Prime Minister in regard to the legislation of this session ? Am I to understand that everything that will be introduced in the way of legislation now appears upon the order paper either in the form of notice of motion or under the item of introduction of Bills, and, further, that so far as railway subsidies or aid to railways is concerned, the only measure proposed is one for the purpose of continuing subsidies which have already been granted in the past ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that it is not the purpose of the government to grant any new subsidies this year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or aid ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Or aid. The legislation which is already on the order paper or announced is all that is contemplated except perhaps a Bill of which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will give the particulars.

Mr. FIELDING. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister informs me that he omitted to mention a possible amendment to the Banking Act. It is a matter of a technical character arising out of the fact that one of our banks is operating in the West Indies. The Bill is a purely formal one and if it is introduced I am sure it will not be a matter of contention.

DELAY AT PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA. Might I call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to the delay in the work at the Printing Bureau. The lists for my county were brought down in the month of December, and I was promised by the King's Printer that I would receive them at the end of January. We are now nearly at the end of July and I have not heard of them yet. Some time ago I called at the Bureau to inquire and saw Mr. Smith who has charge of the printing. Mr. Smith seems to be an efficient officer but he explained to me that it was impossible during the session to look after the lists with the facilities at their disposal. If we are to have six or eight month sessions and if during that time the printing of the lists will be delayed, a great deal of inconvenience will be caused, and it seems to me that if the government cannot have the work done at the Printing Bureau they should see that the lists are printed outside.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has, I think, been found that it is preferable that the lists should be printed at the Printing Bureau. I am sorry to say that the capacity of the Bureau is not adequate to the requirements of the business. I think that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has the intention to ask parliament for an appropriation for extending the space available at the Bureau, and with the increased space it may be possible to give satisfaction to my hon. friend who is not by any means the only complainant.

Mr. SPROULE. Wait until the new building is up and you will get them all right.

TEMISCOUATA RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 144) to amend the Act of the present session respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company—Mr. Fitzpatrick—was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that Bill was to be sent to the Railway Committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is a Bill simply to correct an error caused by an omission by the clerk of the Ralway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. It establishes a precedent for doing the same thing with other Bills that might go further.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is perfectly immaterial to me but it seems to me that it would be an unnecessary waste of time for the House or the committee to discuss the Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. TISDALE. What is the nature of the amendment ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the original Bill I introduced, provision was made that this company might dispose of the railway to a certain number of companies, and among the companies named in the original Bill was the Canadian Northern Railway. There were a great many others. When the Bill came before the Railway Committee and was reported to the House, the name Canadian Northern Railway was omitted by clerical error, and it is proposed now to insert it.

Mr. SPROULE. I draw attention to the rule of the House, which provides :

> Every private Bill, when read a second time, is referred to the standing committee charged with the consideration of such Bill.

I do not know whether the committee charged with the responsibility of looking into the question has passed on it or not. Does the minister say it did ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know.

Mr. SPROULE. At any rate, it is not intended to allow the committee to get such information as is necessary to enable it to determine whether it is right or not to re-

commend the privilege asked for. That is one objection. The other is that we are departing from the rule we invariably follow, and when we break a rule our custom is to cite that action as a precedent. We should be jealous of our rules; and if in this instance the delay would not imperil the passing of the measure, it seems to me we ought to follow the rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No one will dispute the correctness of the views which have been stated by my hon. friend, but I would ask him if there is any occasion to apply the rule on the present occasion. The Minister of Justice has told us that this Bill is simply to correct a clerical error by supplying the omission of words which were in the Bill when passed by the Railway Committee, but which afterwards were left out by an error of the clerk. This was brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice by the clerk himself. Nobody disputes this statement. If the statement of fact were disputed, the advice of my hon. friend should prevail; but as it is not, I cannot see why we should refer the Bill to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. If the allegation of fact be correct, I do not see that there should be any objection, but the Minister of Justice says he has no personal knowledge, and I personally am in the same position.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are members of the Railway Committee on both sides of the House. The statement has been made openly and no one has challenged it, so that we may accept it as true beyond doubt.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not make the statement of my personal knowledge, but on information given me by the clerk of the Railway Committee, who asked me to introduce this Bill. I have read a letter from him to that effect, which I read to the House when I introduced it. That letter will be found on page 5577 of 'Hansard.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That should remove any objection.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

NATURALIZATION AND ALIENS ACTS —AMENDMENT.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved second reading of Bill (No. 147) to amend the Acts relating to Naturalization and Aliens. He said: As I explained on the first reading, this is intended to meet a difficulty in the province of Quebec. Under the law application must be made to the circuit court of the district. This court sits at the chief place in the district and in addition at other places. The clerks in the circuit court, in order, I suppose, to avoid unnecessary labour, contend that applications for naturalization must be made at the chief place or shire town, and cannot be made at other places where the court sits. Since introducing this Bill, it has attracted attention in the province of Manitoba, and I have a letter from the ex-chief justice of that province, Judge Killam, in which he suggests an amendment of a similar nature applicable to that province. Let me read his letter:

Winnipeg, 9th July, 1904.

Dear Sir,—Observing that you have introduced a Bill to amend the Naturalization Act, I desire again to call your attention to some points which I mentioned to you some time ago, when I was Chief Justice of Manitoba.

By section 11 of the Act, Revised Statutes Canada, chapter 113, the naturalization certificate is to be presented (in Manitoba) to the Court of Queen's (now King's) Bench during its sitting in the county in which the alien resides, or to the court of assize, &c., or to the county court of such county.

There are now no courts of assize and 'nisi prius' in the province. There are sittings of the Court of King's Bench for commercial and jury trials twice each year in each judicial district (which, under the interpretation clause is the 'county').

There are weekly sittings of the Court of King's Bench at Winnipeg for non-jury trials, also weekly sittings for motions and legal arguments. These have always been considered sittings within the Naturalization Act and many naturalization certificates have been brought up and read at these.

At times, at trial sittings, many parties are present as witnesses. But often at these, and usually at the other sittings there are only a few lawyers.

The reading of such certificates at these sittings gives no publicity and is often a great nuisance to the judge, the officials and those having business before the court.

I would suggest that all such certificates be presented in the county courts. This affords a far better chance of securing publicity among the neighbours of the alien, the sole object of such reading.

Chief Justice Killman sends me a draft-clause which he suggests as a substitute for that relating to Manitoba, which is as follows:

Said section 11 is further amended by striking out line 20 to 26 both inclusive and substituting the following:—'In Manitoba to the county court having jurisdiction where the alien resides or if there be no county court having jurisdiction there, then to some other county court in the province.

This amendment I will move when the Bill reaches committee.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN. If I understand the object of this amendment of the law with regard to Quebec, then, taking the example given by the hon. minister (Mr. Fitzpatrick) the alien may be naturalized on applying to the circuit court in any town in which the circuit court sits, and is not obliged to apply at the sitting in the chef lieu, or chief town of the district. I think

that is all right. But I would call the attention of the hon. minister to the second clause which makes the law retroactive, from and including 13th August, 1903. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will give us some explanation and reasons for the introduction of this retroactive clause.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the statute here, and cannot refer to it, but the object of this second section is to give effect to any naturalization certificates which may have been issued in the interval by some of the circuit courts sitting outside the chef lieu.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA. I think I can supply the information asked for by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) not that I think it necessary to throw light on any question of law dealt with by the Minister of Justice, but that I happen to be familiar with the facts. Every year in my constituency many aliens are naturalized. The former Naturalization Act forms chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes. Section 110 of that Act named the courts in which certificates are to be presented. A part of that section is as follows :

In Quebec to the circuit court in and for the circuit within the jurisdiction of which the alien resides.

Last year in the Act introduced by the Minister of Justice, which appears as chapter 28 of the statute of 1903, but was changed so as to read :

In Quebec to the circuit court in and for the district within the jurisdiction of which the alien resides.

So, it will be seen that under the old Act a petition could be presented in the circuit within which the alien resided. But, in the new Act it must be presented in the circuit court of the district. As my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) knows what is generally called in our province, the district circuit court, as I understand, is a court which sits in the chef lieu where the superior court sits. Now, some naturalization certificates were presented last year before the superior court judge sitting at Papineauville, and the judge said that on account of last year's amendment of the Naturalization Act, they had to be presented at the district circuit court at Hull. I see that the retroactive clause carries back to the date when this Bill of last year was assented to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To explain my own position, I may say that I have never entertained any doubt that these petitions could be presented at the circuit court sitting anywhere in the district. But the difficulty is that the clerks of the court, over whom we have no jurisdiction, to save themselves the labour of these certificates, for which they get no remuneration, insist on the work being done at the headquarters of the court.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the House will bear with me, I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that retroactive legislation is objectionable in principle. I suppose I can get the assurance of my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that it does not interfere with any action of law pending before the court.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot give that because I do not know. We might protect that point by amending the clause to provide that it shall not interfere with any question now in litigation. But I cannot say that there is no litigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). This, of course, is objectionable on the face of it——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And possibly it would be better to add some clause such as the minister suggests. I do not know that I quite gather how this particular date of 13th August, 1903, was arrived at.

Mr. BOURASSA. This was the day on which the Act of last session was assented to. Of course, I am not contending that the present law ought to be changed. I simply pointed out that where it was printed in the old Act 'circuit' in 'which the alien resides,' it was printed in the Act of last year 'district.' The petitions I referred to, presented last year to the judge of the circuit court under this law, he would not receive, because he said they ought to be presented at the chef lieu.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The answer is perfectly satisfactory. The date is that on which the Act of last session became law.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

2. The circuit courts in and for territorial divisions of districts and counties in the province of Quebec are hereby declared to have had jurisdiction under the Naturalization Act, as so amended, on and since the thirteenth day of August, 1903, as if the said section 11 had been enacted by chapter 38 of the statutes of 1903 in the form of that section as amended by this Act.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It has been moved to amend section 2 by inserting 'Provided this clause shall not affect any pending action or proceeding.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I move to add the following as clause 3:

Said section 11 is further amended by striking out the lines from 20 to 26, both inclusive, and substituting the following :—

In Manitoba, to the county court having jurisdiction where the alien resides, or if

there be no county court having jurisdiction there then to some other county court in the province.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) has suggested to me that the latter part of the clause might be modified with advantage to the effect that the other county court referred to should be the nearest county court.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not exactly the language, but the idea may be there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He means the adjoining district ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What he wants is to go into the courts of the nearest district to the place where the man resides. I wish to amend this suggested amendment in such a way as to provide that if there is no county court within the district where the alien resides, then the application is to be made to the nearest county court within the place where he resides ; and for the purpose of preparing the proper amendment I would move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

REVISED STATUTES—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 154) to amend chapter 61 of the statutes of 1903, respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada—Mr. Fitzpatrick—was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 4 of the present statute reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council, after such deposit of the said last mentioned roll, may by proclamation declare.

There is only one roll, therefore the use of the words 'last mentioned' is unnecessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think that this is a proper amendment. I have not specially examined the statute of last year, but I may say to the hon. Minister of Justice that under a somewhat similar statute in the province of Nova Scotia a very curious condition has arisen. Perhaps he may have heard something of it. It seems that a roll in exact conformity with the report of the commissioners with certain additions and corrections taken from the statutes of the same year was prepared ? In the margin of that some person had pencilled a word. It had been in the former statute, but it had been omitted from that statute by subsequent legislation. The statute of the province providing for the roll was to the effect that after the roll was prepared by the commissioners and after it was printed it should be signed by the Governor and the provincial secretary and that it should be regarded as the original roll. When it was printed it was printed with the inclusion of this pencilled word in the margin and the result was that very important litigation arose which was recently determined by the Supreme Court of Canada. In the litigation another point arose which is worthy of consideration at the present time; that is to say whether or not the printed roll so provided for by the statute and signed by the government and provincial secretary would have the same force and effect as the roll of parliament, or whether it could be controverted by evidence which could not be introduced to controvert. If the roll of parliament as finally signed and verified by the officers of parliament and the Governor himself could be shown by the most indisputable evidence to differ in any respect from the legislation as it had passed the committees of this House or had pased the third reading of this House and the Senate, you could not controvert it by any evidence of that kind because it imputes absolute verity. I would think that, taking every precaution to make sure that the roll shall be absolutely correct, it is desirable in this statute, if it has not already been done, to make it absolutely clear that the roll so signed by the proper authorities named in this statute shall impute the same verity and shall be as binding and conclusive as the roll of parliament itself would be.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not quite sure whether these amendments have been suggested as a result of the difficulty which occurred in the province of Nova Scotia to which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has referred, but I may say that these amendments have been prepared as a result of a report made to me by three gentlemen who went over this roll and who were appointed a sub-committee by the commission for that purpose. These gentlemen were Mr. Newcombe, Mr. Roscoe, and Mr. Sirois. These three careful and painstaking gentlemen having examined the roll have suggested these amendments.

Mr. GOURLEY. How far have they got with the revision ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I had expected to be called upon to make a statement when I brought down my estimates in connection with the item which I will have to submit to the House. Then I will be able to give all the details to my hon. friend, but I may say that the work is very far advanced and that I think early within the next year the whole matter will be disposed of.

On section 3,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the effect of that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In one section they called it 'the last roll' and in the other 'the amended roll.'

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Welland canal—electric lighting and power plant, $100,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that under the contract the government takes 500 horse-power and it may be extended to 700.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Yes, if we require it. I do not think the original arrangement with the Lincoln Company was by tender, but tenders have been called for all the materials required.

Mr. SPROULE. What materials do you require ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They only supply the power under that contract, but we have to install the plant ; and everything is included in this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the price per horse-power ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $14.

Mr. BLAIN. This contract is for the supply of horse-power only ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Last session the government explained that the supplies for the electric plant would be obtained by tender.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has been done.

Mr. BLAIN. Who were the tenderers ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian General Electric Company, the Packard Electric Company, the Canadian Westinghouse Company ; there were quite a number. All the materials were not purchased from the one concern. Some prices were lower on some articles than on others, and I selected from the tenders the articles that were quoted at the lowest prices.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total construction of the electric plant, when complete, cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimate given by Mr. Parke, the electrical expert, of the lighting and the power plant is $250,000. It will not be exceeded I understand.

Mr. BLAIN. When will it be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It should have been completed this month, but these companies have failed to come to time.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the government under any obligation to the contractors for power, in case the plant is not constructed by a certain time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, when we are ready to take the horse-power we will pay for it.

Mr. SPROULE. What horse-power do you require for moving the gates, &c., in contradistinction to the power used in generating the electricity for the lights ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We require hardly 400 horse-power for the lights alone and the balance of the 500 will be required for the gates and bridges.

Mr. SPROULE. How many lights have you ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 500 lights of 2,000 candle-power requiring about three-quarters of a horse-power to a light.

Mr. SPROULE. What length is the canal that you are lighting ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Twenty-seven miles is the length of the canal and we are lighting it throughout.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this complete the expense on the Welland canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, this completes the improvements. We have to take out the centre piers of the bridges that cross the canal. In the interests of navigation that becomes necessary. We are not doing that all at one time, but year by year as it becomes necessary we will do so. There is one in contemplation now at St. Catharines known as the Niagara street bridge. The centre pier will have to be removed and the present bridge replaced by a larger and heavier structure.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to call the attention of the minister to the question suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) as to whether this will complete the expenditure in regard to the lighting on the Welland canal. I have been endeavouring to impress on the minister and I would like to impress on parliament this one fact that the proper thing for the government to do is to put in their own electrical plant and not to make any contract with any company. That is the cheapest way to do it ; there is water going to waste on the Welland canal in very large quantities. The government can install its own electrical plant, light the Welland canal and open and operate lock gates and bridges very much more cheaply in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of experts, than they are doing it under the contract which they have entered into now, although the contract which has been entered into is an exceedingly reasonable one so far as the prices are concerned. In view of what the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has just stated, I beg to suggest that the proper thing to be done is for the government to install its own electrical

plant and use its own water-power for lighting the canal and operating the locks and bridges.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the feature of it which attracted my attention. If we have power going to waste, why should we pay for power from an outside corporation? The power we are paying for is water-power. I understand that the government put in their own plant but pay the company for power. What power is it if not water-power that they are paying for ?

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose that the hon. gentleman from Welland is aware that this contract is for ten years. Is it not a fact that power is becoming cheaper from time to time in this district, and does not my hon. friend think that it is rather an unwise move to enter into a ten year contract for power of this kind when the price of power is being reduced very rapidly ? The plan advocated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. German), namely that the government operate the whole thing, might be very much cheaper he says and for that reason I think that entering into a ten year contract is not a good move. I think we could do better.

Mr. SPROULE. Why enter into a contract with an outside company for power, if we have water going to waste which contains all the power we require ? Why not use the water going to waste on the Welland canal, install a plant there, operate the locks and bridges and canal and light it as well, in that way.

Mr. EMMERSON. That might be done very rapidly but it would involve a large expenditure of money in order to utilize that power.

Mr. SPROULE. How could it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not something lying there to be availed of at any moment. For the utilization of that water-power a mechanical arrangement is required and the expense is considerable ; I do not know how much. However, be that as it may, it stands in this position that a contract was entered into and we are now under contract to take so much power from the Lincoln Company, and we have to furnish a certain equipment along the line of the Welland canal in order to utilize the power that we thus secure from that company.

Mr. SPROULE. If you use your own power you would have to do no more than you are doing to-day. If you have the water penned up and the requisite pressure it simply requires a wheel to bring it into operation. All you would require then to connect that with your machinery is a water wheel. Every one knows that that is not a very expensive item. Then you have the power, and if I understand correctly you are installing your own dynamos and other plant. Since the government must do that, why should they pay $14 per horse-power when they have so much power going to waste ? All they need do is to install the plant and utilize that power. You would then have your own power and would not be bound by any contract and could take advantage of every improvement to cheapen it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know as to the relative cost of furnishing the water-power and purchasing it, but I am informed that the government, if they wanted to utilize the water-power along the Welland canal, would have to spend more than they are paying this company.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you an engineer's report to that effect ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Then that is just mere rumour.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is more that a rumour, it is a statement.

Mr. SPROULE. By whom ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From the department.

Mr. SPROULE. That statement must be based on knowledge.

Mr. EMMERSON. However, the contract is let, and that is only a statement with reference to the cost. It may or may not be correct. I certainly cannot vouch for it. But I can say that $14 per horse-power is certainly a very reasonable figure, as water-powers are leased in Canada to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I may tell the hon. minister that I am interested in a contract for the supply of electric power, not only water-power but the electric current as well, for $8 per horse-power, and we carry that five miles by wire.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where is that ?

Mr. SPROULE. Right where I live. That is a very reasonable rate, and it shows that where water is plentiful power can be supplied very cheaply. The minister says the contract is let and of course there is a vested right, but I am arguing antecedent to the letting of the contract. I am contending that business prudence would have suggester the necessity of making ample inquiry and securing sufficient data to satisfy the minister that the power could not be furnished cheaper by using the water that is going to waste in the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the date of the contract ?

Mr. SPROULE. 5th of December is the date of the Order in Council.

Mr. INGRAM. 1st of July, I think. The only point in this discussion is whether it would be cheaper for the government to generate their own power. That I think

we must admit. You are furnishing everything outside the power, and since you have to go to so much expenditure in furnishing plant, why not complete your plant and furnish your own power ? You would then have control for all time to come instead of being in the hands of a company. I am strongly of the opinion of the hon. member for Welland that that would be the right step to take in view of the enormous water-power in the neighbourhood.

Mr. EMMERSON. Personally the matter has not come under my notice as to whether it would be advisable or not to utilize that water-power, but it does occur to me that it could not be utilized without the expenditure of a very considerable sum in addition to what we are spending. I did not even make personal inquiry to ascertain whether there is ample power along the canal, because there has been no occasion for me to do so. And I am therefore not in a position to give an opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. How much have you let in that canal to outsiders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a great deal under lease, and the leases go over many years. Water-powers are being applied for.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there not still power, over and above what is leased, sufficient to do all the lighting of the canal and operate the gates and bridges ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there could be some leased, but I have not had occasion to make inquiry, for the simple reason that we entered into a contract in 1902.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an excuse for the minister that he was not responsible at the time.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not relieving myself of responsibility, but am simply drawing attention to the fact that personally I have not felt called upon to make inquiry.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister is assuming responsibility for what his predecessors did, he is responsible for their mistakes and blunders as well as successes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. We are selling power, I am told, in many cases at a merely nominal figure. Look at the power we sold on the Cornwall canal. I venture to say that there is over 1,000 horse-power, probably 2,000, on that canal, and we are selling it at $1,000 a year. That would not amount to $1 a horse-power, yet we are buying it back at $63 horse-power. Can that be called good management ? What is the essential cost of the development of power ? It must be developed by steam or water-power. All through the country the great requisite is water-power, because then you save the cost of fuel and machinery for the generation of steam. Wherever you have water pent up you can generate power very cheaply. And it is a permanent power. We have that power there, and we could sell it, or we would use it to generate electrical energy. But we lease the right to others for a nominal figure, and then we buy back at a considerable figure the power which they generate by using the opportunities that we have leased to them. I am not saying that the price paid by the government is exorbitant ; frankly, I do not think it is. But we could produce that power for our own use if we provided the proper means. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) says that it would be very costly machinery. The hon. minister is mistaken. Where you have the water already stored up, all you need is a pen-stock and a wheel. This will produce the power, and you can use that power to run a dynamo, a saw-mill or any other machinery. I contend that it does not show good business management for the head of a department to allow power to go to waste, and, at the same time, buy power from outsiders. And, especially, this does not show good business management when a contract is made for ten years to pay a certain rate per horse-power. No matter what inventions may be made to develop power cheaply, we are compelled to pay the same price under the contract. And if we find fault we are told that contracts are sacred, and, even if we can get the service at a cheaper rate, we must continue to pay the price agreed upon. I contend that the department should have had one of its engineers ascertain what power is available ; and, if enough power was going to waste to work the locks and bridges and generate electricity to light the canal, that power should have been used, rather than take power from an outsider under such a contract as this. In this case there seems ample evidence that we could supply the power at a rate much less than that we are paying. To say that is to say that the minister is not doing his duty in not having the investigation made to learn the best means of utilizing that power.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Lincoln Company, of course, sell their power. But they had to spend a very large sum of money in order to develop that power.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister should not insist that it requires a large expenditure to utilize this power, now that the water is pent up.

Mr. EMMERSON. The power has to be developed, and that means a permanent investment.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. minister mean by 'developed' ? The first requisite in the making of a water-power is a dam, and that is often a very expensive work. But in this case the dams are all

made. The water is now running in the sluice-ways. It is only necessary to put in a wheel to utilize the power.

Mr. EMMERSON. But it means putting up buildings and installing machinery. I understand it requires a very large expenditure to develop water-power, and the mere fact that you have the water does not mean that you have power—you must harness it.

Mr. COCHRANE. But the main expense of harnessing is the making of a dam, and that work is already done. Common sense must tell the minister, as it tells me, that when a company is furnishing power to the government the company must receive interest on its investment, and that the government is paying that interest in the price it pays for the power.

Mr. EMMERSON. I admit that I am not an authority on these points. I am glad of suggestions from my hon. friends.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then if the minister is not an authority, why does he not——

Mr. EMMERSON. I am modest enough to admit that I am not an authority, but my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) perhaps is not modest enough to admit the same concerning himself.

Mr. COCHRANE. The difficulty is that the minister admits too much. Of course, we do not expect the minister now to know everything about his department. But he has a competent staff, and they are there for the purpose of giving him information. And I am very strongly of opinion that no minister should come down here and ask the House to vote money without proper information. There is no excuse for ignorance. If he has not been in his office long enough to learn it himself, his staff will furnish it for him. Does not the company that furnishes this power get that power from the water in the canal? If so, they must put in the necessary machinery to develop the power, and on their investment they must receive interest. I do not think it requires such an enormous amount of capital. In the section in which I live there are immense water-powers, but to utilize them is an expensive matter, because in every case you must first build a dam. But once the dam is made the putting in of the machinery is an insignificant thing. I believe, and I think the committee feel, that the minister should take steps to find if he could not utilize the power now going to waste and at the same time save money to the country. I am not finding fault with the amount he is paying if he must buy the power. But if we can use the power that we now own and so avoid paying to somebody else, it should be an advantage to have this power harnessed.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems that there has been no calculation made as to whether we can get power more cheaply by utilizing the water that is going to waste in the canal. I do not call that good business management; in fact, I think it is bad business management. The minister should make the same inquiry that a wise business man would make in such a case; and I think that that might have been done before now.

Mr. GERMAN. The contract price for this power is $14 per horse-power. At Niagara Falls, New York, manufacturing companies are paying from $25 to $30 per horse-power for electric power delivered on the spot. There are three companies carrying on operations to develop electric power on the Canadian side at Niagara Falls. It is said that when they have finished the work of development which is now going on, which, I think, will be this fall—one of them, the Canadian Niagara Power Company, by December, at any rate—you will not be able to get power from them for less than from $15 to $20 per horse-power. Under those circumstances, it can hardly be said that the price charged the government by the Lincoln Company is too high. I quite agree, however, and must again insist, that the proper thing for the government to do is to develop the power itself.

I quite agree with the idea that power should be given to the government to develop this power itself. I had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the late Minister of Railways and suggested to him that the government should put in plant and develop power rather than give the contract to a company; but he thought that at that particular time it was more advisable to enter into the contract for ten years. We know that this very company has been urging strenuously on the government that the contract should be extended; as a matter of fact people interested in the company have spoken to me about it, asking me if I would use my influence, if I had any, with the department to obtain a further extension of this contract.

Mr. SPROULE. They would like it for a hundred years.

Mr. GERMAN. No doubt. The price of power will be lower, but I doubt if it will be lower within the life of the contract. I think $14 per horse-power during the life of this contract is probably about as low a figure as you could get power for. I would not be in favour of extending the contract, and I think that if the government can see its way to put in plant of its own and utilize the water that is going to waste on the Welland canal to develop power which will operate all the locks and bridges and furnish light on the canal, it would be the best thing to do in the public interest. I have made that statement before, and I am prepared to stand by it, because I do not think it can be controverted. As far as price is concerned, I think the price that is being paid now is reasonable. The hon.

member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked how much power was being used by manufacturers on the Welland canal. I venture to say there is 100,000 horse-power, probably more than that.

Mr. SPROULE. Going to waste.

Mr. GERMAN. It is not wasted, it is in the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. It is practically wasted as long as it is not used.

Mr. GERMAN. We must have water there in order to have a canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not the water run on just the same even though the power was not used ?

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman says it does not cost much to put in machinery. I can tell him that it costs an enormous sum of money to put in machinery. Go to the Westinghouse Company and ask them what is the cost of dynamos per horse-power necessary to light and operate the Welland canal.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the minister said they put in the dynamos and the plant themselves.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was mistaken with respect to that, I had not the contract before me.

Mr. SPROULE. As to the price of power, we paid that much for horse-power per annum already, before the contract.

Mr. GERMAN. It is $14 per horse-power per year.

Mr. SPROULE. But that was not in use during the full year.

Mr. EMMERSON. By the contract it is only paid proportionately, we do not have to pay for the whole year.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister tell us about how much it will cost the government to supply the power for electric lighting and the horse-power, separately ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimated cost of installing the arc light system ?

Mr. BLAIN. No, I am asking, when the $10,000 plant for both electric lighting and power is completed, what will be the total cost to the government of the power to be used for the gates, and the cost of the electric lighting separately.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I said to my hon. friend, the government expect to spend fully $250,000, and after expending that sum we will have a lighting plant and a power plant. Then we will be called upon to pay after that for the power generated by the Lincoln Company at the rate of $14 per horse-power.

Mr. CLARKE. Per annum ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At that rate per annum, in proportion to the length of time in each year that it is used.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman has already told us that. What I am asking is, how much do the government expect it will cost to operate these two distinct plants when the work is done. The hon. gentleman has told us $14 per horse-power. I suppose the government will have some estimate made as to how much it will cost per year to supply the power.

Mr. EMMERSON. The cost will not exceed $7,000. We hope it will be within that sum.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day were called, I asked the right hon. the Prime Minister if he could give the House any information with respect to the military situation at Sydney. There have been reports in the newspapers that the militia who had been sent on duty to that town have been withdrawn, and their places taken by the regular military force of the Dominion. It has also been stated that a warship has been sent round from Halifax. I would like to know from the Minister of Militia what the facts are in connection with the trouble down there ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Under the provisions of the statute, three magistrates of Sydney, Cape Breton, one of them being the stipendiary magistrate of the town, made a request upon the district officer commanding at Halifax for assistance. The district officer at Halifax called out, in the first instance, the local militia, which was not found to be adequate ; and later on he sent 200 men, I think, from the city of Halifax. As the difficulties continued, and appeared likely to continue for some time longer, and as these men were employed in Halifax in various ways and their absence was causing inconvenience, the district officer commanding asked headquarters to lend 100 men of the permanent force to go to Sydney and replace the active militia so that they might return to their homes and their work.

Mr. CLARKE. How many of the active militia were on duty ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 200, I think. This was agreed to, upon condition that the money, necessary to pay the cost of transportation and all expenses, was deposited in the bank at Sydney to the credit of the Receiver General. Upon that being done, and the department being informed of the fact through the bank—and I may say the money was deposited by the three magistrates already mentioned—the troops were allowed to go, and are there now, under these conditions. With reference to the warship, I have no information at all. I was not aware

that a warship was there. I do know, however, that it is the custom of warships, British warships and others, to call occasionally at the port of Sydney. I presume this was merely one of the occasional calls.

Mr. CLARKE. I am very glad to have the explanation of the minister in this matter. When the announcement was made that the regulars were being sent and that a warship was proceeding to Sydney, I feared the situation was more serious than it really is.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seemed to take exception to the purchase of power for lighting and operating the gates on the Welland canal, and he seemed to be of the opinion that the government might have utilized the powers which they have on the canal. It is well known that I was not personally cognizant of the transaction at the time, but I find on looking into the matter that the expert employed by the department at that time, in a report presented in November, 1902, sets forth his views. I will read this report to the committee. The expert is Mr. Roderick J. Parke, consulting electrical engineer of Toronto. The report is as follows :

Ottawa, Ont., Nov. 28th, 1902.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING CONTRACT FOR WELLAND CANAL.

The Hon. A. G. Blair,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In accordance with your instructions I have examined and read the correspondence in the matter of the proposal by the Lincoln Electric Light and Power Company, Limited, of St. Catharines, Ont., to supply electrical power to the Dominion of Canada for the operation of electric arc lights along the canal and of electric motors at the various locks, bridges, shops, and so forth, on the canal, and I beg to submit my report herewith :—

The company propose to supply electrical power at the rate of fourteen dollars per horse-power for such amount of power as may be required to supply light for about 400 enclosed arc lamps of 2,000 candle power each, from the opening until the close of navigation, beginning May 1st, 1903, each year for ten years.

They further propose to supply power for about 100 lamps, all the year round for the water watch, presumably 2,000 candle power lamps for this service, and I further presume that the power required for the said 100 lamps is not to be added to the amount of power required for the total number of lamps (arc) in use during the season of navigation.

They further propose to supply any further power that may be called for in the future for operating lock gates and bridges and workshops at any time at the same rate per horse-power, namely, $14.

I infer from their letter dated November 21st, 1902, addressed to you, that it is not their intention to supply and install at their expense the necessary poles, wires and apparatus for distributing and utilizing the power so required for the canal, but that the government shall at its expense supply such equipment, the contractors merely delivering the energy at a receiving station to be erected by the government at some suitably convenient location on the canal, presumably at Thorold.

In my opinion the proposal of the Lincoln Electric Light Company to supply power required for the canal at the rate of $14 per horse-power, delivered at Thorold, is a reasonable proposition for the following reasons, namely :—

The superintending engineer of the Welland canal advises me that not more than about 400 horse-power is available at any one site on the canal, and as the maximum load is likely to exceed 400 horse-power at any time, a duplicate hydraulic plant and generating station equipment would be necessary or else some means would have to be provided at each lock, to store the energy during periods of light load (i.e., any load under 400 horse-power which would not be utilized by the motors for the time being, either by assistance of storage batteries or by means of an air compressing plant, so that when the maximum load, or in fact, any load, over the capacity of the power available at any one site (i.e. water-power) is thrown upon the system, such overload, could be carried by the storage batteries or by the reservoirs of compressed air. No matter which system of energy storage were used, the maintenance charges would be quite heavy, and certainly much greater than would be the maintenance charges on a motor equipment at each lock taking the power direct from the transmission line just when required ; if the power were supplied by the Lincoln or any other concern having ample capacity for the requirements of the canal, it would of course be always available and would dispense with the necessity for energy storage equipment at each lock. The cost per horse-power for distributing the energy obtained from the Lincoln Company would therefore be less to the government than if its own generating plant were installed.

A further argument in favour of awarding the contract to the Lincoln Company is that their rate of $14 per horse-power for the eight and a half months or nine months during which it would be required, is on the basis of $18.64 per horse-power per annum, which, in my opinion, is a reasonable charge, provided that the calculation of the power consumed be on the basis of a power factor of not less than ·80. If the power factor be less than ·80 the rate per actual horse-power per annum, increases proportionately as the power factor grows less. The proposal that the contract be made to cover a period of ten years is in my opinion a reasonable one.

The above report is respectfully submitted by

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) RODERICK J. PARKE.

From that standpoint it would seem to me that the department at that time very wisely determined to take the steps which they did. Certainly they must have felt that the

cost to the government would be greater by the other process. The department have relieved themselves of an endless amount of worry, not to say expense, connected with the necessary superintendence, with the establishment and renewal of a plant and other irritating circumstances inseparable from an attempt to generate their own power. All these circumstances added to the expenditure of an additional amount of money as a permanent investment in establishing the plant gives a sufficient reason why the department of that day determined, and why the government approved of their decision, to purchase this power at a price which is recognized to be reasonable, instead of undertaking to develop their own power.

Mr. SPROULE. What is there in that whole report, with the exception of one thing, that bears on the question of cost? It says that because there is not sufficient power in one place this is a good plan and that the other plan would make it more costly.

Mr. EMMERSON. They would have to gather the power from all points and that would require a storage plant.

Mr. SPROULE. It requires a plant at two points but that is all the report says. Would the hon. gentleman tell me what it costs per horse-power for supplying electrical power at the Soo where the government are supplying the power with their own plant?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not that information. My deputy tells me he cannot give it off-hand.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has brought that report down and advanced it as an argument to show that the department in buying power from the company have done the wiser thing of the two.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Parke said it would cost less to take the power from the Lincoln Company at the rates offered than for the government to install its own power plant.

Mr. SPROULE. The only reason he gave was because it would necessitate two plants.

Mr. EMMERSON. He is an expert, and I presume he would not make the statement without believing it.

Mr. SPROULE. It should cost the government less than the company, because the company would have to pay interest on their capital and make a profit besides. It seems to me that where the government have wasted power at hand, it would cost less for them to utilize it than to rent power. I suppose there was some friend of the government in this company urging for a contract, and I presume Mr. Parke was brought on to give some reason to justify the government in doing so.

Mr. EMMERSON. You should not be suspicious.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears to me that the government could have utilized the power to be obtained on the Welland canal just the same as they utilize it at the Soo, where they found it cheaper and better to supply their own power. The conditions at the two canals are similar.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the deputy minister that there was no company at the Soo at that time to supply power, and that the government was obliged to install a plant.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that they were prepared to supply power to others and why not to the government?

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows of his own knowledge, but I have to take the statement of the deputy minister.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me it would have been the part of wisdom for the government to install their own power plant on the Welland canal where they have power to spare, as they did on the Soo canal. Owing to the deficiency of knowledge on the part of the minister he led us into the supposition that the government were installing all the plant on the Welland canal and that the company was selling only the actual power.

Mr. EMMERSON. I corrected that. I was under the impression in the first instance that that was so, but as soon as I found my mistake I corrected it.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be well for the minister to read up his case before he comes to the House, and not waste time by giving wrong information.

Mr. EMMERSON. If you make a mistake it is just as well to correct it.

Mr. BLAIN. Before one o'clock I asked the minister how much it would cost the government for the power for electric light, and how much for the power to operate the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimate of the chief engineer was that the whole yearly cost of the power to be purchased would be about $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How much for each separately?

Mr. EMMERSON. As near as you can estimate it, it would be about $8,000 for lighting and about $7,000 for power.

Mr. BLAIN. How does that compare with the present cost of lighting?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a contract for $10,000 and there would be something extra in addition to that. Of course the

difference in time in the operation of the locks should be taken into consideration ?

Mr. SPROULE. What do these 2,000 candle power lamps cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The arc lamps cost originally about $50 each with the transformer.

Mr. SPROULE. What I mean is : how much would each 2,000 candle power lamp cost per year according to the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a matter to be figured out on the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. That is valuable information because we know what each arc lamp costs in towns and cities and it is only by comparison that we can ascertain if the government is paying a fair price. The lamps on the Cornwall canal cost $108 a year, as nearly as I can figure out. These same lamps in towns throughout the country are supplied at from $50 to $75, the latter price applying where they run all night. I would like to know what they cost on the Welland canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry I cannot give the exact figures. But that will be seen from the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I would think that an estimate would have been placed before the minister showing what would be the cost per lamp per annum. He has a long list of data there from the report of Mr. Parke, the electrical engineer, who says the price is reasonable. You can get such a statement as that for almost any contract the government wants to enter into.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister a question in reference to supplying material for this electric light plant. Mr. Parke, in his estimate, says that it will require 75,000 pounds of No. 6 bare copper at 16 cents per pound, a total of $12,000, to complete that work. The minister made the statement that he received tenders for the supply of these goods, and I would like him to state the price that was paid for this copper wire.

Mr. EMMERSON. My memory does not carry that figure, but I have sent for the information.

Mr. SPROULE. I would also like to have a statement of what these lights cost per year each.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is in the contract. The cost for each light is dependent on the circumstances and conditions. The number in operation at one time will govern the cost for that particular night.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not care for the circumstances and conditions ; we want to know the cost of each light per year.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some of them are not for the whole year.

Mr. SPROULE. I am asking the cost for the season of navigation.

Mr. EMMERSON. You have the contract before you. Is it necessary to allow the item to stand until I furnish the item as to cost of this wire ?

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the minister will furnish it some time later ?

Mr. SPROULE. And the cost of the lamps as well ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If I can get the information, I will do so. I will study out the contract.

Welland canal—Improvements at Port Colborne entrance, $300,000 ($240,000 yet to be voted).

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount asked for this year is $300,000. The amount appropriated last year was $300,000, of which only $200,000 was expended. The total expenditure on this work up to May 1st, 1904, was $669,007.13. The amount this year is asked to continue the work of improvement at the entrance to Port Colborne. It consists of dredging, rock excavation, cribwork, and a concrete superstructure, forming two slips at which vessels may lie, and sites for elevators. That is the work that is now going on. There will be necessary, before the completion of that work, foundation for an elevator, and also, I suppose, ultimately an elevator. The total estimated cost of the works which are covered by the vote of this year is estimated at $1,150,000. That is for the work that is on hand now. The value of the work done up to June 30th was, in round numbers, $699,366. The value of the work remaining to be done is $450,633, and they are asking of this $450,633, $300,000. That would leave $150,633 further to be voted.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it estimated that that amount will complete the work at Port Colborne ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the work on hand. There will be in addition to that, of course, if the work is gone on with, an elevator and foundations.

Mr. COCHRANE. What does the minister mean to tell the committee when he says that $100,000 are required ?

Mr. BLAIN. How much money has been expended at Port Colborne and how has it been expended ? How much in elevators, how much in wharfs and dredging and so forth ? and how much do the government expect to expend to complete the works ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Surely my hon. friend has not been paying attention or he would have heard what I said.

Mr. BLAIN. I heard what the hon. gentleman said. He said that $400,000 had been spent and they were asking $300,000 to complete the present works under construction.

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that the total amount expended up to the 1st of May, 1904, was $669,007.13, or bringing it down to the 30th of June, in round numbers, there was $700,000 expended. The estimated value of the work yet to be done is $450,663. We are asking $300,000 for this year to be expended in connection with that balance. This does not provide for elevators.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this being done by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, Hogan & Macdonnell are the contractors.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the work they are doing ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Dredging, rock excavation, cribwork and concrete work.

Mr. CLARKE. What has been accomplished by this expenditure of $700,000 ? What area of harbour has been built ? what is the depth of water ? What will be the capacity of the harbour where this improvement is taking place ? I notice that you estimate for the works under construction an expenditure of nearly one and a quarter million. After these have been completed, what dockage capacity will you have ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There will be two slips at which vessels can lie alongside the elevator. At these points there will be 22 feet depth of water.

Mr. CLARKE. How many vessels can lie alongside these docks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Eight vessels of the ordinary size. The docks will be 600 feet long and 200 wide and there will be two of them. At other points there will be 16 feet of water, and at the point where the elevators are to be situated there will be 22 feet.

Mr. CLARKE. The docks will have 2,400 feet frontage ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and 22 feet depth of water covering the area which will be fed by the elevators.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the depth be 22 feet for the whole distance of 2,400 feet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. All around that and the entrance will be 22 feet. There is also an area outside and beyond the dockage where there will be 22 feet.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand the hon. minister to say that parts would be only 16 feet.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is at another point.

I will read the description :

The work now under construction provides for the formation of a wide channel leading from deep water up to the south end of the west entrance pier of the canal, and the extension of this pier in a southerly and westerly direction by the construction of two piers of cribwork with a concrete superstructure, each 600 feet long by 200 feet wide, connected across the north end by a pier 200 feet long. The water in this channel and around the piers will have a depth of 22 feet at low water level of Lake Erie, which is taken at 17 feet on the south mitre sill of the new guard lock. The present condition of works may be briefly described as follows :— The new docking on the west side of the canal basin is completed except 300 feet at the crossing of the Port Colborne town water main, preparations are now in progress for the lowering of the water pipe and completion of this part of the docking this fall. On the east side of the canal basin the new docking north of the Grand Trunk Railway elevator is finished, but the 900 lineal feet of docking on this side of the basin south of the elevator, embraced in this contract, was ordered last November not to be built, so that nothing has been done at this point this season. The dredging of the canal basin, principally earth excavation, is practically completed, except cleaning up the bottom.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the estimate in the first place?

Mr. EMMERSON. The first estimate was $900,000, but there has been a deepening near the Grand Trunk elevator since which has added materially to the cost.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the draft of vessels that come to this port ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 18½ or 19 feet of water.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it expected that the same class will continue to be used or vessels of a larger draft?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the same class as come through the Sault Ste. Marie canal.

Mr. FOWLER. This dock will accommodate as large a class of vessels as go through the Sault Ste. Marie canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any money expended last year on the elevators of Port Colborne ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not by the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Or on elevator foundations ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In connection with the site for the elevators. I think that in making the cribwork they had in view the necessity for putting up elevators. They may have provided for possible elevator foundations, but no money was expended in placing those foundations.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the foundations for the purpose of construction, by the government, of elevators ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It can be done by the government or by anybody.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that a little vague ? Last year the minister asked for $40,000 for foundations.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has not been spent.

Mr. BLAIN. Very well. Now, what I ask is whether it is the intention of the government to construct the foundations or to have them constructed by other parties. Surely the government have some plan. Or are we to understand that this expenditure at Port Colborne is made merely at haphazard ? Last year we were told by the ministers that a large proportion of our trade was going by the way of Buffalo. That has been the complaint for years—that trade was going by Buffalo that should come down our own waterways. It seems to me that the government should have decided by this time whether they would construct elevators at Port Colborne or allow others to do so. If the government does not reach a decision, does that mean that we are to go on losing our trade ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Although $40,000 was appropriated for the foundations of elevators last year, there was a great diversity of opinion. as to the size of the elevators required, nor was there any final determination as to whether the government should build and operate the elevators themselves or give the rights to private parties. I cannot say that that question is finally determined yet. But, in any case, foundations must be provided, and, while the government is doing the rest of the work they can make those foundations.

Mr. FOWLER. The reason for that, I suppose, is that, as you are building the dock you can make the foundation at the same time, and do it more cheaply ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and have the work done.

Mr. FOWLER. Has anything been done towards preparing the foundations ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No actual work, but the plans are being completed so that the contractor can proceed.

Mr. FOWLER. Has anything been done with the docks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but not with that portion in which the work of foundation building will go on.

Mr. FOWLER. Are not the elevators to be on the docks ? Would not the foundation of the elevators form part of the docks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Has not the building of the docks proceeded to the point where it is necessary to proceed with the foundation ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Provision is made for the building of the foundation. The outside of the dock, the concrete portion is finished but, in the centre, where the foundations are to be, provision is made for the building of the foundaiton.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the docks being built of ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is crib-work inside faced with concrete.

Mr. FOWLER. The concrete has been finished, but not the crib-work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not all done.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention, if private parties are allowed to provide the elevators, to charge them for the foundation work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will be taken into consideration in arranging for any rights to be granted.

Mr. BLAIN. At what stage is the rock cutting between Humberstone and Port Colborne ? I understand that it is under contract. Has the contract been given to the same firm as the hon. gentleman mentioned ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The contractors are just beginning the work with a view to bringing that down to the depth of the Lake Erie water.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended on the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No appreciable amount —they are just beginning.

Sault Ste. Marie canal, construction, $170,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a work under contract with Messrs. Heckler Bros., of Sault Ste. Marie, for the dredging, and Mr. William Birmingham, of Ottawa, for the pier work. We are asking this year $170,000—last year $94,000 was appropriated for this work. The canal is cut through St. Mary's Island 1⅛ miles in length. The canal proper has a depth of 22 feet of water in the prism and 21 feet 6 inches on the mitre sills. The dredging of the lower entrance to 21 feet 5 inches is completed. Of this amount of $170,000, $100,000 is to be expended in deepening the upper entrance to 21 feet 5 inches and widening it to give a safer passage for vessels. The sum of $70,000 is to be expended on the entrance pier at the upper end south side. This pier is to be extended 800 feet. The sub-structure is to be built of cribwork to the lowest known water line, the top, of concrete, will be constructed on the front and rear of cribwork and between the two walls filled in with stone. These works when improved will make a safer entrance. At present there is only 18 feet of water in the upper end.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the government doing any work on the Canadian side, putting in plant ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Public Works are building a dock, not the Railway Department. The channel is being deepened on the Canadian side, and the Public Works Department are building a dock at that point near the town of Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. SPROULE. In what shape is the canal now ? It is strange to see nearly all the vesssels going through the American canal, and the Canadian canal so little used.

Mr. GERMAN. One reason why the Canadian boats and the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company which controls the boats going up there, and which is the great company in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite—the reason why they continually go through the American canal is because they get their supplies on the American side instead of getting them on the Canadian side, as they could if they liked. The government is now building a dock there with sufficient water for Canadian boats to land on the Canadian side, and for the Canadian Pacific Railway boats to land there. But they invariably go to the American side of the river to get their supplies. This matter came up in parliament last session, and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) endeavoured to make an explanation, which however I do not think satisfied any one, as to why the Canadian Pacific Railway boats did not get their supplies on the Canadian side of the Soo as well as on the American side. But the reason why our Canadian boats go through the American Soo canal is because they get their supplies on the American side of the river.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the answer given when the matter was up before. It was said that for want of dredging the entrance to the canal they could not conveniently get through, therefore they were obliged to resort to the American side ; also because on the Canadian side there was no place to land passengers.

Mr. GERMAN. They can go through the Canadian canal just as well as through the American canal—with fair and proper navigation, I am free to add. They have got docks there and a sufficient depth of water to land passengers there if they desire to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Where ?

Mr. GERMAN. On the Canadian side of the river.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no dock on the Canadian side except an old one that was badly broken down.

Mr. GERMAN. The government is building a dock now. But there was one before that they could use if they wanted to. Now there is the question of the coal supply, and that matter came up last session, as the Minister of Customs would remember if he were here. I took occasion to look into the matter myself, and I know that you can get coal in Canada for ships' supplies, free of duty.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that true of other ships' supplies as well as coal ?

Mr. GERMAN. Ships' supplies for boats traversing international waters are free of duty, including coal, and they can get coal free on both sides. But it would have to be in bond, it would have to be kept in bond on the Canadian side of the river, and there would have to be a bonded warehouse. But if they are willing to keep it there in bond, ships' supplies for all vessels traversing international waters are free of duty. So there is no excuse for them going to the American side.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is every excuse. The Canadian Pacific Railway boats could not land at the Soo because there was not sufficient depth of water to allow them to approach the dock. I took passage there two years ago last fall, and we had to ferry across. So it is now, unless a dock has been built within the last year.

Mr. GERMAN. The government is building one now.

Mr. TAYLOR. But there is not water enough for a Canadian Pacific Railway boat to land at a Canadian port at the Soo. There has been no dock there since a year ago last fall.

Mr. FOWLER. If their coal would be cheaper on the other side, I should think their stores would be about as cheap on the Canadian side.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may tell the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), answering his question of a little while ago, that the price of the wire per pound was 13⅞ cents.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has his deputy beside him who knows all about the harbour. I would like to know if there is dockage and water sufficient for the Canadian Pacific Railway boats to call at the Canadian side.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is at the canal, not at the town.

Mr. SPROULE. It was emphatically denied in this House that the Canadian Pacific Railway could get coal any more advantageously on the American side than on the Canadian side. The hon. gentleman says they would require a bonded warehouse on the Canadian side before they could get their coal free. But if I remember right, the hon. member for West Toronto stated that they

could get their coal on the Canadian side without paying duty as well as on the American side. It might be they would require a bonded warehouse. But when I was up there and we landed on the American side, the question was asked by many: Why don't you land on the Canadian side? and the answer was that they could not land there because there was not a dock and not sufficient depth of water. I am satisfied it is so to-day. Now from year to year we have been voting money in this House ostensibly for this purpose, and we never seem to accomplish the object. That has been going on during the past six or seven years, and no one knows whether we are any nearer to the accomplishment of the object than we were five years ago—so far as official information is given.

Mr. FOWLER. Is all this expenditure to be made at the canal, or is it to be used for making such a dock as has been spoken of?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is all at the canal. I stated that the Public Works Department have charge of the expenditure down near the town, and they are building a dock there, and dredging.

Mr. SPROULE. What depth of water have you on the mitre sill of the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are deepening it to 25 feet 5 inches. It is now 18 feet at the upper entrance, and 20 feet 4 inches on the mitre sill. The canal proper has a depth of 22 feet of water in the prism, with 20 feet 4 inches on the mitre sill of the lock. It is 18 feet at the entrance. We are going to make the entrance correspond with the other end. We have completed dredging the entrance to a depth of 21 feet 5 inches.

Mr. SPROULE. Now you are at the upper end.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the Canadian Pacific Railway boats pass through the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. Very seldom.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they go through at all?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have done so once or twice.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it a fact that the large Canadian Pacific Railway boats cannot land on the Canadian side for want of dredging and a proper wharf and if so how long is that condition going to continue?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have stated twice that the work is under construction by the Public Works Department. Some contractor is at work there upon it. I do not know the extent of the docking. I cannot give my hon. friend any information as to the docks now that are in course of construction because they are not under this department. My information is that the only dockage on the Canadian side now is at the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Now you are doing dredging.

Mr. EMMERSON. And some pier work.

Mr. SPROULE. The pier work will be under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in connection with the canal. This is the entrance pier of the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that let by contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, Mr. Wm. Bermingham of Ottawa, who was the lowest tenderer, is the contractor.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the price of the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a schedule contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there more than one tenderer for the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. There were eight or ten.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the schedule prices under that contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are a number of items. The prices are as follows:

Nos. of items.	Description of items.	
1.	Timber in sides and ends of cribs sawn 11 x 11 inches, rate per lineal foot	$ 0 21
2.	Timber sawn 10 inches square for floor of concrete superstructure, rate per lineal foot	0 13
3.	Timber sawn 6 x 11 in face and ends of cribs below flooring, rate per lineal foot	0 20
4.	Timber for ties, stringers and bottoms flatted to a size to square 10 x 11 inches at small end, rate per lineal foot	0 20
5.	White pine plank 3-inch thick, per M. feet B.M.	20 00
6.	Binding pieces for cribwork 4 x 10-inch pine plank, per M. feet B.M.	28 00
7.	Wrought iron in bolts (best Staffordshire brand) for cribs, in L bolts for fenders, mooring posts, &c., rate per pound	0 06
8.	Boiler plate in guards or fenders, rate per pound	0 08
9.	White oak for fenders 12 x 12, rate per lineal foot	0 75
10.	Providing and placing complete mooring posts of cast-iron wherever directed, as specified, rate per pound	0 05
11.	Stone filling in cribs and superstructure, measured in place, rate per cubic yard	0 65
12.	Broken stone and gravel, rate per cubic yard	1 50

Nos. of items.	Description of items.	
13.	Concrete in superstructure, rate per cubic yard..	$6 50
14.	Labourers for tearing down section of old pier, including superintendence and use of all tools, rate per day...	2 00
15.	Carpenters for levelling of old cribwork for concrete floor, including superintendence and use of all tools, rate per day..	3 50

Mr. FOWLER. Eight cents for excavation work seems to be a very large price. Of course it would depend very largely on the nature of the material to be taken out, whether it is rock or mud.

Mr. EMMERSON. This was the lowest tender.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the character of the soil there ?

Mr. GERMAN. It is a regular excavation of boulders. The price of dredging ranges from ten cents a yard in soft earth up to a dollar all depending on the conditions. This is simply digging out rock instead of blasting. It is a soft rock. I have seen the dredge working. Instead of blasting it out the dredge is so strong that the hooks of the dipper get into the rock and dig it out. They are digging it out in that way. The material is boulders and rock. It is certainly a cheap price for what they are doing. If they had to blast it would cost probably three times as much.

Mr. BLAIN. As to the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway boats not stopping on the Canadian side is that not a matter that the government should take immediate action upon ? The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) stated that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) did not give a very satisfactory reason to the committee last year why the Canadian Pacific Railway boats did not stop on the Canadian side.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite sure the hon. member for Welland did not wish to misrepresent the hon. member for West Toronto. The hon. junior member for West Toronto made the statement before the committee last year that the Canadian Pacific Railway boats were unable to stop on the Canadian side because the water was too shallow and there was no wharf accommodation. It seems to me that that is sufficient explanation why the boats do not stop on the Canadian side. Does the hon. minister not think that this is a matter which requires immediate attention and action on the part of the government ? Here is a large line of boats passing close to the Canadian shore, yet these boats are compelled to go over to the United States side and purchase their supplies not because we cannot supply them in Canada, not because we have not sufficient merchants on the Canadian side or a sufficient quantity of goods of Canadian manufacture, but simply because the water is too shallow and we have no wharf accommodation for boats of that capacity to stay in while they purchase their supplies and give accommodation to the public. Surely that matter should be considered by the government at once. If that continues for many years longer our trade will be identified with the American Soo, and it will be difficult if not impossible to secure it for ourselves. Whatever other expenditure of money is made by this government, that is an expenditure that every man in Canada will support, and it should be undertaken at once in order that Canadian steamers may be able to purchase their supplies from Canadians.

Mr. EMMERSON. So far as the government can control the matter, they are doing everything to furnish a new dock with sufficient water on the Canadian side. If the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers or any other steamers want to purchase their supplies on the Canadian side there is nothing to prevent them. I can well understand that it is to their advantage, even regardless of the duty, to coal on the American side, because the coal comes to that point from the mines in Ohio.

Mr. GERMAN. It is the same rate of freight to the Canadian side as to the American side.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but the question of bonding involves delay and expense and may be somewhat irritating. If they wished to purchase their supplies on this side and could do so to advantage I venture to say they would do it.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that the large Canadian steamers can stop on the Canadian side and purchase their supplies, and take on and put off cargo ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think they can do so without question if they wish. I think the cargo could be put at the Canadian locks.

Mr. FOWLER. They cannot land their passengers at the Canadian locks.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think so ; they sometimes go through there now and go to the American side afterwards.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister would leave the impression, whether intentionally or not, that it is possible for large boats to stop on the Canadian side and transact their business with Canadians. Last year the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) said on that point :

Mr. OSLER. There is no doubt that after building the canal at the Sault, we have neglected to build wharfs and other necessary railway accommodations. I think it is humiliating for any of us who go up on the boats to find them on all occasions passing through the American canal. I have gone up many times, and on no occasion, either going or coming, has the vessel passed through our own canal. I understand that one of the reasons was that the coal was dutiable when taken on at the Canadian Sault ; but the main reason undoubtedly is that there is no wharf accommodation, and that the approaches to the canal on both sides are quite inadequate for large boats to pass through the Canadian canal.

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) and it is uncontradicted.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not wish the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Blain) to go uncontroverted. Last year the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway boats did not stop on the Canadian side because they could not get their coal there. The hon. gentleman asked me about it and I had the pleasure of sending him the regulations. There is plenty of water on the Canadian side of the river for any Canadian Pacific Railway boat that wants to go there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where ?

Mr. GERMAN. On the Canadian side at the government wharf. It is quite true that the approach to the Canadian canal is not satisfactory. I believe the late government spent money in improving the approaches, but at any rate there is money being spent on that work now. In my opinion the canal on the Canadian side was a botched job in regard to the approach at the eastern entrances, because boats using it have to take too circuitous a route. But that is not the reason the Canadian Pacific Railway boats do not stop on the Canadian side. It is simply because they can get their supplies on the American side to better advantage. That is absolutely beyond controversy. They could get their supplies on the Canadian side if they wanted to, but it suits their purpose better to get them on the American side, and I challenge any member of this House or any man outside of it, to show that they cannot land their passengers at the government dock on the Canadian side of the river. They do not do so because they wish to get their supplies on the American side.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. German) has said that there is good accommodation on the Canadian side but last year in his speech on the question he said :

> There is no dock at the Soo at which the upper lake boats can land.

Has there been a dock built since last year ?

Mr. GERMAN. Read all I said.

Mr. BLAIN. It is a very long statement, and I do not wish to have it repeated in 'Hansard.' It is the duty of the government to see to it at once that the Canadian Pacific Railway boats shall have an opportunity of embarking and disembarking passengers and loading and unloading freight upon the Canadian side. If the government do that these steamers will get their supplies on the Canadian side, and I am sure the Canadian people would support the government in any reasonable expenditure to accomplish that.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me very humiliating that we have such a town as Sault Ste. Marie and yet have Canadian lines of steamers arriving on the American side, dumping their passengers and freight there so that the passengers and freight have to be taken across the river in the ferry boats. It looks too much like a one-horse town. The Canadian town is a good town, alive, enterprising and active, and for years the same complaint has been made that boats cannot land there for want of accommodation. It seems to me the government is doing less than its duty when it does not provide what is required.

Mr. TAYLOR. Two years ago last fall I went to Sault Ste. Marie accompanied by my wife. I purchased tickets at Owen Sound and asked to have them made out for the Canadian Soo but they would not sell them to the Canadian Soo and we had to be landed on the American side and go over on the ferry to the Canadian side. During my stay at the Soo, a boat was sunk, some place east of the Soo and a blockade of shipping ensued ; I presume that 100 to 150 vessels of all sizes and shapes were tied up there but not one of them came to the Canadian side. I discussed the question with the people there, and I was told that the boats could not land on the Canadian side owing to lack of water. Yet the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) says that Canadian boats can buy supplies on the Canadian side. They cannot, because if they do they have to put the supplies on the ferry boat and take them across to the American side where they will be met by a customs officer as I was, and be obliged to pay duty. They could only put the supplies on board without paying duty while the boats were passing through the Canadian lock, but if another boat came along they would be unable to tie up long enough to do that, so that practically it is impossible for Canadian boats to take on supplies at the Canadian Soo, or to land passengers there with comfort. On my return I brought the matter before the House at the first opportunity but I presume that affairs are in the same position to-day as they were then. No boat of any size can

land on the Canadian side of the river owing to the shallowness of the water. The old government built a canal and had it about completed when this government came in, but the approaches and docking facilities to-day remain just as they were then.

Mr. GERMAN. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should do away with protection.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend would like to do away with protection and have us annexed to the United States. We have built a lock at an expense of millions of money on the Canadian side and it is doing no business because this government has been expending money upon useless docks all down the river and along the sea coasts, instead of taking a few thousands of that money to deepen the water at Sault Ste. Marie, a work which would be to the general advantage to Canada. It is a case of negligence on the part of the government in permitting this matter to remain as it has for the past nine years. After spending millions to build a lock, Canada is getting no benefit in the way of trade from vessels passing through that lock.

Lachine canal, slope walls, $13,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This $13,500 is required for a dry stone wall, 2,300 yards at $2 per cubic yard. The coping, timber and stone of the dry stone wall will cost $13,500. This is to continue the repairing of the stone lining in the upper reach of the Lachine canal. The north side, it is expected will be completed during this coming season. It is slow work as it can only be done when the canal is watered in the spring.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it done, by contract or day labour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A man named Lorrimer is the contractor.

Mr. CLARKE. Where does he reside ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. You advertised for tenders.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, yes. This has been going on year by year. I am informed that he has been doing the work ; but his contract is closed out and we will have to ask for further tenders for the continuation of the work.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the matter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He got on too slowly. There was a limited time in which to do it, and he did not seem to hustle, so that great inconvenience resulted. We simply gave notice and closed out the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What did you do with the percentage of the contract you got as security for the work being done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be adjusted of course.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you paid that back yet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, but it will have to be of course.

Mr. FOWLER. How long since you closed it out ?

Mr. EMMERSON. During the month of June.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not have called for other tenders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We cannot unwater the canal until next spring. The only time we can permit the canal to be unwatered is in the spring, because of the business interests. The contractor delayed his work to such an extent that, acting on the report of the deputy minister, I authorized the cancellation of the contract.

Mr. FOWLER. The work has to be done in the spring before the canal opens ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. When you have it unwatered, all the business is paralyzed. The contractor should have done 1,000 yards this spring and he only did 400. Therefore we will ask for tenders for next spring's work.

Lachine canal, dredging basins Nos. 1 and 2, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How is that going to be done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to continue the deepening of the basin on the lower section of the Lachine canal, to a depth of 15 feet. This work is nearly completed. It is done by the canal dredge under the direction of the Marine Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Were you working at that last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there was no appropriation last year. In No. 1 basin we calculate there would be 12,000 cubic yards at 75 cents or $9,000, and in basin No. 2 8,000 yards at 75 cents, $6,000.

Electric installation, &c., Lachine canal, $8,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was an appropriation last year of $10,000 and we require this year $8,000. This is for electric installation on locks and bridge cabin. The present locks and bridge cabins are in a very dilapidated condition.

Mr. BLAIN. Do the government use their own power ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Trent canal, construction, $100,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there not some discussion as to where the outlet of this canal is to be ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not yet determined.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government sent an agent to examine the different routes ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and I laid on the table the reports of those engineers. I think there were two different engineers. The people of Trenton and Port Hope have taken exception to the conclusions of the engineers and there will have to be another survey. There is a difference of opinion among the engineers and we will have to get some sort of arbitration.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the government engineers not make a recommendation ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They report the facts ?

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government reached any conclusion yet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not yet.

Mr. SPROULE. When do they expect to reach a conclusion ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Very shortly.

Mr. FOWLER. What portion of this canal has been completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a canal without an end, it is short at both ends.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it of any use until it is completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it is of use. The other day we went up to Peterborough and examined it and were much pleased with what we saw. It is navigable now for 170 miles of water stretches, with the locks.

Mr. CLARKE. What depth for traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is about eight feet deep, with six feet of water on the mitre sill.

Mr. CLARKE. The people of that district would like to get some more information about it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you want me to go into the whole matter ?

Mr. CLARKE. No, but I think some opportunity ought to be given to gentlemen who represent that district to speak upon it.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all arranged for.

Mr. VROOMAN. Could the minister say whether the work is being pushed on on the upper division, the division that is called the Simcoe and Balsam Lake division ? I think it is under contract now. That work, seems to be going on very slowly, it has been on the tapis ever since I was a boy, and seems to be interminable. I would like to know what is being done.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Simcoe and Balsam Lake division is being pushed on. The section known as the Larkin and Sangster division is nearly completed. On the other, I think the work is progressing now quite rapidly, but there has been some delay in the past.

Mr. VROOMAN. Is the Larkin & Sangster contract completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. VROOMAN. Does the minister mean to say that there are 170 miles of continuous navigation on that canal now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The section between Balsam Lake and Kirkfield is completed. The next section is under contract to Larkin & Sangster, and is just about completed. Then the section between the Larkin & Sangster section and Lake Simcoe, is progressing well, that is the Brown & Aylmer section. Another lift-lock is to be put in on the Larkin & Sangster section, but the steel work is not yet completed. It is not yet under contract.

Mr. VROOMAN. Will that be as high as the Peterborough lift-lock ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will be a fifty foot lift, fifteen feet less than the Peterborough lift-lock.

Mr. VROOMAN. When may we expect that will be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The steel portion of it within a year. The substructure is completed now. However, we have got our hands in now and we will carry it right along.

Mr. VROOMAN. I think the minister must be mistaken when he says there are 170 miles of continuous navigation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was wrong in making that statement. You can navigate from Feely's Falls below Peterborough, through to Kirkfield, a distance of 120 miles.

Mr. CLARKE. How much remains to be done to complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to say that. $310,000 were expended on that canal prior to confederation.

Mr. CLARKE. How long will it take to complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps that could be worked out by the rule of three.

Mr. VROOMAN. I would like to hear from the minister a little more with regard

to his visit to that canal, and of what use he thinks it is going to be. Is navigation complete from Peterborough to Lakefield ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is complete. I was delighted with everything I saw in Peterborough, and I am sure no one went away without feeling impressed with the importance of that water stretch.

Mr. VROOMAN. That is a very brief account. I am pleased, however, to hear the minister express himself in this way, because for many years, in fact ever since I can remember anything about politics, I have been hearing hon. gentlemen now sitting on the opposite side traducing and running down this work as being of no use. I am glad to see that the government and the party sitting behind them, appear to have changed their minds on that subject. What is the length of the construction from Peterborough to Lake Ontario and what would be the probable expenditure there ? I understand that $4,000,000 has been spent on this canal already.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is estimated to cost about $6,000,000 to complete. The cost will depend on the route. Some say that to go by one route will cost a great deal more than to go by the other. And, under any circumstances, the cost will exceed $6,000,000 according to the estimates of the engineer.

Mr. VROOMAN. What weight of freight can be lifted at one time on the lift-lock at Peterborough ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A vessel containing about 25,000 bushels of wheat can be lifted

Mr. HAGGART. It would be interesting to know the policy of the government with reference to the completion of the canal. If I understood rightly, it is completed to within 15 or 16 miles of the Bay of Quinte. What will be the cost of finishing that portion, and what will it cost to finish the uncompleted work at the Lake Simcoe end, which, if I remember well, is about the same distance ? And I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us how these lift-locks work—I see he was at the opening of them. Besides the one at Peterborough, which has been completed, I understand there is to be another at Lake Simcoe. What progress is being made upon it, and what amount is required to complete it ? This is an important work, and we ought to have the fullest possible information.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend asks what it will cost to complete from Feely's Falls to the Bay of Quinte, and also what it will cost to complete the section to Georgian bay. It will cost upwards of $4,000,000 to complete the Bay of Quinte end and about $1,500,000 to complete the part to Georgian bay.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the distances to be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 13 miles on the Georgian bay end and about 17 or 18 miles on the Lake Ontario end. The lift-lock recently opened at Peterborough works very satisfactorily. In saying this, of course I give the judgment of others, for my own judgment would not be of great value. The substructure of the other lock is completed, but the superstructure has not yet been contracted for.

Mr. HAGGART. Are any contracts proposed to be made for the work at the lower end of the canal and at the Georgian bay end ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not routed yet.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister speaks of an expenditure of $6,000,000 to complete this canal. I understand that to cover the whole of the Trent Valley canal system. But I find that on 21st March last the present minister, in answering a question in this House, said that if the canal were carried out by way of Trenton it would cost $6,960,000, and if it were carried out by way of Port Hope it would cost $6,850,000. This, I presume, was made on the basis of careful estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was according to the estimates made by the engineers who were sent.

Mr. LENNOX. That is as I understand it. But I presume the minister was speaking more definitely than he is just now. The estimates show an expenditure to be made of about $7,000,000 either way. What I would like the minister to explain is how much work this covers, and to what point it would carry the construction. We understand, of course, that we get to what is practically the St. Lawrence, whether the canal is made by way of Trenton or by way of Port Hope. The minister speaks of the Georgian bay end. Do his estimates cover all the expenditure required to carry on the work through to Georgian bay ; and, if so, by what route ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By the river route from Lake Couchiching to Georgian bay.

Mr. LENNOX. That would be by the River Severn. So this would include all the expense estimated to be incurred in carrying the canal by way of the River Severn to the Georgian bay. Has the department under consideration the idea of carrying it through by way of Barrie, coming out at Collingwood, or probably some miles east of Collingwood, by way of the Nottawasaga river ? I can direct the hon. minister's attention to that by saying that I understand that the Transportation Commission—I think it is only fair to refer to this—have that matter under consideration, and have been receiving evidence as to both these routes. From all the information I have been able to collect, it seems to me that the best course is to proceed to Orillia, thence to Barrie,

through the open waters of Lake Simcoe and Kempenfeldt bay, and so west to the Georgian bay. That route would go through a magnificent country. And even if it cost more money—and I do not know that it would cost more—still I believe it would be found to be much more desirable than the route by the River Severn. However, I have no doubt that the hon. minister is waiting, the same as the people are waiting, for the report of the Transportation Commision in relation to this matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would ask my hon. friend if the route he is advocating is through the riding that is represented by my hon. friend ?

Mr. LENNOX. No, it is not. It is through the riding which is temporarily represented by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and which I hope will be better represented when we assemble again in the new parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. You anticipate being the man ?

Mr. LENNOX. No, I have a better riding still. Nothing would induce me to leave old South Simcoe. There is no riding which has such a pleasant ring in the ears of the Liberal government as South Simcoe and I have the honour to represent that riding. We have no canals in it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think you are both to be congratulated.

Mr. LENNOX. We have no canals in it and no public works of any kind, but we have a magnificent Conservative majority, I am happy to say. I hope the hon. minister will take this matter into his most serious and careful consideration. Of course, I do not expect him at the present time to be influenced very much by what may be my opinion or the opinion of any one who is not an expert in matters of this kind as to which is the best route, but I am in hopes the matter will be carefully considered by the Transportation Commission and that we will soon have a report upon it. The other day when I called the hon. minister's attention to the question of the Transportation Commission he told me that it had made an interim report in reference to some ports in the maritime provinces. I think the whole of the evidence has been taken in regard to the Trent Valley canal. If that is the case I would urge upon the hon. minister to endeavour to get a report in reference to this matter without waiting for the general report of the commission. There was a time when there was some division of opinion as to the utility of this work. I am exceedingly glad that there is no division of opinion as to that now and that the present government, as represented not only by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals but as represented by the hon. Postmaster General, recognize that this is a great work and that there is great necessity for immediately pushing it ahead. I want to urge upon the hon. minister and upon the government that it is a loss of money if this matter is not taken in hand now and finished. I do not mean dribbling out a little money from year to year. I mean a sufficient sum of money to complete this work in the same way as the government would go at the construction of a railway, not dragging it out for an indefinite period of years but doing it within a few years and I would say a very few years as to that. There is no system that is more to be condemned than the system that governments practice once they have committed themselves to a certain scheme of merely making a parliamentary appropriation from year to year. What is the fact in reference to this canal ? It has cost us up to the present time almost $4,500,000. That means that it is costing the country for interest, without receiving anything by way of compensation, in round figures, $150,000 a year. What is the use of that. The moment the canal is completed we will be getting a return in some form. That is the only theory upon which this work can be prosecuted. That is the theory on which the government have continued the work and until it is completed, until communication is opened from the Georgian bay by whichever course may be adopted down to Trenton or Port Hope the country is not getting the benefit of this great work. It will get a great deal of benefit from it, not only the direct advantage of affording means of transportation to a large class of people along the line of the canal which traverses a farming district which in many parts is unsurpassed, but it will be of great incidental advantage to the people by affording direct competition with the railway and so reducing and controlling rates. In this I think the hon. minister will be ready to agree with me. Therefore, I think there can be no excuse that the government could urge or that the government would be disposed to urge for not taking this work in hand as a definite work to be completed within a reasonable date. I cannot prescribe the date but I would say within a few years, probably within four or five years at the outside. We have $4,500,000 in it now and within ten years we will have, according to the present rate of progress, $3,000,000 or $4,0000,000 more so that it will then cost us about $300,000 a year in interest. Until the whole work is undertaken as we undertake a railway or undertake to erect a public building, that is that we keep at it and do not let up until it is finished, we will be losing money by this transaction. I trust the hon. minister will give us a promise more or less definite

now—I hope very definite—that some such policy as this will be pursued. I think the people look for it, I think it is fair, I think it must commend itself to a man of the astuteness and energy of the present minister as being the only wise and proper policy to pursue.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is in error in saying that the canal as far as it has been constructed is unproductive.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not intend to advance the idea that it is absolutely unproductive, but as compared with what it will result in I consider that it is unproductive. I understand that there are a number of miles in use.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At the present time I understand there are 120 miles of continuous navigation made possible by these improvements which are the subject of discussion at the present moment, and that this facility for traffic is of very material advantage to the district locally at the present time. Before the completion of the lift-lock the navigation was divided into two parts, north of Peterborough and south of Peterborough. There were on the waters from Peterborough northward thirty steamboats engaged in various classes of business and seven below Peterborough, making thirty-seven steamers with 120 miles of continuous and uninterrupted navigation. These vessels are engaged in carrying passengers, lumber, cordwood, grain and other native products. There are, as my hon. friend is aware, at Peterborough at the present moment certain cereal works manufacturing foodstuffs of various kinds and consuming daily enormous quantities of grain.

Mr. SPROULE. They do not bring that in by the canal.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, except from some adjoining local district.

Mr. SPROULE. I was there some time ago and the manager told me they were obliged to bring it in by train, and he spoke of the advantage the canal would be.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They consume great quantities of grain and the bulk of it is brought in by train. I am told by the grain buyer for that concern, that they were grinding 22,000 bushels of oats per day and were looking forward to a greatly increased output. He told me that the great bulk of it came at present by rail, but nevertheless the canal will serve, and is to-day serving, a very good local purpose. I mention that to show that the expenditure up to the present is not dead money altogether. As to what should be the policy of the future with regard to that enterprise, it is not a matter that at this date need be regarded as open to any doubt. When the country committed itself to this enterprise by various expenditures, it committed itself to completing the enterprise as rapidly as circumstances would warrant, and we may look forward to the Trent Valley canal in the near future as completed to connect the Georgian bay with Lake Ontario at Port Hope, or Trenton, or some other point which may be determined upon as under all circumstances the best. I had the honour of visiting Peterborough on the occasion of the opening of this lock, and I came away filled with delight at what I saw there. The work itself is a credit to all who had a part in its construction. The only thing I have to regret is that though this enterprise had been pressed upon our predecessors for so many years, their interest in it was chiefly made known on the eve of the election, and that the prosecution of the work seemed to cease after election day. That has not been the case with the present government. We have not made it an election card; we have not made any boasts, but we have steadfastly pursued a policy continuing expenditure on that work, and to-day there are 120 miles of navigable waters. I trust that before long we shall see that canal system completed, and not only interprovincial trade passing through it, but that we shall also see it serving a very important local purpose. I would think that the wisest course to pursue would be for the government at the earliest moment to have a most complete inquiry as to the proper route to connect the system with Lake Ontario and with the Georgian bay, and when a decision is reached proceed with the work vigorously to completion.

Mr. HAGGART. The Postmaster General took a great deal of trouble to state that all the progress on this work was due to the present administration. Would the hon. gentleman point out what part of the work his government initiated on the Trent canal? My memory is that all the contracts that are under way at the present time were let by the Conservative government. He says that the government intends to push this work to completion, but look at the paltry vote of $100,000 which they ask for, and which would not pay for the contracts already let. What are these gentlemen doing in connection with making the Trent canal an election issue? When I asked the minister when he was going to let the contract down to the Bay of Quinté, his answer was that it was not routed yet. The Postmaster General says that when they decide where the outlet is to be, the canal will be proceeded with energetically. He is thus in a position to say to the people of Port Hope: Support our candidate if you wish to have the canal at Port Hope; and to the people of Trenton he will say: Unless you behave better than you have in the past there is no chance whatever of having the entrance at the Bay of Quinté.

The decision as to the entrance of that canal should have been arrived at long ago. The members of this House should have been told where the entrance would be before they voted any money. The government now take credit for the lift-lock. What had they to do with it? I listened to the speeches these gentlemen made the other day at Peterborough, and the name of the man who started the first lift-lock in America was never mentioned? I myself let the contract for the lift-lock and decided upon the principle of it, and yet the present Minister of Railways thinks it was all done under the able administration of himself and his Liberal predecessors. They had nothing to do with it. No work has been done on the Trent canal that was not initiated by the Conservative government, and the contracts let for it by that government. The present government had to go on and complete it because the contracts were let. That is the truth of the matter. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General say that this work will be of benefit to the people of Canada. That is a new idea of his, because when any expenditure on the Trent canal was proposed by the Conservative government it was denounced by the Liberals when they were in opposition. I say that the expenditure of $4,000,000 on the Trent canal has been returned twice over to the people of that section, and that is true if for no other reason than that it has controlled freight rates. But, Sir, we have no expenditure on public utilities in our section of the country. Poor Ontario fares badly; the public money is reserved for other places. What do you think of an expenditure of $100,000 on the Trent canal, a work which the people of that district have been expecting the completion of for years. Even to-day the government state that they do not know what route will be taken by the canal. Well, I can tell them that the route is decided. They are within 16 miles of the Bay of Quinté; are they going to stop there and go to Port Hope. I would like to see both routes adopted.

I think it would be better that the canal should be built both to Trenton and to Port Hope; then you would satisfy both sections of the country. However, in my opinion, the work is one of great utility to the people in that section of the country. The expenditure is a justifiable one and one that will have the result of equalizing freight to any man who lives upon any part of the canal and I am glad to hear that this undertaking, for which I let the contracts, has proved a success. I would like from the minister a comparison of the expense of working a lift-lock and of working an ordinary lock such as is in use in other parts of the country. What is the difference in time and expense of the two systems? We want the fullest information, and I would like parliament to know how this $100,000 which is voted this year is to be expended. Is it to be expended for the completion of the upper lift-lock in order to enable us to get communication with Lake Simcoe, or is it intended to expend it in some other way.

Mr. GERMAN. Having let the contract, the hon. gentleman no doubt decided in his own mind as to whether or not the canal should go from Rice lake to Port Hope or to Trenton. Did the hon. gentleman or his government decide that question?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt that when our government were in it was never thought that the canal was going to Port Hope, but it was urged upon the government that this would be an equally advantageous scheme.

Mr. GERMAN. Then you decided against Port Hope?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has asked me to give an opinion of the two routes when the government which he is supporting has not given such an opinion. Do you think the opposition have not as much right to dangle the two routes before the people as the hon. gentlemen supporting the government?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What route does the hon. gentleman favour?

Mr. HAGGART. Hon. gentlemen say that it is not routed, but would ask the opposition to adopt a particular route. We have not the routing of the canal.

Mr. GERMAN. You had it.

Mr. HAGGART. And then we proceeded upon a plan and intended to complete that plan.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. To what point?

Mr. HAGGART. But when these gentlemen got into power they said: No, the canal is not routed at present. They have not surveys or information enough to enable them to determine whether the canal is to go to Port Hope or to the Bay of Quinte. The general election is coming on this fall, and in each section of the country through which the proposed routes run, hon. gentlemen will be able to give assurances to their friends and will send letters into the country: Do your duty by our condidates and we will see that you get justice in the building of the canal.

Sir. WILLIAM MULOCK. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals professes to say that his government really placed under contract the works which have now been completed, and manifested great energy, zeal and earnestness to complete that work, and if I understood him rightly he went on to say that the government or himself had decided in favour of the outlet to the canal at Trenton.

Mr. HAGGART. I never did.

Mr. COCHRANE. No he did not say any such thing.

Mr. HAGGART. I carefully avoided that and I told the reason why.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says he was working on a fixed policy rapidly to complete that enterprise and he dropped a remark that Trenton was their destination.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, he did not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am surprised that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) should seek——

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not surprised because I always advise people to tell the truth.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am sorry that we have East Northumberland against East Northumberland in this matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. You need not say that at all. You have been fibbing to me for 18 years and I am not going to allow you to do it any longer while I am here.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has informed us, that he had given great study to this question and was pushing it forward, and he has here stated to us that, according to his conception of the scheme, Trenton is the outlet. I am surprised that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) does not try to hold him to that expression instead of helping him to escape.

Mr. COCHRANE. I will attend to East Northumberland without any of your help.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is not helping East Northumberland at this moment. But to return to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). After all, what would be the policy of the late government that began this enterprise in 1880 and in 16 years had expended upon it in all $882,000, or the record of this government that in 8 years has expended $3,200,000 upon it. We have expended nearly four times the amount that my hon. friend's government expended upon it.

Mr. HAGGART. You have expended $3,200,000 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is what I am told by the engineer. He said that all we have done is to complete the contracts he had let.

Mr. HAGGART. I said that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am now speaking on the information of the chief engineer, and my hon. friend will of course bring out any errors and the chief engineer will be obliged to give me the correct information. I will now give the information I have from the engineers who are now present, the chief engineer and Mr. Rogers the engineer in charge of the work. I wish to show my hon. friend how erroneous he is in his statement that we have practically done nothing except to allow the running on to completion of contracts which he had let before his government went out of office.

We found the following contracts let by the previous government and we have completed them : The contract of Brown, Love and Aylmer, the Corry and Laverdure contract and the Onderdonk contracts. These are the only uncompleted contracts handed down as legacies to the present government. The present government has let the following contracts and there has been expended on these contracts the sums which I am about to mention :

Larkin & Sangster....	$296,860
Dominion Bridge Co., for the lift-lock..	211,160
Brown & Aylmer..	282,660
Central Bridge Co., bridges...	32,420
Dominion Bridge Co., bridges.	4,301
Hamilton Bridge Co..	35,514
Conroy..	7,638
Edward Conroy, for piers.. ..	27,317
Grand Trunk Railway Company, track	23,490
James Bogue	6,625
Battle, for cement	610
Lakefield Cement Co....	60,948
Owen Sound Cement Co..	55,031
Rathbun Cement Co..	190,444
A. T. Rowley..	14,200
Sola cement..	23,214
Wurtelle cement..	5,428
Land damages	310,619

These land damages of course are not contracts, but are features of the scheme.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are there contracts for them ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No you cannot contract for damages of that character. My hon. friend says that they were determined to carry this scheme through and therefore that we are only completing their work so that they are entitled to all the credit ; that we are simply drifting on with what they commenced.

He says that on the other hand we pronounced ourselves against the scheme and yet to-day are committed to it. Well, we have heard of the one who said he would not and yet he did and of the other who said he would and yet did not. To whom belongs the greater credit ? My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) when in office, favoured the Trenton route. Out of office he favours both the Trenton and the Port Hope routes. Any gentleman who would voice the opinion of his party as favouring two routes evidently favours neither, because he knows that no government would ask parliament to vote an expenditure for connecting that inland system at the two points.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would support both routes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is another available route as well. That would be three routes. There is the Cobourg route. Is the ex-Minister of Railways going to give the go by to Cobourg? It is true that Cobourg in the last election or two did not support these hon. gentlemen, but prior to that it gave them good support. Why then turn their backs on Cobourg?

Mr. COCHRANE. You want to help your candidate.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I want to do what is right. It is contended by the people of Port Hope that the surveys made up to date in favour of the Trenton route are not reliable. They contend that their route has not received fair consideration. That may be true or it may not. I am sure that none of the officers who have been giving consideration to the selection of a route would unintentionally do any injustice; but nevertheless it is quite possible that the merits of one route may have been so paramount in the minds of the engineers that they paid no attention to a more desirable one. I am not offering any opinion, because I know nothing of the relative merits; but when a great portion of the community, when the people in the eastern part of the county of Durham and the western part of the county of Northumberland assert that they have a more desirable route, is it not the duty of the government to listen to their representations and give them an opportunity to make good their statement? We have received twice of late very influential deputations of prominent men from the county of Durham urging the government to have a careful examination made of the topography of their country before reaching a final conclusion. We would not be a representative government if we turned a deaf ear to such an appeal. Therefore before any government would be justified in committing itself to any special route, it should have unbiased and reliable advice as to which is the better route. This is the course we intend to pursue and one which will commend itself to the taxpayers of this country. When expert opinion is obtained and all information with regard to the business side of the question, the government will be in a position to decide. Did the ex-Minister of Railways ever have a survey made of the Port Hope route? Did the late government ever have plans and specifications showing the work to be done on the Port Hope route and a classification of the advantages and disadvantages, or did they reach a decision with regard to the Trenton route, without considering any other? I would like an answer to that question.

Mr. HAGGART. I will answer everything as soon as the hon. gentleman is through. The hon. gentleman took me to task about my statement that this government only carried out the contracts which the late government had let for the purposes of this canal. Well, there are two contracts which he let since he came into office—one to a Mr. Brown and the other to a Mr. Larkin. The contracts he read had reference to the Hamilton Bridge Company, the Dominion Bridge Company and other bridge companies and four or five cement companies. All these were for the purpose of carrying out the contracts which I had let when I was in power. The cement is for the purpose of building the locks and the iron and steel are connected with the lift lock, so that his boasted comparison between the expenditure of the late and present government falls to the ground. The hon. gentleman talks about the two routes. To go back to ancient history, the first route, the Trent canal route, was surveyed by the imperial engineers shortly after the battle of Waterloo.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Some seventy odd years ago?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. The plan they adopted was by Trenton up to Lake Simcoe and further on into the Georgian bay. They built a couple of locks, I think, upon the Trent canal, which became the property of the province of Ontario when the assets of the provinces were set aside. The hon. gentleman asked me if I had a survey of the Port Hope route made. Why I never heard that route suggested until these gentlemen got into power. The first person I ever heard speak about it was my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). He did not begin agitating until long after the work was under construction by the late government, and I do not know whether it was the late or the present government—perhaps it was the present government—which got a survey made of the two rival routes. We would like to hear which is the cheaper and better route. If I remember rightly, from the information which the present government brought down to the House and the surveys made at that time, it was decided that the Port Hope route was the more expensive and the most difficult to construct.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Who decided that?

Mr. HAGGART. The engineers did. If I remember rightly, I heard the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) criticising the report of the engineers, and pitching into the engineer in charge of the work, saying that his report and skill were not to be relied upon, insisting upon the government having another and a better survey of the route, because it was condemnatory of the Port Hope route.

Mr. EMMERSON. One of the reports I laid on the table was from an engineer who was connected with the department, Mr

MacLeod. The other is the report of Mr. Rogers, the superintending engineer of the Trent Valley canal. But there was an independent report.

Mr. HAGGART. The report of the engineer in charge of the Trent Valley canal was in favour of the Port Hope route. Is that so ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not remember.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is.

Mr. HAGGART. I heard the hon. member for Durham criticising it in the House, insisting upon having a new survey of the route, because the route proposed, or supposed to be better than the Trent route, had been examined by the engineers attached to the department, who showed that it was more expensive and a less valuable route than the other.

Mr. SCOTT. Which one do you favour ?

Mr. HAGGART. I am not responsible for the route of the canal at the present moment. But the gentlemen who are responsible for the legislation of this House, when they come down with a vote, and we ask the fullest information, and when they have the fullest information from their engineers as to the feasibility of the one route or the other, ought to be prepared to give a decision upon the information they possess which route will be selected.

Mr. SCOTT. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he favoured the construction of both.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I never said anything of the kind, nor insinuated anything of the kind.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) understood him so.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman interrupts me again, I wish he would be more accurate, and state something which is pertinent to the remarks which I make. It is unfair to make interruptions of that kind, especially when they suggest an inference that I said something some time ago and was saying the contrary now. I never did that. What I said was this : It is not my business to have a policy in reference to this matter, I am not called upon to give a decision between the Trenton route and the Port Hope route. What we say is that the government, when asking for a vote at the present time upon information from their own departmental engineers upon facts which are in their possession, ought to give the House the information and decide at once upon the route, instead of descending to the petty parish politics of holding up the two routes before the electors in the coming election and saying to them : Gentlemen, we are making an accurate survey of two different routes, and it may be that the route which you ask us to take will be the preferable of the two. Now, I want this information from the minister. I want to know when the contract will be completed for the upper section so as to give communication into Lake Simcoe ? I understand from the minister there are about 130 miles of continuous navigation completed. I did not think there was that much.

Mr. EMMERSON. 120 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear it. That takes you to within 16 miles of the Bay of Quinte and within 17 or 18 miles of Lake Simcoe. I think that the true policy is for the government to make up their minds at once and go on and complete the canal. But I want an answer to these questions : When will that contract be completed ? What is the comparison between the cost of a lift-lock and ordinary locks serving the same purpose ? What is the time saved ; and whether this lock has proved to be the success that they expected ?

Mr. SCOTT. I much regret that my interruption has ruffled my hon. friend. But I am within your judgment, Mr. Chairman, and the judgment of the other members of the House, if the hon. gentleman, in his former remarks, did not advocate the construction of the canal over both routes, the Trenton route and the Port Hope route.

Mr. HAGGART. I stated distinctly that I did not, and here is the hon. gentleman getting up again in the face of my denial. If I did say so, and I stated afterwards that I did not say so he is obliged to take my denial.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAGGART. Why is he repeating it ?

Mr. SCOTT. I have not the slightest intention of declining to accept the present statement of the hon. gentleman. But I was proceeding to say that I was within the judgment of the chairman and the other members of the House that my hon. friend did——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HAGGART. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to question my statement.

Mr. SCOTT. I will ask the hon. gentleman to read the 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. HAGGART. Order.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Allow me to make a remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will point out the rule. The rule is that if an hon. gentleman is charged with making a statement and denies it, his denial must be accepted, and the matter must end there.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I was going to offer a word of explanation, because,

while I freely accept my hon. friend's denial, yet I am in the same position as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). My hon. friend from Lanark will remember that after his remarks I commented upon his attitude.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are trying to clear the matter up. I want the hon. member for Lanark to do justice to my hon. friend from Assiniboia, who is quite ready to adhere to the rule of debate. I honestly believed that the hon. member for Lanark made the statement attributed to him by my hon. friend, and I think other members of the committee were under that impression. Probably the hon. gentleman does not remember what he said. He may not have intended to say it. That is his position. My hon. friend from Lanark did not intend perhaps so to express himself; but I am under the impression that every member of the House understood him to say that he favoured both routes. Then I proceeded to say: Why does not my hon. friend go further? There is a third route, why does not he favour that as well?

Mr. GOURLEY. That was myself.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister think I stated on the floor of the House that I was in favour of building both routes?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think he said so, yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I never said anything of the kind.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend will find, I am sure, that he is mistaken. He did not intend to say so, and that disposes of the whole point. But my hon. friend will find on reference to the 'Hansard' that he so expressed himself.

Mr. COCHRANE. I regret that this matter has been dragged into little parish politics by the Postmaster General, and we have an illustration now how the progress of the estimates is hindered by ministers of the Crown dragging parish politics into a large question like this. I was never more surprised in my life than to hear the Postmaster General on a big question like this, when he was so elated by seeing the superstructure that is built and that magnificent lift-lock, that when we were taking into consideration the estimates to finish that job, he should drag in parish politics by referring to the member for East Northumberland as he did. I am here to say to the Postmaster General that I can go into East Northumberland and challenge the electorate upon the question whether I ever misled them in any statement I made. I do not think that any minister who is sitting on the treasury benches now and who was sitting in opposition in former years can truthfully make that statement in the House. They now say that we are aiding them. We are, and I want to tell the hon. minister who is now controlling the Department of Public Works and I want to tell the hon. Postmaster General that I am here to act upon a higher plane in promoting the best interests of this country and that I am not here to import little party politics into every question that is submitted for the consideration of this House. I care very little where the money of Canada is expended provided it is expended in the best interests of the country and I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Customs to the fact that when we were promoting this canal we got almost abuse when the estimates were submitted. They made party and parish politics out of it, and they said that we were throwing away the people's money in order to secure the return of Conservatives to this House. They do not get that criticism from us now. We are prepared to vote the money provided it is to be expended for the promotion of the best interests of the country and for the development of trade. When we were in power we were developing great works in this country. We built the Soo canal. We deepened the St. Lawrence canals. What have these hon. gentlemen done? Millions of money have been frittered away for paltry party ends in the maritime provinces and in the province of Quebec. Although we built the Soo canal it is useless from the fact that these hon. gentlemen, instead of spending a few thousand dollars to build a wharf, are allowing all the trade to go to the American side. There was $60,000 spent to build a wharf to benefit an hon. gentleman who is in this House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I want to ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. COCHRANE. If you want any information in reference to the canals ask it from the engineers. That $60,000 that was spent to benefit an hon. gentleman sitting in this House, if it had been spent at the Soo, would have built a wharf there so that Canadian vessels would not require to go over to the American side to land. The large amount of money which has been spent on the Soo canal is almost useless because you have not made the entrance of the canal what it should be and you have not built a wharf on this side so that vessels can go in there. I do not care where this money was spent on this route and I am not opposed to it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

WEST CANADIAN COLLIERIES, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 80) respecting the West Canadian Collieries, Limited.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought that this Bill had been referred to the Railway Committee. May I ask if it has been before that committee and if it has been reported back by them ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes. It has been before the Railway Committee and has been reported back by them.

Mr. HENDERSON. The endorsation, I see, reads, 'Reprinted as reported by the committee on miscellaneous private Bills.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The copy before me is signed by E. P. Hartney as being reported from the Railway Committee with amendments.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 150) to amend the Act of the present session to incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. German.

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. INGRAM moved concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 40) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Two of these amendments seem to be unimportant, merely adding the words 'subject to the Railway Act 1903.' But the Senate have cut out clause 10, which reads as follows :

Notwithstanding anything in this Act or any previous Act applicable to the amalgamated company, the Railway Act, 1903, shall apply to the amalgamated company to the exclusion of such of the provisions of any special Act of any provincial legislature as are inconsistent with the Railway Act, 1903, and instead of any general railway Act of any province of Canada.

It seems to me that that would have an important bearing, because, if there were any provisions of the provincial Act applying to this road which ought to be continued they would be made null and void and the company made entirely subject to the Railway Act of the Dominion. I do not know whether it will cause any injury or not, but it seems to me that it must have been put in there for a special purpose, to keep alive some provisions of the provincial Act, this having been originally a provincial company.

Mr. INGRAM. This clause 10 was hastily drawn when the Bill was before the committee of this House of Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines. Since then the promoters have interviewed the Department of Railways and Canals and the Bill has been made perfectly satisfactory by the amendments to subsection 4 of section 5 and subsection 3 of section 7, which brings it under the Railway Act, 1903. None of these railways, as I understand it, are brought within the scope of provincial Acts. I understand that this is thoroughly satisfactory to the Railway Department.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be, and yet the Bill may not be entirely satisfactory to the Railway Committee. I think it was at the instance of the committee that this clause was drawn to protect the rights of province in the railway.

Mr. INGRAM. The Senate Committee looked carefully into the matter and deemed it well to make this change.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be all right. I am not saying that it is not. But I think that this clause that has been struck out was inserted by the Railway Committtee after careful discussion.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the clause was somewhat hastily drawn, and it was thought well after by the Senate Committee and after consultation with the Railway Department it was thought well to make this amendment.

Motion agreed to and amendments concurred in.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Canals—Trent canal—construction, $100,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the fact that when the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was Minister of Railways and Canals and the Conservative party was in power we had the oppposition of a good many members of the present government to the carrying out of this Trent Valley canal scheme. We were accused of dilly-dallying and of insincerity in connection with that work. When the Liberals were in opposition one of the members of the present government proclaimed in sonorous tones that it was a burning shame and disgrace to tax the farmers of the country and bleed them white in raising $35,000,000 a year to govern 5,000,000 people.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Considering the government.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, considering the government; but while we were raising

$35,000,000 a year the present government is raising $70,000,000 in taxes from the people and they are frittering away the money. The late government was building the Sault canal, and building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and deepening the St. Lawrence canals with a revenue of $35,000,000, but this government with double the revenue is simply throwing the money away on a wharf here and there without pursuing any well thought-out plan for the development of the waterways of Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What wharf do you object to ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Time would fail me to point out the iniquities of the expenditure made by the present government. Ask the Minister of Finance alongside of you and he will tell you.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot ; I do not object to any of them.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not objecting to them, but I am telling you where the money is going.

Mr. FIELDING. We know that.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am glad you do. You are accusing the late government of not hurrying on with this work, but all you did towards completing the St. Lawrence canal system was to take a contract away from a man, and you did not get the job finished any sooner than if you had left him alone. The Postmaster General wants to deceive the people. If he were honest with the people he would tell them which was the best place to have the terminal of this canal, and he would not have the audacity to talk about the town of Cobourg. If the Postmaster General had any decency he would wait until nearer election times before he attempted to bribe the people. He wanted to make the electors believe that I was opposed to having the terminal of this canal at Trenton.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is obstructing the vote at this moment.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why, my dear man, what are you doing ? For half an hour you talked unmitigated nonsense which you did not believe yourself, and which no one listening to you believed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why don't you let the vote pass if you are in favour of the canal.

Mr. COCHRANE. No intelligent man would have a doubt in his mind as to where the outlet of that canal is going to be. If you want it to be of any benefit you know where it is going to be, and if you were not humbugging the people and playing to the gallery you would state so openly. I do not care about the expenditure of money in East Northumberland——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You are not voicing the opinion of the people of East Northumberland in that.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am voicing the opinion of the people of East Northumberland, when I say that their desire is to have the public money expended where it will be for the best advantage of all Canada. We are not local in our ideas. Do you understand that ? I suppose it is incomprehensible to certain of these gentlemen opposite, how people can stand on a plane so high as that. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) is here, and he can tell that I always insisted that the public money should be spent in the best interests of Canada. I knew that if the money for this canal were wisely expended the canal would go down the Trent route. It is two-thirds way across the riding I have the honour to represent. It is navigable to Healey's Falls and with a lift-lock like that at Peterborough, it would bring it down to the level of the waters of the Trent, and then it would develop water-power all along that route. I want to tell the Postmaster General if he doesn't know it, that there is a bay below Healey's Falls, and from Chisholm's Rapids westward there are ten miles of navigable water, so that it is not all canal. If his estimate is right that there are eighteen miles to complete, then deduct the ten miles, and you have only eight miles of canal to Trenton. Does the minister think that he can locate the entrance of this canal at Port Hope when he knows that in the fall of the year the barges could not live on Lake Ontario, from the harbour of Port Hope to the harbour of Presqu'Ile. I may not live to see the canal completed, but I will live as long as I can and, I hope to see the Postmaster General out of power and then he will not be able to humbug the electors in talking about Port Hope or Cobourg or anywhere else in order to catch votes. These hon. gentlemen opposite know as well as I do that the outlet must be on the Bay of Quinté where the barges can take the inland waters, and bring their cargoes to Quebec and Montreal without transhipment. I do not want the Postmaster General to leave the impression that I am opposed to that canal going to Trenton. I thought that question was settled, and I believe it is settled, and the Postmaster General knows deep down in his heart that he is only humbugging the electors when he talks about it going to Port Hope or Cobourg.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) pretends to be very anxious to have this canal completed to the town of Trenton. He belongs to a party that began that work in 1880. They were in that office from that time until 1896, a period of sixteen years. The total cost of that canal would be, I suppose, $10,000,000. In sixteen years they had not built one-

twelfth part of that canal, in sixteen years they had not accomplished one-twelfth of the work. At the rate of progress they were making, it would have taken nearly two hundred years to have completed that work, and the hon. member would tell this House that he hopes to live to see it completed. The only chance he ever had of realizing that hope was that the enterprise should be put in the hands of an enterprising government. That happened to be the good fortune of the canal in 1896. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) says that he never gave a thought to the Trenton route. I would have thought that, as representing East Northumberland, he would have given thought to it continually, would have been ever alert to guard the interests of East Northumberland and to see that the canal came by that route.

Mr. COCHRANE. I knew it was settled.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You knew it was settled ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How did he learn that it was settled ? I have asked his late leader, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, if it had been settled in that way by the Trenton route. What answer did I get ? The hon. gentleman made the confession that he favoured the Trenton route, but he receded from that in a moment, and my hon. friend from East Northumberland backed him up.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I did not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Debates will show. I say that the hon. gentleman backed him up in withdrawing any expression he had given in favour of the Trenton route.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I did not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And I had occasion to point out that my hon. friend was not doing justice to East Northumberland.

The attitude of the government in regard to the enterprise is perfectly plain. It is quite true that certain engineering reports have been made in favour of the Trenton route, and it may be that those reports are well founded and that the balance of argument is wholly in favour of the Trenton route. But inasmuch as a very influential section of the country has asked to have another route considered, I may ask my hon. friend if it is not only fair that their request should be listened to and that full consideration should be given to their contention ? My hon. friend has as much as said so himself at this moment, because he says he is not wedded to any route ; he rises above local considerations. No pent up Utica for him, and the money is to be expended where it will do the most good If a more thorough inquiry should show that it would be best to adopt the Port Hope route, my hon. friend will be found standing up here supporting the Port Hope route. Will he not ? He has made great professions of virtue, he is not a partisan in the sense that he would have the money misapplied. He is in favour of the Port Hope route, according to his statements here to-night, if it can be shown to be the better route, and therefore he, like others, is asking us to consider the whole situation and not to reach a conclusion after only a partial consideration of the question. So we now have a statesman instead of the former mere local politician from East Northumberland. He is willing to support this route if it is necessary for the benefit of Canada as a whole. I compliment him on the high stand he has taken. However, if he would really stand the test when it comes to submitting this to the decision of a final tribunal, time alone will tell. In the meantime the government propose to proceed expeditiously in the completion of this enterprise, as rapidly as the circumstances of this country will admit. The hon. gentleman protests against our spending money, and at the same time says he is anxious for the completion of the canal. We are told its completion will cost $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. Can we build it without money ? The hon. gentleman protests against the expenditure of money necessary for the completion of the canal ; therefore, he must be opposed to the completion of the canal. He cannot take all these inconsistent positions in the same breath. The country is committed to the completion of the canal : the government regards it as an enterprise of great promise, which is entitled to be completed as rapidly as circumstances will warrant. That is our attitude, and to that attitude we propose to adhere.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Postmaster General has continued on the same line, trying to make a little cheap political capital out of this great question.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Never dreamt of such a thing.

Mr. COCHRANE. And has put words in my mouth which I never uttered, and which he knows I never uttered. I am not going to allow him or any one else to say that I said certain things which I did not say.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What did you not say ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I would think you would be above interrupting me. You should play the part of a gentleman anyway in the discussion. I never said that I was in favour of the Port Hope route. I said that I believed that that question was settled, and therefore I had not given it a thought, because I thought that any sensible government would decide on the route that had been decided on for seventy years past. That is what I thought, and I think in my own mind to-day that that question is

settled just as firmly in the mind of the present government as in the mind of any previous government, only they want to make a little cheap notoriety out of the matter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. COCHRANE. You can shake your head; I do not think there is much in it, and it is easy to shake it; but I am not going to allow you to put words in my mouth and put me in a false position. I will repeat what I said. I never was asking the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to spend money in my riding because I represented that riding. I thought the money would be expended when the proper time came, and I would wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the statement that he has made, that he is going to complete this canal as rapidly as the circumstances of the country will warrant. Will he not allow the same latitude to the previous government as to the present government? This government is asking the House to vote $70,000,000, and should not the previous government have shown the same consideration for the interests of the country when it was in power with only $37,000,000 of revenue? I pointed out to him what we were doing with that $35,000,000. We were deepening and completing the canals, but the present government is doing no such thing. All public work, so far as canals are concerned, is now centred on the Trent canal, and although the Postmaster General tells us that the government is so anxious to complete this canal expeditiously, yet there is only a paltry $100,000 out of that $70,000,000 voted for that purpose. I cannot see how you have—I was going to say the cheek, but perhaps that would not be parliamentary—but I cannot see how you can stand up before this committee and tell the country that you are anxious to go on with this work when you are voting a total of $70,000,000, of which only $100,000 is to carry on this work, and then make a great plea on account of that expenditure. The contracts were all made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and you have carried them out. I think when you think the matter over and see what an exhibition you have made of yourself, you will feel sad.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If you are anxious for the completion of the canal vote the money. The hon. gentleman is here obstructing the passage of this vote; if he is so anxious to have the canal completed why should he not have the money voted? If we have this amount of difficulty to get a paltry $100,000, what would the difficulty be with a larger sum?

Mr. COCHRANE. I was not objecting to it.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The country will understand how interested he is when he will not allow us to get the estimates through for this paltry sum.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the Postmaster General was not so willing and anxious to make political capital, and to make himself conspicuous, coming to the rescue of the Minister of Railways and Canals when it was not necessary, we would not have had all this debate.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have just a few words to say to the hon. the Postmaster General, because I think he has been making rather an unfair attack on my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). The Postmaster General complains that the previous government did not proceed rapidly enough with the construction of this public work, and compared the progress which the present government have made with that made by the late government from 1880 to 1896. But let me, Sir, draw attention to this fact, that from 1880 to 1896—and I believe the Postmaster General had the honour of a seat in this House all that time—the opposition of that day made every effort to obstruct this public work, and the hon. gentleman himself was one of the most prominent in that obstruction. If there were delays during those sixteen years the government of that day could not be held responsible.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Because every dollar that the late government succeeded in obtaining from parliament to expend on that work was practically, owing to the obstruction of the then opposition, like drawing teeth, to use a common expression.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You had an overwhelming majority.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; but day after day the time of the committee was wasted in obstructing that public work, and every effort of the opposition was directed to prevent its being proceeded with.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. We know the tactics that were resorted to by hon. gentlemen opposite in those days. Why, the present government has a very easy road compared with what the late government had in more matters than one. In the construction of public works they were opposed at every turn; and when they did succeed in getting a few hundred thousand dollars, they were hounded from one end of the country to the other for their extravagance. Those hon. gentlemen opposite who constitute the remnant of the old opposition were largely responsible for the delays that occurred, and therefore it ill becomes the Postmaster General—who was one of the foremost of those who denounced this public work as

worthless and as being constructed for political purposes—to now taunt the late government with delay. I do not live in the neighbourhood of that canal, I do not pretend to know the topography of that country, I am not a judge as to whether Trenton or Port Hope is the proper outlet, the matter is one in which I am not personally interested; but I have no doubt that had the late government remained in power, they would have determined long before this what route was best in the interests of the country, irrespective of politics. I hope that the Postmaster General, now that he has had his memory refreshed, will withdraw some of the charges he has preferred against the late government for delays. The former government spent very considerable sums in preparing to push this work through. In 1887 they spent more money on that canal than the present government spent in 1899. From 1896 to 1903 more money was spent on the canal each year, except one, than was spent in the previous years. But the reason is evident. Hon. gentlemen on this side are patriotic. We believe in having a public work, which is of great advantage to the country, completed. We assist the government in these matters instead of giving it the bitterest opposition. I notice also that two of the contracts which, I understand, are just about completed, if not already completed, were let by the late government. They were given by the predecessors of the hon. gentlemen now in power—one of them in 1895 and the other in May, 1896. So that the late government should not only have credit for the money they did spend, but also for having pushed that work forward even to the very dying days of that administration. I think there is as much credit due to the ex-Minister of Railways, who gave out these contracts, as to the present government, which carried them to completion. We are not offering to the present government the factious opposition which hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side, offered the late government. We act like men who take a keen interest in the affairs of the country, and hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of taunting us with the results of their obstruction in the past, should give us credit for helping them to expedite business in the present.

Mr. GOURLEY. I desire to say a word on this question. I think that a member from a province in which the canal is not situated will probably be in a better position to voice the sentiment of Canada than one directly interested in the work. I want to say here that it gives me the greatest pleasure to support the building of this water-way. Ever since I have entered this House I have endeavoured to inculcate the principle that we should not view any public question from a narrow provincial standpoint. I have gone so far as to say that we should be the last to advocate expenditure in our own particular province. That should be left to people outside, because the members themselves should regard all the provinces as but one country, and should be as interested in the development of every other portion of Canada as they are in the little spot in which they happen to live. I am now in a position to justify the stand I have taken ever since entering this House. When I received the invitation to visit Peterborough, I made up my mind to go and see the opening of this great public work. I went, I may say, in fear and trembling, because I believe that if there is a stain on the escutcheon of the Conservative party, it is the Trent canal. I concur absolutely in what my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) have said, namely, that no work was ever more represented by gentlemen constituting Her Majesty's opposition as a low political job than the building of the Trent canal.

I live in Nova Scotia. I was not familiar with the location of the Trent Valley canal. I knew nothing about the possibilities of the water-ways of that section. And so, I, and others in Nova Scotia like me, had to take the word of members of parliament. We, in Nova Scotia, had learned to respect members of parliament. We had men to represent us like, for instance, Hon. Mr. Ross, who, though he differs from me politically, would be fair in this discussion of a public question. He is a strong Liberal, and, if he ever went wrong, it was when he was swayed by that unholy passion. But, we were accustomed to public men who would fairly represent the interests of the country, and we could not believe that any public man would prostitute his position in the House of Commons, to misrepresent a work that was calculated to be a benefit to his country. I went to Peterborough, the other day, with fear and trembling. When I received an invitation from the government, I thought, at last, the government was to show the country the extraordinary character of this work. I fancied they would say: We found this scheme, which was a piece of political debauchery, only half completed; we have done the best we could with it; we are in possession of the record, and we want to lay before you the jobbery of the Conservative party in connection with this work. So, as I say, I went there in fear and trembling. The Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) was there, and he was one of the happiest men I ever saw. He seemed to be presiding over the completion of the work that was entirely to his liking. I did not think it possible that one who had inveighed against the Trent Valley canal could preside at the opening of that canal with such pleasure. Why, I recollect that we people in Nova Scotia were almost frightened out of our wits that the Conservative government had done something wrong in carrying on this Trent Valley canal work. We trusted the Conserva-

tive party and believed that, in the main, it was right. Still, we feared that, in connection with this matter, there must be something wrong. And the Liberal party in Nova Scotia used to tell us : Look at your corrupt government ; look at this infamous ditch in which the public money of Canada was pretended to be spent ; that money was not spent, except to be the means of corrupting and debauching the electorate. That was the opinion that hon. gentlemen opposite cultivated for eighteen years. And, even members of the Conservative party almost half believed it. The hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) amused me, some time ago, by telling me that, when the Liberals opposed the Conservatives so earnestly, strongly charging them with corruption, even he almost felt like deserting the government, for it seemed impossible that men could bring themselves to carry on such stern opposition, unless they believed something of the charges they were making. Of course, he said he had lived long enough to know that they did not mean a word of what they said. But, such was the earnestness of their advocacy, that even he wavered in his support of Sir John Macdonald, on several occasions. And, if we in Nova Scotia ever wavered in that support, it was over the question of this Trent Valley canal. So, you can imagine the feeling with which I went up to view this work. And, you can imagine my feelings when I found it to be such a splendid work for the development of the country. I believe in the development of Canada in every part—not less in Ontario and British Columbia than in my own country. I got hold of the map—I love maps and study them always. And, as I studied the map, it was borne in upon my mind that, whether this canal was to carry through freight or not, did not matter, for it is a splendid internal water-way, and will develop an immense country. I devoted a night or two to the study of the map ; and I assure you, Mr. Chairman, my esteem for the province of Ontario was not heightened. We, in Nova Scotia, are apt to believe that the people of Ontario are the narrowest people you can find. And, as I say, my esteem for them was not heightened by my study of this map. Why, you should have had this canal developed eighty years ago. You have settled along the St. Lawrence and taken the little peninsula of western Ontario, but you have left the rest of the country, up to James Bay, almost as bare as when Cartier came. And, you deserve no credit for what has been done. If confederation had not come, you would have been as backward as you were thirty-seven years ago. But, the other provinces have joined you, and have helped to develop your province. I was amazed, when I looked at the map, to think that any man of integrity could have opposed the development of his province by this splendid water-way. Every man in Ontario should have joined to get that country developed thirty or forty years ago. But the great misfortune of Canada is that we talk, and dispute, and decades go by, and nothing is accomplished.

Well, as I say, I went to Peterborough. And I must say that I admired the courage of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock). Why, his courage was Alpine in its grandeur. For a man who has spent years in opposing this canal to stand up here, and speak in its defence, shows that he possesses the courage of an African lion. And, when I recall the names of McMullen and Cartwright, associated for years with the most deadly opposition to this canal, I admire also the courage of the Conservative party in insisting upon the completion of this scheme. The Conservative party carried every dollar in support of this canal at the point of the bayonet. No Japanese assault was ever bolder, more masterful, or courageous, than the work of the Conservative party in carrying these votes for the Trent Valley canal, against the deadly opposition of their Liberal opponents. Why, these hon. gentlemen opposite must think that the people of Canada have no memories, if they think, for a moment, that we shall lose sight of one of the saddest, and most disgraceful, chapters in Canadian history, the opposition of Ontario Liberals, for eighteen years, to the development of their own province. We always thought that the narrow Liberals of Ontario were opposed to the development of the maritime provinces. We thought that their betê noir was Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces. But I find that they are equally opposed to the development of Ontario. Bred in a little mould, they could not bear the expenditure of a dollar for public improvement anywhere, even in the province of Ontario. That being the case, I can understand the feelings of contempt that such men as the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), must have for hon. gentlemen opposite. There is such a thing as carrying bravado too far. A statesman should have some sincerity. The Postmaster General would have commended himself more to me if, when this matter was under discussion, he had appeared in habiliments of sackcloth, and with ashes sprinkled on his head. That would have been his proper garb. Had he come here, and said : I have sinned beyond all forgiveness ; but I acknowledge my sin, and, in acknowledging it, I hope I have half won the forgiveness that I crave—had he done that, I would have thought him a man. But when he glories in his sin, when he tries to gain credit by it, he does not add dignity to the public life of Canada. Having seen this great water-way, I heartily support this vote, and I hope my party will support it, as a great work for the development of Canada.

I viewed with great pleasure that high lift-lock. The effect of that great engineering work is not confined to Peterborough, it solves many transportation difficulties all over Canada, for instance in the province of Quebec, where rivers drop down from a high plateau to another high plateau. This lift-lock will make the water-ways of Canada available to the commerce of the country. Therefore when I looked upon that magnificent feat of engineering and scientific skill, and remembered that it had been conceived to a large extent in its improved form by the genius of Canadian engineers, I was proud of Canada and of its sons. I am delighted to know that this parliament is charged with the development of more territory than any other parliament in the world, or any other government, barring that of Russia. We have half a continent in charge, we are simply standing at the edge of its development, and in the work of that development we shall find that this lift-lock solves many of the problems that will present themselves to our engineers. Therefore I hail with delight the opening of this lift-lock at Peterborough. I said some harsh things about the Postmaster General, but not intending to say unpleasant things, and I hope that when he looks at this great work and begins to realize its true meaning, he will ask forgiveness from high Heaven for the awful sins he has committed in not seeing this great work in its true proportions twenty-five years ago, and I hope God will forgive him.

Now my hon. friend seemed to treat with much levity the proposition of having two termini for this water-way. I would like to see half a dozen termini for this water-way. I am not pleading for either one or the other. You can locate them anywhere that will serve the purpose of making a through highway, because then you will want elevators and all the equipments of a port, and I regard this as infinitely valuable as a local and internal water-way. But so narrow minded was the Postmaster General, so bred is he in that little Liberal, Grit, Ontario way of his and of his party, that he could not dream of there being two termini to a great work of this kind. It would burst his head, I fancy, and shatter his brain if he once attempted to conceive it. In many ways I admire the hon. Postmaster General, I admire his good nature, and I wonder how a man of some humour can ever be sober when he is speaking and indulging in jokes of that character. I support the idea of two termini, one at Port Hope and one at Trenton ; you can make your third terminus wherever you will ; but in every section of this country where there is a little town growing up, it should be connected with this water-way in the same way.

Now allow me to refer to another thing. My hon. friend said : Let us get expert testimony about the settlement of the termini of this water-way system. But I recollect that when they were proposing to spend two hundred millions of money on the Grand Trunk Pacific system, and we proposed that they get expert testimony before doing so, they refused us, they laughed us to scorn, they said : Let us vote the money, get the railway started, and we will get expert testimony afterwards. That was their position. But hon. gentlemen, in a little matter of this kind, must play the cheap politician and hold this dangling in the air for the purpose of fooling the people of Ontario. I am bound to say that the people of Ontario will be infinitely greater fools than I think they are—and I have not the highest opinion of a great many of them, especially of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the lower provinces we always had an idea that there was a little soft spot in the pates of people of Ontario, but we never dreamed they would go so far as to take the hon. gentleman seriously when he proposes to dangle these two termini before their eyes, without meeting just retribution at their hands. If I were a Liberal of Ontario, after hearing the speech of the Postmaster General this afternoon, I would vote against him and his pary at once and for ever. It is too late in the day for public men to be eternally fooling and scheming about a question of this kind. We want integrity, we want ministers of the Crown, representing the people in this country, to settle these questions on the broad lines of statesmanship and patriotism, then they will be worthy of our confidence.

Now I want to congratulate the ex-Minister of Railways, the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), whom I have learned to respect. I was a stranger when I came into this House, and I had to make up my estimates of men as I met them. I have a very high opinion of the member for South Lanark. He has got convictions, and very few men have them. That is what I admire in him. Right or wrong, you know where to find him. It is a great credit to a man to have convictions about something. The misfortune is that so few of our public men have convictions, but the public man who has them must always be a strong man. But I never knew my hon. friend from South Lanark had such a claim upon the eternal gratitude of the people of this country as to be the father of this great system of the Trent canal. I honour him for supporting it twenty years ago, because at that time there was no Liberal public opinion in Canada. Every little fellow was struggling for his own province. There was no such thing as a man voting for a public work in the interest of the whole of Canada, but he had to vote from the standpoint of his township, or his county, or his province at most. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman started out to carry that canal forward—because it had started years before, but somebody had to carry it forward—and when that hon. gentleman undertook to

carry it forward he was a brave man, because he had to meet, and oppose, and overcome objections of all sorts from the Liberal party in this House. When he undertook to vote money for this canal he found it a herculean task. Now, after having seen his efforts crowned with so great a measure of success, I hope he will be the father of many other great schemes for the internal development of Canada, and the great Conservative party who has supported him, and will continue to support him, will deserve the utmost credit from the people of this country.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell us about the lift-lock ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there was a question by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in respect to the route at the Georgian bay end. He referred to the alternative to the Severn, or river route, as it is called. That alternative route, around by Barrie to which he refers) was surveyed some years ago by Mr. Rubidge, an engineer connected with the canals of Canada for a great many years and who has recently died. He had a very large experience in connection with the canal.

Mr. CLARKE. A very able man.

Mr. EMMERSON. So I understand. He surveyed that route and reported, as I have been led to understand, condemnatory of it. He favoured what is known as the river route. I simply call my hon. friend's attention to the fact because he may not have heard of it, or he may not have known that the matter was ever under consideration. It appears that it was. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has asked me a question with respect to comparisons between the ordinary lock and the hydraulic lift-lock. One set of ordinary locks would consist of five as compared with one hydraulic lock, or double lock as it is called. The capital cost of one set of five ordinary locks would be $275,000. One hydraulic lock, double set, costs $500,000. The cost of maintenance and wages on the five ordinary locks requiring twenty lockmen, two men to each lock with day and night shifts, each man at $400, is $8,000. The wages in connection with the working of the hydraulic lift-lock would be, for a lock master, one during the day and one at night, and four gatemen, $2,500, as against $8,000 for the five ordinary locks. The annual repairs to the five ordinary locks would be $1,000. They would cost about $250 each.

Mr. CLARKE. It would cost $1,250 if there were five locks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. The annual repairs to one hydraulic lock are estimated at $100. An element to be considered is the time of locking. With the five ordinary locks, sixty-five feet, one and a half minutes per foot, if will take one and a half hours for one vessel going up or down, or if two vessels go through the locks at the same time it will take one of them one and a half hours, while it will take the other vessel three hours to get through. By the hydraulic lock both vessels will pass through at the same time in twelve minutes. If the saving in wages and repairs, $6,650, in favour of the hydraulic lock over one set of five ordinary locks is capitalized at three per cent it will be equal to a sum considerably above $200,000. This, if deducted from the capital cost of the hydraulic, will leave the cost of the hydraulic lock very little more than the cost of one set of five ordinary locks, while the advantage in the saving of time by the use of the hydraulic lock is vastly greater than by the use of one set of five ordinary locks. These are the views of the engineer, Mr. Rogers, who is in charge of that work and who is certainly to be commended for the efficiency displayed by him in the carrying out of the work.

Mr. HAGGART. When will the canal be completed to Lake Simcoe ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In about a year; when the other hydraulic lift is finished.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister has not noticed my question as to whether it is the policy of the government to make immediate provision for the completion of the work not in sections and by dribbling out an amount of money each year, but as I suggested this afternoon by the making of provision for the immediate finishing of the work. I do not know whether the hon. minister takes it seriously. I think he does. Certainly the hon. Postmaster General does not take it seriously and I think the committee is entitled to some explanation as to how it happens that after the boast that has been made by the Postmaster General as to the rapid way in which the present government have been carying on the work, as to the generous way in which they have been providing money to carry on this work, we are only asked for an appropriation of $100,000 at the present time. The hon. Postmaster General says that according to the rate at which we were proceeding under the Conservative administration it would have taken a great many years to complete the work.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK About two hundred.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the hon. gentleman's way of stating it but it does not figure out. According to actual computation, according to the rate at which we are asked to vote money for this enterprise now, it will take at least 150 years to complete the work. Estimating that it

will cost $7,000,000 it will take seventy years by dividing up the time. If you take into consideration that works are always deteriorating as they progress and if you take into account the additional sums of money that will therefore require to be expended during that time it will certainly take a century and a half at the present rate of progress before you may expect the completion of the work. The hon. Postmaster General points out that this work is proving very productive and beneficial at the present time ; in fact he says it is exceedingly beneficial, that this is a magnificent work and one of the greatest possible moment to the people located along the line of that portion of the canal which is now open. But, it is sealed at both ends and it is not a tithe of the benefit to the people that it will be if you open up the two ends. We have been working in the centre and it is the duty of the government to set to work vigorously and open up the ends. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that he does not know whether I ever heard of the surveys. Why, I live right alongside of where the surveys have taken place. We know a great deal about the canal, we are interested in it, and I am amazed to think that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who is attached to the government has never brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the fact that the people of North Simcoe are intensely interested in this matter. We have been studying up the reports of the engineers. The people of North Simcoe are greatly interested in the question as to what the Transportation Commission is going to do, and whether the route is by way of Barrie or by the way of Orillia and through Midland by the Severn river, the project is still one of great importance to the people of North Simcoe.

I am amazed that the minister does not realize that all the Simcoes, and especially North Simcoe are interested in this matter. The town of Barrie has the happy fortune of being now associated with South Simcoe, and by reason of my political connection with it in the future, I am urging upon the minister the importance of getting to work seriously. If this $100,000 for such a work came from any source but the government, I would say it was an insult to the intelligence of the people. Why, when this lift-lock has been opened and connection made between the two stretches of the canal, should this vote be cut down to $100,000 ? The Postmaster General only considers that the public are watching for the expenditure of money in each locality, but I look upon this as a great national work. The people of the United States are watching us and their most eminent engineers are pointing out that this immense improvement should be developed in the interest of Canada, and they are pointing out, too, that it will probably be their greatest competitor for the trade of the western states. At the present time there is every danger, on account of the building of the so-called National Transcontinental Railway, that our trade be diverted to United States ports, and it is more than ever important that we should see to it that our water-ways should serve the purpose for which nature designed them, and that this scheme inaugurated almost a century ago, should not be allowed to lag. Now that there is congestion of traffic in the west it behoves the governments to open up every avenue of transportation, and the most natural of these avenues is by Lake Superior through the Georgian bay to Montreal and through this very canal. It will not only open up a channel for the commerce of the west, but it will have the effect of compelling railways to largely reduce rates by reason of the competition it affords. I understand that this item is not to pass, as the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) wishes to speak in reference to it, and on my own behalf, until I get certain papers, I would ask the minister to allow it to stand for the present.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have arranged with the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) to have a discussion on this question, and if the item passes the same opportunity will be given to my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Durham might take the matter up when I am accidently out of the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall try to arrange that you will be present.

Mr. HAGGART. Any way there are several items for the Trent canal.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the minister give us an idea as to whether this work will be progressed with rapidly ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I can say that the object is to make progress.

Soulanges canal—survey for breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This seems a very large sum for a survey. You have the staff on the Galops canal who have done nothing for over a year and surely you can utilize them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am advised by the deputy minister that this amount would be necessary. If we take the men from one canal to the other we shall have to charge their services to this work.

Soulanges canal—steel bridge at power house, $4,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I want to know the total expenditure on the Soulanges canal and what it costs to work each year. The Auditor General was comparing the cost of the Soulanges canal and the Cornwall canal, and there was a dispute between him and the

Minister of Justice as to a very large amount.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will give my hon. friend a full statement at next meeting.

Soulanges canal—workshops, heating, lighting and machinery, $7,200.

Mr. EMMERSON. This includes $4,000 for the steel bridge at the power house over the tail-race. That is the first item. The next is the workshop. $7,000 is for the installation of machinery, wiring, electric lamps, &c. There are about 140 incandescent lamps at forty cents each.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can buy electric lamps cheaper than that retail.

Mr. EMMERSON. These are by public tender, advertised in the newspapers. The total estimated cost is $7,200.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there anything for the workshops themselves ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is simply for lighting and heating and the machinery of the two workshops on the Soulanges canal.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have it stated in connection with the Cornwall canal that the workshops there will require a large amount of horse-power.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are two at Cornwall which will require sixty horse-power. This also requires sixty horse-power.

Mr. LENNOX. We were told that the workshops to be built at Cornwall were to serve the two canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no. The workshops at Cornwall are to serve the St. Lawrence canals. They are separate altogether.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the meaning of this last item of No. 103 ?

Appropriation not required for 1904-5, $413,919.37.

I notice that recurring frequently and I would like to know what it means.

Mr. FIELDING. It means that the columns for the two years would not balance otherwise. That is simply striking a balance from the appropriation of last year. The different items coming under that head which it is not necessary to repeat are lumped together and put in in that way. It is a mere striking of the balance, an aid to comparison, and has no bearing on the estimates of the two years.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not balance.

Mr. FIELDING. It is intended to permit of a comparison of the appropriation for the two years.

Mr. LENNOX. The column comes to $2,000,000 odd but the corresponding column for 1904-5 is $1,500,000.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. FIELDING. In order to show the amount appropriated last year, they take the amount for similar services this year and then in the case of other services for which no vote is required, they fill in the difference as an explanation of how the total of last year was made up. This practice has been adopted in the preparation of the estimates for generations.

Mr. LENNOX. It means that items of a similar class last year are not required this year and the items are added together and inserted in this way ?

Mr. FIELDING. Quite correct.

Mr. HAGGART. Are the whole final estimates made up and paid on the Soulanges canal now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are the total estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. Are the final estimates made out and settled with the contractors ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In so far as they can be settled between the department and the contractors they have been, but the contractors have an idea that there are certain additional sums which are due to them.

Mr. HAGGART. What I want to know is this. Has the department made its final estimates on the Soulanges canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. All except the workshops.

Mr. BLAIN. How many men are employed in the workshops ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We require two or three carpenters and a blacksmith and a machinist.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you workshops on the Beauharnois canal ? Where was the work for that canal done before ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A good deal was done at Lachine.

Mr. HAGGART. And the workshops on the Cornwall canal did the work for the upper canals ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, on the St. Lawrence canals.

St. Ours lock, constructing new gates, $6,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is the work done —at Lachine or on the canal itself ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is below St. John's on the Richelieu river. New gates were provided for this lock last year and they were placed in position at the opening of navigation this spring. The old gates are in a dilapidated condition, not fit for service, and this amount is intended to provide spare gates. Usually on the canals we keep sets of spare gates in case of accidents. This is to provide the timber and $6,000 is the

estimate. The timber is estimated to cost $2,410; the castings are estimated to cost $700, the steel $140, the paints and oils $250, and labour $2,500.

Mr. LENNOX. Let by contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, done by the men employed on the canal. We must have men there to make these constant repairs. A great deal of the material in the old gates is good, especially the timber, and we put in new timber just as you would put in new ribs in a wooden vessel. You could not have this work done by contract.

Mr. LENNOX. This is not a question of repairs, but of constructing new gates.

Mr. EMMERSON. These new gates are made by the men in the employ. It was necessary to keep them to make repairs to the old gates, and as they are there it is cheaper to utilize them in making the new gates than to give out the contract.

Mr. LENNOX. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will find that it would be much less expensive to have this work done by contract. This is a most improvident way of doing the work.

Mr. BLAIN. How much money was expended there last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was nothing expended last year on that item, because there was no appropriation.

Mr. HAGGART. Are these new gates made at the shops in Lachine or on the St. Lawrence canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the workshops at Chambly. A good deal of the work is done in the winter, and these men employed in the summer are given employment in the winter in connection with this work.

Carillon and Grenville canal—rebuilding—Grenville wharf (revote), $23,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This wharf was built twenty-one years ago. The part above water is in urgent need of being renewed. It is proposed to replace the cribwork with concrete. The whole amount was voted last year, but became available too late to be used during the year.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this $23,000 finish the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the estimate. It is intended to invite tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. What did the wharf cost before?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was built twenty-one years ago, and I have not the figures as to the cost.

Mr. HAGGART. The portion under water ought to be as good as ever, and all that would need repairing would be the upper part. This seems an enormous sum for such work.

Mr. EMMERSON. The cribwork is to be replaced with concrete, which makes it much more expensive.

Mr. HAGGART. But it is only the part above water that is to be replaced, not the whole cribwork.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a good portion of it.

Mr. HAGGART. And this is a good price. It must be a large wharf when the part above water costs $23,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the estimate of the engineer. But the work is to be put up for tender, and I suppose there will be competition. Of course, the lowest tender will be accepted.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the hon. minister to say that no money was spent at St. Ours Locks last year. But I would draw his attention to the fact that $800 was voted last year. Was not that expended?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in connection with the gates at St. Ours.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not say for the gates. I asked if there was any money expended.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were two wharfs repaired in that lock last year.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not that information.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the expenditure be at the same point?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, at the same point—the St. Ours canal.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the minister to say there was expenditure for new gates last year. What was the necessity for that?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in the appropriation of the year previous. There was no appropriation in 1903-4. Of course, I was reading the explanation given by the engineer, and this explanation, of course was prepared last fall.

Mr. BLAIN. Under what item can we find the explanation of the $800?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will bring a statement of the expenditure for my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) if he wishes it.

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, no.

Welland canal—stone protection to banks of new canal, $20,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is represented that the rip-rap protection of the banks of the new canal has not been renewed since it was first placed about twenty years ago? It is all worn away in many places and the banks have been cut by the action of the

water. It is estimated that $20,000 will renew the rip-rap protection on ten miles of the bank.

Mr. CLARKE. Will this work be let by tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Welland canal—to change valves and hanging gear of new Welland canal lock gates, $30,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to change the Townsend valve, which never worked satisfactorily, being complicated, easily put out of repair and slow. This valve is being replaced with what is known as the butterfly valve. The valves are placed at the bottom of the gates. There are twenty-seven locks, in over half of which the valves have been replaced. The amount expended up to last May, 1904, was $14,498.62. The work is being done by the canal staff. The full expenditure on the work does not appear in the amount I have named. The account was not kept separately, the expenditure charged up to the vote to execute heavy repairs.

Mr. CLARKE. How long has the Townsend valve been used ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has been in use since the opening of the canal. I was there myself and was shown this apparatus by the workmen, and, I thought the new valve a very great improvement.

Welland canal—to build retaining wall rock cut, $70,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This work is at Ramey's Bend. The expenditure becomes necessary because the deepening along the side of the present wall which is now going on tends to bring the wall down. It is already falling in places. It is proposed to build a concrete wall founded on the new bottom of the canal at a cost of $70,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the contract been let ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Lachine canal—rebuilding old Locks 1 and 2, $45,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to rebuild and lengthen or extend the walls of the old locks 1 and 2 at Montreal. The walls were falling into decay, and becoming unsafe. This is contract work, Quinlan & Robertson are the contractors. This amount will complete the work. It is expected the locks will be ready for navigation in the course of the present season. The total expenditure up to the 1st of May last was $143,014. The estimated cost is $213,000. The work is certainly very necessary. It is all let by contract. Both locks were old. There are many market boats that go down through them.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought there was a plan for utilizing the old locks of the canal, taking them down altogether and building virtually a docking place for ships.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a basin formed there which is to be utilized for the purpose my hon. friend mentions.

Lachine canal—under-pinning wall, basin No. 2, $7,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This work can only be done during the period when the canal is unwatered in the spring, a short period of about a month. The foundation of the new wall will probably be completed in a couple of seasons, after which it is expected the balance of the work will occupy two summers.

Lachine canal—lock gates, $10,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is required for repairs and for spare gates for the new locks. It is usual to keep on hand spare gates in case of accident.

Soulanges canal—arms for gates and heaters, $1,350.

Mr. EMMERSON. We require five spare arms for operating the gates, costing $50 each. Then we want 12 electric heaters, costing $30 each, 13 transformers, costing $50 each ; and the wiring is estimated to cost $140.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like you to bring down the amount expended on the power-house and the amount expended for electrical purposes, both for power and for lighting that canal. I want these amounts for the purpose of comparison with the expenditure on the Cornwall canal.

Soulanges canal — water-wheel governors and heaters, $1,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. We want to put in two new culverts at $400 each ; remove the old culverts and settle the new ones, $100 ; 6 electric heaters, at $40 each ; 6 transformers, at $50 each ; wiring, $60.

Soulanges canal—widening and deepening St. Amour's gully, $4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This gully is about two miles above the lower entrance to the canal. The soil is very soft. There is a ditch which was not made deep and wide enough at first, and is now choked ; and in order to avoid damages to the adjoining farms by back water, this work is necessary. It is to be done. During the present season we expect to do the excavation, stone-lining, sodding and alterations to culverts.

Mr. HAGGART. Are they under the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The culverts are under the canal. It is to prevent water doing damage to the farms.

Mr. HAGGART. We have had an enormous expenditure on the Soulanges for the purpose of taking that river under the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not the place.

Mr. HAGGART. But I do not know of any other place in which drains passed along the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is on section 3 of O'Leary's contract.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there a drain before the canal was constructed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there was a natural water-course, but they carried more water into it by reason of the ditches on the side of the canal.

Mr. CLARKE. This work is all done by tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Wherever you construct a canal you have to drain the whole neighbourhood ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and then you have claims for damages for injuring property.

Chambly canal—to extend and repair wall at head of Ste. Therèse island, $2,200.

Mr. EMMERSON. This work is necessary and the money is required to provide a boulder line on the slope above the piece of wall built in the last three years to protect the head of the island against the action of the Richelieu river. The water in the river, a year ago last spring, rose to an unprecedented height and the necessity of protecting the slope above the wall became apparent. There was $900 provided last year. Up to May 1st, it is estimated there has been $748.29 expended. We will require $2,200 more this year.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister seems to have branched out a good deal since last year. Last year $900 was all that was required.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but that was for a separate wall. That wall was completed but this is for an additional wall to line the slope above the wall already built with small boulders extending about 1,400 feet, the total estimated cost of which is $2,200.

Mr. LENNOX. This is something that has developed since last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. And this $2,200 will complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the estimated cost.

Mr. LENNOX. It will be let by contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be let by tender.

Chambly canal—to rebuild culvert, Denault's farm, $8,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a large sum for a farm. You had better buy the farm and make a present of it to some one.

Mr. EMMERSON. The culvert has been giving a good deal of trouble owing to leaks. It was examined during last winter and the timbers were found to be in a decayed and rotten condition, so much so that it is necessary to rebuild it. It is proposed to rebuild it of concrete as was done in the case of other culverts on this canal in the last few years. The excavation is estimated at $1,800. Other items are the removal of the old culvert, concrete and unwatering, the whole being estimated at $8,000. This is not for the protection of one farm.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of the culvert ? Does it drain more than one farm ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This culvert is under the canal and there is very much more than one farm drained but it is located on Denault's farm, it is given that name.

Mr. LENNOX. Will that work be let by tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Has there been any money spent on that work in the last three or four years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Chambly canal—to macadamize road west side of canal, $4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was an appropriation last year. It is estimated that the materials and labour for the one and a quarter miles necessary to be done will cost $4,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What are you macadamizing it for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They say the road is almost impassable during wet weather. During the construction of the canal the earth was removed from the side and used in the building of that tow path. It has spoiled the road. At some seasons of the year the water in the canal comes up to within a foot or two of the road and makes the road soft and wet. The highway is on government property. About a mile of the road was macadamized in 1873. The macadamized tow path extends on the east side of the canal between St. John's, lock No. 1 and Chambly lock No. 2.

Mr. LENNOX. This is on the west side?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this a tow-path simply?

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no. This is a road built for the benefit of the people of the country.

Mr. LENNOX. This runs parallel to the canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the government expected to build these roads alongside of the canal for the accommodation of the public ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In building the canal they injured the road.

Mr. CLARKE. And this is making good the injury ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This makes good the injury. The road is impassable practically by reason of the act of the government in building the canal. Now it is necessary to macadamize the road in order that the public may get the benefit of it.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the government have to maintain this road for all time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Part of this was done as far back as 1873.

Mr. CLARKE. I say will the government have to maintain this road for all time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. If you encroach upon the road in building the canal you should restore it to its original condition, but I think the maintenance of the road should fall upon the municipality. What appears to be done in this case is that the government is keeping up at the expense of the country this highway which I think should be maintained at the expense of the municipality.

Mr. EMMERSON. The water in the canal has been raised since the canal was built. The lock-gates were raised and the height of the water was raised with the result that the soakage into the bank does great injury to the road.

Mr. CLARKE. The country seems to be getting soaked in this case.

Mr. EMMERSON. They think that the government rather than the road should be soaked. Perhaps there is some equity in it.

Mr. CLARKE. I dare say.

Mr. LENNOX. If it is by reason of the water rising it is quite proper to restore the road to a proper condition, but I do not think the government ought to keep it in repair unless some new condition arises. The ordinary repair of the road should fall upon the municipality.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly when I was minister there was a petition to have this road repaired. I think I got a report from the officer down there as to the liability of the government and I found that they had none. In fact I went over part of it myself when I was down there and I did not see any liability on the part of the government. The damages were paid for and the repairs made after the canal was built. It is alleged now, as the hon. minister says and it was alleged in my time, that the height of the water some how or other had increased in the canal. I do not think that is so. The man in charge of the waste weir has reported that there has been no increased water in it since the canal was built.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the deputy minister that there is no doubt the water was raised by the raising of the lock. The damage done to the individuals was paid for, but there is constant soakage from the canal to the road, and it is necessary to macadamize it.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the work been done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About a mile was done last year, and there is about a mile and a quarter to do.

Mr. FOWLER. It costs $3,000 a mile ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The people of the country will be amazed when they find it takes $3,000 a mile to macadamize a road.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is done by contract and tender.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps you are asphalting it.

Mr. CLARKE. No ; macadamizing.

Mr. LENNOX. It is time to give the government warning that the people will not be satisfied to pay $3,000 a mile for macadamizing a road.

Mr. TAYLOR. Vote the money ; it is the last chance the government will have.

Mr. LENNOX. There is something in that, but if the minister does get a chance I hope he will not do it again.

Mr. FOWLER. The cost of the macadam would depend upon how the work was done. If it is an ordinary country road $3,000 a mile would be an outrageous amount, but if it is made with broken rock it would be different. What is the character of the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is macadamized with broken stone.

Mr. TAYLOR. What depth of broken stone ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the specifications here.

Chambly canal—renewing landing wharf, $6,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The old wharf is beyond repair. The action of the ice each spring is very damaging, but with concrete walls and steel girders the work will be of

a permanent character, except the timber flooring.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this complete ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. We appear to have voted $6,000 for this last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; there are two wharfs, one above and one below the locks, and this is for the one above the locks.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it time we were adjourning ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought, if these items were not controversial, we would probably get through with them.

Mr. HAGGART. We cannot. Have you brought down the information we asked for the other day in reference to the Galops canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I think so. Here is the Gilbert contract ?

Mr. HAGGART. Of what year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 1897. This is the only contract. I asked the deputy for all the contracts with regard to these matters and he gave me these papers as copies of all there were.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you intend doing on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. We propose going into supply and taking up the estimates of the Interior Department.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 18, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PAYMENT OF RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) respecting the payment of certain railway subsidies. He said : This is a Bill to make it possible to fix the amount of a subsidy before the work is completed. Under the present law a subsidy of $3,200 per mile is contracted for, and under the terms of the Subsidy Act, if the cost of the railway exceeds $15,000, an additional subsidy can be paid not exceeding $6,400 per mile. This Bill seeks to make it possible, at the request of the railway company, to have a contract entered into, upon the report of the chief engineer, for the payment of a fixed amount. The $3,200 would be paid on progress estimates, as at present, and 70 per cent of the cost above $3,200 would be payable, the remaining 30 per cent being held until the final completion of the work. The operation of the present Act causes very much difficulty to the department and also to the Auditor General. He favours fixing the amount beforehand, upon a survey and report of the chief engineer, by the Minister of Railways and Canals under the authority of the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAND TITLES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 158) to amend the Land Titles Act of 1894. He said : The purpose of the Act is to enable the owner of farm land to register a mortgage under the Torrens system before he has secured the deed from the company from which he buys, such as the Hudson Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other land company. Under the Torrens system in the Northwest Territories, an agreement for sale, or anything except an absolute transfer, cannot be registered. There is provision for the filing of a mortgage before the patent issues in the case of land granted directly from the Crown ; but when a farmer buys land from a company, unless he has the deed as the owner, though he may have paid the full price, he cannot register a mortgage on the land. In practice this is found very inconvenient owing to delays on the part of the companies in issuing deeds, and it is proposed to allow the registration of a mortgage on the filing of a certificate from the selling company that the land has been paid for in full. While I am amending the Act in this way, I am taking advantage of the circumstance to remove a technical defect that exists in regard to the registration of maps and plans.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called. I wish to ask the following question of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government : Have there been any negotiations between the government and any other per-

son or persons or corporations regarding the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway ? Has any letter or assurance of any kind been given by the government or a member of the council that would encourage the proprietors of the Canada Atlantic Railway to believe that an arrangement would be carried out after the next election ? If so, what is the price that is agreed upon ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There has been no negotiation of any kind. We have been approached on the subject, but we would not consider the question now.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND LT.-COL. WHITLEY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place. If he is in the building, I would like to have him sent for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend wants to make a speech, we shall go into supply shortly, when he will have a better opportunity.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not going to make a speech. I wish to draw attention to the fact that in the organ of the Minister of Agriculture of Saturday last——

Mr. FIELDING. What is that—the 'Gazette' ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I refer to the one that receives $80,000 a year from the treasury of the Dominion of Canada. I hold in my hand a copy of the Montreal 'Herald' of Saturday last, in which I find the following despatch marked 'special,' which is generally understood in the city of Montreal to be dictated by the minister himself :

Ottawa, July 16.—There is a feeling in military circles that Lt.-Col. Smart, commandant of the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons, should be heard from in reply to a slur cast upon his command. Col. Sam. Hughes on Tuesday evening made a rumour the excuse for the following statement concerning that corps.

Then follows the statement from 'Hansard' :

As the statement was made on the floor of parliament, and as there is no truth in it, the opinion here is that Lt.-Col. Smart should show his interest in the good name of his splendid corps by giving it a public denial. A number of the Conservative journals of the country are taking advantage of his silence to give a great deal of publicity to the matter.

Now, if the minister were here, I would ask him, what is current rumour in the city of Montreal. Is it true, or is it not true, that the Minister of Agriculture has once more turned down the Minister of Militia, and has arrogated to himself——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has arrogated to himself——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has arrogated to himself the functions of the Militia Department ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me. I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend is entitled to ask a question or make an explanation; but if he wants to make a speech, he will have an opportunity in a few minutes to do so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will conclude with a motion now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that it would be far more proper for him to take this matter up when the House is moved into committee. He could then make whatever statement he wished.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I shall, if necessary, conclude with a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presmue the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is going to move the adjournment.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes. Once more I say the Minister of Agriculture has overridden the Minister of Militia. It is rumoured in Montreal that the Minister of Agriculture has wired to Colonel Whitley, brigadier of this regiment, and demanded of him a statement of the facts in connection with this matter, and Colonel Whitley, the story goes——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I judge from my hon. friend's remarks that he is about to make some statements about an alleged action of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am.

Sir WILLIAN MULOCK. I observe that the Minister of Agriculture is not at this moment in his seat.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not responsible for that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is not responsible, but as a military man would he not think it more fitting that his adversary should be present before he made an attack ? There will be an opportunity, as the premier has pointed out, of taking up this matter at a later period in the day, but if my hon. friend wants to go on——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, I am making my statement, and the matter can be brought up again when the Minister of Agriculture is present, if we can get him here.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He has been here before.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am giving what is current rumour in Montreal, and then when the Minister of Agriculture returns he can take any opportunity he chooses of contradicting this statement.

Mr. CLARKE. He will have the advantage of reading my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) points out, he will have the advantage of seeing my remarks and having time to frame his answer. The Minister of Agriculture did wire to Colonel Whitley—I do not know the form of the telegram, but he demanded, I presume, the answer which is referred to here—he wanted a public denial. The story goes that Colonel Whitley was not in a position to give a public denial, but on the contrary sent a public message to the Minister of Agriculture, telling what the facts of the case were.

Mr. CLARKE. That correspondence should be brought down.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is right. I wish to have that correspondence brought down, the communication addressed to Colonel Whitley and the answer that this officer sent to the Minister of Agriculture. I understand furthermore, from telephonic communication with Montreal, that it is rumoured that Colonel Smart is out of the city, but it is also rumoured that Colonel Smart was also wired to on Saturday or Sunday—certainly at some time—and a demand was made on him by the Minister of Agriculture for a denial of this statement. The story goes that Colonel Smart was not in a position to deny these statements, but his telegram to the minister was such as to show that the statements, while possibly not in their exact chronological order, were far within the truth. I would ask the First Minister to be good enough to see that these two telegrams or communications sent by the Minister of Agriculture to the commander of the regiment are brought down. I will also call attention to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture is still arrogating to himself the direct control of affairs in the eastern townships instead of having communications sent through the regular channel, through the Minister of Militia and the adjutant general to the district officer commanding and the officers in these various corps. I wish to put some facts on record. One officer did go into camp, a very good fellow, but an officer who was brought in at the last moment owing to the holding up of the organization by the Minister of Agriculture, and this gentleman, the story goes, rode into camp with his helmet reversed, with his gaitered shoes on instead of riding boots, with box spurs instead of jack spurs, with his spurs turned upside down and with two swords upon him——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He was a warrior.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES——one for peace, upon his left side, the other for war upon his right side. Another officer, one of the joint appointees of that Sunday meeting, when the Minister of Agriculture went down to the eastern townships and on the Sabbath day when the minister is so fond of upholding upon platforms in Ontario, held a meeting with the member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee)—an officer who was a good fellow and against whom I am saying nothing personally, came into camp in a sort of mongrel uniform—in fact I understand there was very little uniform about him and that he was in such a state of intoxication that the brigadier saw fit to send him home.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Now we come to the two special appointments of the Minister of Agriculture. One of these a short time before coming to camp had been fined a large sum, $20 or some such amount, for assaulting an old man, and another had been concerned in improper framing of rifle returns, of cooking the rifle returns for his rifle association in the locality. That is one of the two officers whom the Minister of Agriculture forced on this squadron instead of Dr. Pickel and his cousin Tom Pickel. Another of these officers was proven guilty, as the documents read to the House by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) show, of having taken a false oath, and he came to camp with a black eye and was a rather discreditable and disreputable officer generally. These are the two officers appointed by the Minister of Agriculture. There are other stories connected with this camp to which I shall not refer at the present moment but which I shall take up later. There is another charge which I would ask the Minister of Militia to note. No one specially objects to the Minister of Militia receiving a salute on an occasion of this kind. He is the head of the department and a military officer, and as such no militiaman in Canada would object for a moment to the Minister of Militia sitting beside the officer in command of the camp and receiving the salute. I think that is quite proper. It is another matter however to have the Minister of Agriculture or any one else not connected with the militia going to the reviewing point and receiving a salute as the Minister of Agriculture did at Laprairie. It was scandalous and many officers when they saw this Minister of Agriculture receiving the salute hesitated as to whether they were doing their duty to their citizenship in not refusing to salute the officer in command when that salute would be received by the Minister of Agri-

culture. I wonder that the Minister of Militia allowed the Minister of Agriculture to arrogate to himself the salute. I wonder he did not send him back to his place in the rear. A staff officer of the brigadier dare not answer the salute. The staff officer sits perfectly rigid, while his superior receives the salute. I am surprised at the Minister of Militia allowing the Minister of Agriculture thus to bring the Militia Department into discredit.

I understand, too, that a militia order has recently been issued demanding an immediate return of the names and post office addresses of all the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the militia of the Dominion of Canada. This is the first time I have ever heard of such an order ever being issued, and I would like the Minister of Militia at the proper occasion to give a full explanation of what this order means, and why it was necessary to issue it on the eve of an election. I would also like to know if these names, when procured, will be accessible to every one or whether they are for some special purpose. What is the object of having these names sent for at the present time ?

I see by the papers reference to some attempted interference with the right of free speech on the part of Colonel Ponton late in command of the Belleville regiment by the minister or some officer of the department, and I would like the minister, without formal notice, to bring down to the House the papers in connection with this matter, so that we can have full knowledge of the details of the case.

I move the adjournment of the Houes.

Motion to adjourn (Mr. Sam. Hughes) negatived.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL AND THE DAVIS CONTRACT.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE. Before you pass to the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the government to a letter of the Auditor General that appeared in the public press on Friday. It appeared in the 'Evening Journal' of this city. It deals with a debate that took place in this House last week. The final paragraph of the letter is as follows :

> Will Mr. Fitzpatrick bring the papers before the Public Accounts Committee immediately, where I can have an opportunity of being heard and where this difference can be disposed of, and other questions which may be involved in the Davis contract may be explained by me in the presence of Mr. Fitzpatrick and the members of the Committee ?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the exceptional position of the Auditor General and his particular responsibility to this parliament, demand of us at all events that immediate compliance should be given with this request, and that he be given an opportunity of explaining all that he wishes to explain in connection with the Davis contract. It is very late in the session, and it would appear to me that there is no time now for a formal debate on the matter. I would like to ask the government whether it is their intention immediately to afford an opportunity to the Auditor General of explaining his position by remitting this matter at once, either to the Public Accounts Committee or to a special committee, to deal with.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The matter presented in the communication to which the hon. gentleman has alluded is new, and it is perhaps rather surprising to see an official of the government and of parliament deal in this manner with public affairs. I am not prepared to say at this moment what action the government may take on the matter. I do not think there has been any lack of opportunity for the Auditor General to make known his views on all the questions that concern his department or on any others. I am not prepared to answer at the moment what action the government may take in view of his recent letter in the public press.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the Finance Minister has said that the government is not prepared to deal with this matter, possibly he will be able, at a later date, and as early as convenient, to state what the government propose to do about it, more particularly with respect to calling—as I understood it—a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, in order that the Auditor General may make any further communication or statement on the subject which he seems desirous of doing.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS ON SURVEYS.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Sir Wm. Mulock) if verbatim copies of the evidence which has been taken by His Honour Judge Winchester have been supplied from day to day to the Grand Trunk Pacific or to the Grand Trunk Railway authorities ? The matter was brought before the House some weeks ago, and a request was made to the minister for his views respecting the propriety of having the verbatim evidence printed and distributed among the members of the House. I would like to know in what position the matter stands now, whether the evidence is to be printed and laid on the table of the House before the estimates for the Grand Trunk Pacific surveys are discussed ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I am not aware that verbatim copies of the evidence taken before

His Honour Judge Winchester have or have not, from day to day, or at any other time, been furnished to the Grand Trunk or to any one. The inquiries are held publicly in open court, and the reporters or the public press are in attendance. There is also in attendance a stenographer on behalf of the commission, and it is his duty to take down in full all the testimony given, although I do not think, from the recent correspondence I have had with Judge Winchester, that we can hope to get the testimony in detail here before the House prorogues, if it prorogues at an early date, the inquiry not being closed. Yet I think that the substance of the evidence has really been given to the public by the means to which I have alluded.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the stenographer any permission or any instructions to supply copies of the evidence to the Grand Trunk?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never heard of such a proposition. Upon what authority does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) make that statement ?

Mr. CLARKE. Upon a statement I have received from the secretary of the Society of Civil Engineers for Manitoba and the Territories. Does the hon. gentleman say that he has not given instructions or permission to the official stenographer to give reports of each day's proceedings to either the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not understand the insinuations the hon. gentleman is making. Will he be kind enough to state specifically what he understands has been done.

Mr. CLARKE. I have already done so, and I will do so again. I asked the Minister of Labour if it was a fact that copies of the evidence taken before His Honour Judge Winchester had been supplied from day to day by the official stenographer to the Grand Trunk or to the Grand Trunk Pacific ? That is the information I want. I want further to ask if that information had been given with the knowledge and consent of the Minister of Labour ? I ask these questions because it seems to me that it is of the highest importance that this parliament should be placed in possession at the earliest possible moment of the official report of the evidence taken by the official investigator. It seems to me to be an extraordinary thing that the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific should be furnished with copies of the evidence taken before the parliament of Canada is supplied with it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman means to say or to insinuate——

Mr. CLARKE. There is no insinuation. I am asking a question that I have a right to ask.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am quite prepared to disclose a full statement of the facts. But I want to say in the most emphatic way that I never heard, until this moment, of any such procedure being taken. I wish to state that no instruction, or permission, or authority was given to any person, to the stenographer of the department, or to any one else in the service of the government to deliver to anybody any evidence except in the regular way : that is, that as the inquiry was proceeding from day to day, and was completed by the judge, he should deliver to the Minister of Labour for the information of parliament the evidence that had been taken. I am perfectly satisfied that, notwithstanding the statement that has been communicated, the false information that has been communicated, to my hon. friend by the secretary, as he says, of the Society of Civil Engineers, there is not a scintilla of foundation for that statement. If I have not completely covered the hon. gentleman's question, I would ask him to consider as made whatever denial it is possible to express in words.

THE MILITIA BILL.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE. I would ask the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) if he is getting the Militia Bill reprinted, and if so, when may we expect it ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The order for reprinting was given last week. I cannot say when it will be reprinted, but I will try and let the hon. gentleman know this afternoon.

COASTING LAWS FOR BRITISH PORTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government whether there has been any correspondence with the imperial government respecting the exclusion of foreign vessels from the coastwise trade. My reason for asking the question is that I have seen some remarks of Lord Lansdowne which I observe reported in the 'Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin' of June 25. The report of the remarks of Lord Lansdowne in that journal reads as follows :

> The noble Lord has called the attention of the House to a subject of the utmost importance, a subject which has attracted not his attention only, but that of many others besides. He is correct when he cites a resolution at the conference of colonial premiers in support of his views, and he is also correct in reference to the report of the Subsidies Committee. The resolution of the colonial premiers has been referred to the colonial governments for their opinions. We have received some but not all of their replies, and these vary in their nature. Some of the colonial governments are entirely opposed to the idea of excluding foreign vessels from their coastwise trade, and others, on the contrary, are desirous or intend to do so.

Then Lord Lansdowne proceeds to deal with that subject at considerable length, as reported in this journal, but it is not necessary for the purpose of my question to quote the remainder of his remarks. I wish to know whether any communications have taken place between this government and the government of the United Kingdom with respect to the matter referred to, and if so, whether there is any objection on the part of the government to bring down such communications and place them before parliament.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Speaking on the spur of the moment I think, though I am not quite sure, that we have had some correspondence on that subject lately—in fact I am pretty sure we have. But whether the correspondence is in condition to be brought before parliament I could not say to-day. Perhaps I could oblige my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) later on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would give us whatever information can properly be given to parliament on as early a day as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will look at the correspondence, and see what there is, and then confer with His Excellency.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 155) for the relief of Annie Christman.—Mr. Calvert.

QUESTIONS.

FAIR WAGES RESOLUTION ON BONUSED RAILWAYS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. For how many railways have schedules under the Fair-wage Resolution been prepared since the passage of the resolution ?
2. What are the railways ?
3. Have any of these railways been bonused by the government ?
4. Upon what principle has the resolution been made to apply to railways ?
5. Is it proposed by the government to continue to apply the resolution to bonus railways ?
6. Has the resolution been applied to any industry or railway simply because of the industry or railway receiving a bonus from the govment ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. Fourteen.
2. Bay of Quinté Railway ; Halifax and Yarmouth Railway ; Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway ; Inverness Railway and Coal Company ; Canadian Bridge Company for bridge built for South Shore Railway ; Central Counties Railway ; Middleton and Victoria Beach Railway ; Beersville Coal and Railway Company ; Intercolonial Railway for a branch and double tracking ; Nova Scotia Eastern Railway ; Magnetawan River Railway ; Halifax and Southwestern Railway ; Chateauguay and Northern Railway ; Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway.
3. Yes ; thirteen railways received a subsidy.
4, 5 and 6. These questions have reference to matters of policy, and are answered by the record of the government.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—ALIENS ON SURVEYS—WARRANTS FOR DEPORTATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. How many warrants have been issued by the Department of Justice, authorizing the deportation of persons reported by Judge Winchester as having violated the provisions of the Alien Labour law ?
2. Against whom and on what dates were such warrants issued ?
3. Have any of the offenders been deported ? If so, whom, on what date, and by what officers?
4. Has any report been received by the government from any person or officer to whom the warrants of deportation were issued, as to the execution or non-execution of the warrants ; and the reason, if any, given for the non-execution of the warrants ?
5. Have warrants been issued against all persons so reported by Judge Winchester ? If not, what exceptions were made, and for what reasons ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). One warrant has been issued, and twelve have been prepared, and five have been signed and handed over to the Commissioner of police. The first warrant was issued on 14th June last. None of the offenders have been deported by the police, as my information is that they have left the country. At the request of the Department of Labour, warrants have been issued, or are being issued against all persons reported by Judge Winchester as having violated the provisions of the Alien Labour law with instructions to report as to the manner in which each particular case has been disposed of.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW—ILLEGAL INTERPRETATION.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. What are the names of the persons reported by Judge Winchester as imported, contrary to the Alien Labour Act, in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?
2. What positions were given to them on the work ?
3. Have they all been deported ; or are any of them yet engaged on the work ? If so, who ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The following are the names :

Cassius C. Van Arsdol, division engineer.
Edward R. McNeill, district engineer.

Walter Earl Colladay, assistant engineer.
Thomas, C. Taylor, assistant engineer
Charles F. Gailor, assistant engineer.
James H. Bacon, harbour engineer.
Edward McD. Mellen, chief clerk.
Walter M. Anderson, topographer.
Peter Talbot, topographer.
Herman Mark Goodman, draftsman.
Sherman Hurd Mason, draftsman.
Amos A. Meador, draftsman.
John C. Baxter, transitman
Frederick W. Fink, transitman
Luther Collins Gunn, transitman
John A. Green, leveller.
Frederick O. Parsons, leveller.
Stanley J. Mayo, rodman

MR. GEORGE DIXON'S HOMESTEAD ENTRY.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Did Mr. George Dixon, Regina, enter for a homestead for a quarter section adjoining the town site of Craik, N.W.T., three years ago or thereabouts ?

2. Did he perform his homestead duties within the time specified by law ?

3. Has an extension of time been granted to him for the performance of those duties ? If so, on how many occasions ?

4. Is the government aware that Mr. Dixon has let some of this land to different people in small allotments, and that he has not broken any of the land, nor built any house on the same ?

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Mr. George Dixon entered for the south-west quarter of section 14, township 24, range 28, west of the 2nd meridian, on the 7th of October, 1901.

2. Mr. Dixon has not performed his homestead duties, but his entry has been protected by the department for the reason that he is a poor man who made his entry in good faith and intends to go upon the land, which he has been prevented from doing through the disabling of one of his horses and, later on, through diphtheria and other sickness breaking out in his family. He has also met with other reverses which have compelled him to dispose of some of his stock, and it was therefore felt that under the circumstances it would have been a great injustice to have refused his applications for leave of absence.

3. Yes ; three times.

4. No ; but a few days ago a letter was received, in which it was stated that Mr. Dixon had let some five acres in allotments to residents of Craik. The charge will be inquired into.

PRINTING OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

In which of the electoral districts under the Representation Act of 1903 have the voters' lists been printed and distributed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The electoral lists for all the electoral divisions in Ontario are now in, with the exception of Algoma East, Algoma West, Thunder Bay, Muskoka and Nipissing. The lists which have been printed for Ontario up to the present time are as follows :

Bruce South.
Frontenac.
Grey South.
Grey North,
Grey East,
Halton,
Hamilton East,
Hamilton West,
Middlesex North,
Middlesex West,
Norfolk,
Ontario North,
Peel,
Perth South,
Renfrew South,
Waterloo North,
Waterloo South,
Wellington North,
Wellington South.

For the province of Quebec the lists are all in. Those printed are as follows :

Bagot,
Beauharnois,
Berthier,
Bonaventure,
Chateauguay,
Drummond and Arthabaska,
Gaspé,
Hochelaga,
Huntingdon,
Jacques Cartier,
Kamouraska,
Lévis,
L'Lislet,
Maisonneuve,
Missisquoi,
Montmagny,
Montmorency,
Pontiac,
Portneuf,
Quebec East,
Quebec West,
Quebec Centre,
Quebec County,
Rouville,
Shefford,
St. Hyacinthe
Ste. Anne's, Montreal,
St. Antoine, Montreal
Ste. Marie, Montreal
St. Lawrence, Montreal
St. James, Montreal,
Temiscouata.

The lists for the province of Nova Scotia are all in, with the exception of Cape Breton South and Hants, and all are printed with the exception of these two and Yarmouth.

In New Brunswick the lists are all in, with the exception of Gloucester, and, with that exception, all are printed.

In Prince Edward Island there are no lists.

For Manitoba no lists have yet been received, and, of course, none printed.

For British Columbia no lists have been received or printed.

In the Northwest Territories there are no lists.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. How many rifles, known as the Ross rifle, were contracted for by the government ?

2. What were the terms of the contract as to times of delivery and price ?

3. How many have been delivered, how many accepted, at what dates, and what is the cause of the delay, if any, in delivering ?

4. What tests as to efficiency and otherwise were stipulated for ; and have the rifles undergone the tests as prescribed ?

5. When and by whom were such tests made, and what reports or opinions were made or expressed by the inspectors ?

6. Have any reports been so made or opinions expressed unfavourable to the Ross rifle ; and have any rifles been since accepted ?

7. Were any commissions or committees appointed with regard to the Ross rifle ; if so, of

whom do they consist ; and for what specific purpose were they appointed ?

8. Have any reports or opinions been made or expressed by such committees or by members thereof ? If so, what was the nature of the several reports or opinions ?

9. Were any and what members of such committees present at the tests of the rifle ?

10. Is the government aware whether the Ross rifle was at any time submitted for the approval of the imperial authorities, and with what result ?

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

1. The contract for the Ross rifle was laid on the table of the House shortly after the contract was made. The number of rifles contracted for was 12,000, but under the terms of the contract the government is under obligation to purchase all the additional rifles which it may require from the Ross Rifle Company.

2. The terms of the contract were that the rifle should be delivered within the past fiscal year at the rate, I think, of 1,000 rifles per month at the price named in the contract, $25 per rifle.

3. None have been delivered. The cause of the delay is that they are not finished.

4. I am not sure, as I have not the contract before me, but speaking from memory I think that no test is stipulated for, but that the rifles were to be subject to the satisfaction of the government inspector.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. No reports unfavourable to the Ross rifle have been made as far as I know.

7. A committee composed of the Hon. J. M. Gibson, Col. Hughes, Lt.-Col. Anderson, chief engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Col. Otter, district officer commanding No. 2 district, and Major Gaudet, the head of the Dominion rifle cartridge factory, were appointed a committee to examine the Ross rifle, and as far as I know, all of these gentlemen, or nearly all of them were present at the test which was made. A comparative examination of the two rifles, the present service rifle, the Lee-Enfield, and the Ross rifle was made and the report, I think, was brought down and laid on the table of the House some time ago and was to the effect that all things considered the Ross rifle was superior to the Lee-Enfield rifle.

8. and 9. Answered by No. 7.

10. I am not sure whether the Ross rifle has been submitted for the approval of the imperial authorities, but I am inclined to think that it was at one time submitted to a subcommittee appointed by the war office to examine it and report upon it. I do not know the nature of the report.

RESIGNATION OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the government replied to the communication of the Auditor General, dated June 21st, tendering his resignation ? If so, what is the purport of the reply ?

2. Does the government propose to submit the question of the resignation and superannuation of the Auditor General to parliament for consideration and advice ; or does the government propose to deal with the matter without submitting it to parliament ?

3. Does the government propose to accept the resignation of the Auditor General and to grant the superannuation asked for ; or will the government endeavour to retain his services ; and if successful, recommend to the House that an increase be made to his salary ?

4. What action generally does the government intend to take in the premises ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance.) The Minister of Finance has acknowledged the receipt of the Auditor General's communication. No other correspondence has taken place. The matter is under consideration.

SPEED OF MAIL STEAMERS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What was the average speed per hour made during the year 1896 by steamships carrying British and Canadian mails from ports in the United Kingdom to Canadian ports ; and from Canadian ports to ports in the United Kingdom, respectively ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The average speed per hour made by the Allan Line and Dominion Line during the year 1895-6 from ports in the United Kingdom to Canadian ports and from Canadian ports to ports in the United Kingdom, was as follows :

ALLAN LINE.

West bound—Liverpool to Halifax (summer) average 8·9 knots per hour. Liverpool to Halifax (winter), average 9·0 knots per hour.

East bound—Montreal to Liverpool (summer), average 9·4 knots per hour. Halifax to Liverpool (winter), average 10·1 knots per hour.

DOMINION LINE.

West bound—Liverpool to Halifax (summer), average 9·9 knots per hour. Liverpool to Halifax (winter), average 9·4 knots per hour.

East bound—Montreal to Liverpool (summer), average 9·9 knots per hour. Halifax to Liverpool (winter), average 10·5 knots per hour.

PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has any order been issued by the government, or by any of the departments, or any officer of the government, discontinuing the pay of letter carriers while sick ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to stop the pay of all letter carriers while they are off duty on account of sickness ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. No.

2. The government has never so decided, each case as it arises is dealt with on its merits.

PILOTAGE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 100) to amend the Pilotage Act—Mr. Préfontaine—be concurred in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the amendments?

Mr. FIZPATRICK. The amendments are not of very great importance. The Bill originally provided that the Governor in Council might at any time in the interest of navigation appoint the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be the pilotage authority for any pilotage district, that by Order in Council the pilotage authority might be changed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The amendment made by the Senate is that the change can only be made :

Upon the recommendation of the shipping interests of the port or of the council of the board of trade.

I think this change is a very proper one.

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 102) to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901—Mr. Préfontaine—be concurred in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the Minister of Justice be good enough to state what these amendments are?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are four amendments which are not of very much importance. The first amendment is to section 1 of the Bill. Under the Bill as we have it now the expression 'pilot' is defined in the following words :

The expression 'pilot' means any person not belonging to a ship who has the conduct thereof.

To which definition the following words are to be added :

After 'thereof' insert the following as subsection 2 :

2. The word 'pilot' is inserted after the word 'mate' wherever the expression 'master, mate or engineer,' occurs in the said Act.

The next amendment is in respect to the officers which the government may appoint to make preliminary inquiries respecting shipping casualties. That section is amended so as to provide that the territorial jurisdiction of any such officer or person shall be defined in the appointment. Subsection 2 of paragraph 4 is amended by adding the words after the word 'default' 'or by the incapacity,' so that the section will now read :

If, upon a preliminary inquiry, the officer holding it is of opinion that any loss, or damage, or the stranding of any ship, or any loss of life, has been caused by the wrongful act or default or by the incapacity of the pilot in charge. &c.

The next amendment is to section 27 of the Act of 1901 which is section 3 of the Bill we are now considering. By the Bill as it passed this House it was provided that the court could fine

Any licensed pilot in any sum not exceeding one half of the net income he derives from his service as a pilot, based upon his earnings for the previous year.

The change is that of the words

One-half of the net income he derives from his service as a pilot, based upon his earnings for the previous year.

There are substituted the words :

Four hundred dollars and not less than fifty dollars.

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY—MODE OF ANSWERING QUESTIONS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ascertain just what rights members have in this House when they ask for information which they deem to be of importance, and which they have a right to receive from the government. A few minutes ago I rose in my place to ask the Minister of Labour whether it was a fact that the Grand Trunk officials had been supplied from day to day with the official report of the evidence taken before Judge Winchester ; and I am in the judgment of the House when I say that having asked in the most respectful manner for that information, I was treated in the most boorish manner by the Minister of Labour. It was suggested that in asking for this information I was making a statement that I had no foundation for making, and that charge I resent. The Minister of Labour has been long enough in this House to know how to conduct himself as a gentleman, and to respect the rights of others. I wish now to ascertain from the Prime

Minister if I was not within my rights in what I did ? On the basis of a statement from Mr. Geo. L. Griffith, provincial secretary of the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineers, I asked the question. That statement, dated Winnipeg, 14th of July, is as follows :—

The Grand Trunk Pacific officials have been supplied daily with a copy of the evidence by Judge Winchester's stenographer on instructions from the Minister of Labour.

That statement was mailed to me by the gentleman who has supplied not only the Minister of Railways, but the Minister of Labour and many hon. members on both sides of the House, with information respecting the allegation made in the first place, as to the employment of alien engineers, and respecting the conduct of the inquiry. Upon the strength of that statement I was quite within my rights in asking for information. I protest that my courteous questions were not treated in a way that I had the right to expect they would be treated. I do not desire to occupy the time of the House, except to say that so long as I have the honour of a seat here I shall strive to conduct myself in as courteous and gentlemanly a manner as possible ; but neither the position which the Minister of Labour occupies nor the length of time he has been in this House will save him from castigation if he does not treat hon. gentlemen as they have the right to be treated by him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour is not in the House at the present moment to answer the charge that has been brought against him by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke). I do not think that my colleague is liable to any censure in this respect. As I remember the incident, my hon. friend from Toronto asked whether or not the Grand Trunk officials had been supplied from day to day with a copy of the evidence, and the Minister of Labour answered that he was not aware that anything of the kind had taken place——

Mr. CLARKE. Might I remind the Prime Minister that the Minister of Labour asked once or twice what I was insinuating.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Labour stated that he was not aware that any such information had been given to the Grand Trunk Company, and my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) was surprised, because he evidently anticipated an answer to the contrary. The hon. gentleman pressed the point and thereupon my colleague stated that the hon. gentleman was misinformed, that Judge Winchester had no such instructions, and that he was not aware that such a thing had taken place. I may further say that in the relations between gentlemen on both sides of the House, there is I believe an effort to carry on these relations in a gentlemanly manner, and I am quite sure that the Minister of Labour would be the last to be guilty of any boorishness—I do not think that was the proper word for my hon. friend to use. We are all human and liable to get hot, and probably in this very hot weather it is hard to keep cool.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Statements have been made to me to the contrary, of what the Minister of Labour would lead the House to believe. I am not presuming to pronounce judgment upon what the true facts may be, but I will read the statements that have been made to me from the same source which has been mentioned. This letter is from the Secretary of the Society of the Amalgamated Engineers, and it says :

Although copies of our letters to the government department were immediately forwarded to Mr. C. M. Hays, a similar courtesy was not afforded to us. The various communications of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway did not reach us until the second return sessional papers No. 124 ordered by parliament was brought down and a typewritten copy sent to us.

Further :

We respectfully asked the Minister of Labour to allow His Honour, Judge Winchester, to supply us with a typewritten copy of the evidence taken before the commission so that we could intelligently follow the investigation and render assistance, but our request was refused, although Mr. C. M. Hays and the Grand Trunk Pacific officials were supplied with typewritten copies of the evidence daily.

I do not know whether that is correct or not, but that is the statement made to me and I am informed that a similar statement has been made under date, July 14th, to the Minister of Railways.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Is that the same question that was up before this morning ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will repeat the extracts I have read for the Postmaster General who was not present. I have stated that I do not know whether the statements are correct or not, but they do not appear to be in harmony with the views of the Postmaster General.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I recognize the writer of that letter as Mr. Griffith.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I so stated.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As to the statement that his letters to me were furnished to Mr. Hays whilst a similar courtesy was not extended to him ; that is incorrect. In any case where I transmitted a copy of Mr. Griffiths' letter to Mr. Hays I did the same to Mr. Griffith. I made no distinction between either of the parties to the case ; I was desirous of getting at the facts ; I wanted to see where the truth was. Mr. Griffith was charging--and as the facts have disclosed very correctly charging—that United States engineers and others had been

employed, and Mr. Hays was not giving us that information that I thought the circumstances entitled us to. There was a withholding of testimony so that it was impossible to determine what the facts were. During the whole of that correspondence which I was conducting with Mr. Griffith and Mr. Hays, in order that each one should know what the other was saying to me, I deemed it my duty to transmit to the one the copies of the other's letters so that they would know what case was to be answered. Mr. Griffith was treated with every courtesy; just as much as Mr. Hays was. With reference to the statement that he applied to the department to furnish him from day to day with a verbatim copy of the evidence; this was after the inquiry had begun and when it was proceeding at Winnipeg. The department had no machinery for furnishing the public with verbatim copies of the evidence. The meetings were public, the press was represented. We had one stenographer to take down in shorthand the evidence. I should be amazed to learn; I am as satisfied as I am of my existence that there is not a scintilla of truth in the statement, that any officer of the department furnished verbatim or other copies to the Grand Trunk Company or to any other body. I am perfectly satisfied that it never occurred, but the stenographer is here and I will make inquiry at the department, and I will answer the hon. gentleman later on that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is perfectly satisfactory. I have no knowledge of the truth of the statement, but I thought it advisable to bring it to the attention of the hon. gentleman.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am satisfied that it is an unqualified mistake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But I would hardly regard this society as in the position of the general public, so far as its right to receive the evidence is concerned, because it is the body which brought the matter to the attention of the government. Therefore I would suppose that any facility of that kind might very properly be furnished to it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They were in attendance, and any one who read the Winnipeg papers would see that the evidence was taken down and published very fully by them—in some instances as fully as it was taken down by the stenographer—and every facility was afforded to them to know everything that was going on. Mr. Winchester invited co-operation, and no step could be taken by him that would in my judgment in the slightest degree promote a more efficient inquiry than has been held.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has stated that there was a communication sent to the Minister of Railways similar to the one which he has received from Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said I am so informed. I have no knowledge of it myself.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say that up to Saturday night I had not received any such communication, and so far as I have been able to go through my letters this morning, I found none. My correspondence was very voluminous, and I have not been able to open all my letters which have come in the mails since Saturday night; but if there is any such communication, I will bring it to the notice of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Labour.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to place before the House a grievance in connection with the tobacco industry of Canada. I mentioned a few days ago to my right hon. friend the leader of the government that I would avail myself of this opportunity to place before the House certain facts connected with that industry, and I will proceed to do so as briefly as possible, concluding by moving an amendment to this effect:

That the government has not given the tobacco industry of Canada the protection and encouragement it is entitled to.

I think I shall be able to demonstrate that that industry has been neglected in a culpable degree by the government, in spite of the repeated representations made to the government in various forms, by deputations, by memoranda, and by correspondence. In fact, the day after I had given notice of this motion to my right hon. friend, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. L. P. Brodeur), gave notice of a resolution, the object of which is to remedy, at any rate in part, the grievance complained of, which is proof, I think, that the government has been remiss in its duty to this industry. I will refer to that resolution briefly as I proceed with the examination of this question. I will content myself with giving summarily to the House the information which I deem absolutely necessary to a proper understanding of this question, without which the House could not really appreciate the motion which I propose to move.

It may not be known to all the members of this House, though it is known to many, that the tobacco industry is one of great interest to a large number of people in Canada, and that the culture of tobacco, which has received an increased amount of attention in the last few years, is extremely remunerative. Therefore, anything connected with that branch of agriculture ought to interest us to a very large degree. The culture of tobacco, as it has been carried on by many of our people in different parts of

Canada, is susceptible of yielding from $120 to $150 an acre, and even more. If you get from an acre, properly cultivated, 1,200 or 1,500 pounds of tobacco, which is sometimes obtained, you will receive for it at a moderate estimate 10 cents per pound. Consequently tobacco culture is one of the most remunerative kind; and if proper means had been taken to encourage that culture and the domestic trade in our own homegrown tobacco, as well as the foreign trade which that article is susceptible of obtaining, we would have done a great deal to enrich the farmers who give themselves up to this culture in different parts of the country. In the province of Ontario, tobacco is principally cultivated, I believe, in the county of Essex; but in my own province it is cultivated pretty extensively everywhere. In the counties of Montcalm, L'Assomption, and one or two others in their vicinity, the culture of tobacco is very extensive. It has been remunerative, and it is susceptible of being made still more so if the means suggested to encourage its cultivation and trade are adopted. It is cultivated to a considerable extent in my own county, and in other counties around the city of Montreal. In some instances where the culture has been carefully attended to, the results have been really phenomenal. So that the matter deserves the attention of the House as regards both the manufacture and the cultivation. Perhaps I had better proceed to mention at once what are the present duties upon tobacco. The customs duties on tobacco, cigars and cigarettes are $3 per pound, and 25 per cent ad valorem; on manufactured tobacco and snuff, 50 cents per pound; on cut tobacco, 55 cents per pound. The article is also susceptible to a very considerable rate of excise duties, which I will briefly give to the House. The excise duties are as follows: On foreign manufactured tobacco, 25 cents per pound; on Canadian home-grown tobacco, 5 cents per pound; on combination tobacco, that is, tobacco proper, partly of Canadian leaf and partly of foreign leaf, 5 cents per pound. Then, there is an excise duty which is in reality a customs duty, but which for purposes of convenience has been made collectable by the Department of Inland Revenue because that department has greater facilities for apportioning this particular duty properly, calculating the moisture of the tobacco and its proper weight. On raw leaf, foreign tobacco, there is an excise duty of 10 cents per pound; on stemmed raw leaf, scraps and cuttings, foreign tobacco, 14 cents per pound. I think that is the only original duty which has been imposed by the present government upon tobacco. The other duties to which I have referred existed previous to the present government coming into power. On cigarettes made from foreign leaf there is an excise duty of $6 a thousand; on cigars made from domestic leaf, $3 a thousand; on combination cigars, that is, cigars made partly from foreign and partly from home-grown tobacco, an additional excise duty of 16 cents per pound; and on combination cigarettes, an additional excise duty of 37½ cents per pound.

On combination cigars made from stemmed tobacco and scraps and cuttings of tobacco, a still further duty of 23 cents per pound, and combination cigarettes made partly from stemmed tobacco, imported into the country, and partly with homegrown tobacco, an additional duty of 53 cents per pound.

In connection with combination tobacco, the nature of which I have already explained, there are still further duties. Combination tobacco from foreign leaf is subjected to a duty of 20 cents per pound additional and combination tobacco made from stemmed foreign leaf, 23 cents additional. These special duties imposed upon combination tobacco have been so calculated as to impose upon tobacco made partly of foreign leaf and partly of native leaf, a measure of duty based upon the duty imposed on pure native tobacco and the duty imposed on foreign tobacco separately.

There is a duty on snuff tobacco, moist, of 18 cents and dry, of 25 cents.

There are still further duties which I feel I should mention so as to put the House in full possession of the state of our tariff as regards the article in question. There are still further duties on cigarettes as follows:—Foreign cigarettes not more than 3 pounds per thousand, a duty of $3 per thousand; foreign cigarettes, weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand, $8 per thousand; Canadian cigarettes, that is cigarettes made purely of Canadian tobacco, $1.50 per thousand; combination cigarettes, made partly with foreign leaf and partly with native leaf, $1.50 per thousand.

These duties which I have just explained in detail to the House result from the legislation passed in chapter 19 of 60 and 61 Vic., being legislation to amend the Inland Revenue Act and moreover in virtue of Orders in Council dated 1st July, 1897 and 19th of June, 1903. The object of these Orders in Council was to apportion in an equitable way the duties to be imposed and collected upon combination tobacco. Therefore I understand that what the present government has done, that is what constitutes its own legislation so to speak, is the imposition of a duty on the foreign leaf of 10 cents and a duty of 14 cents imposed on the stemmed leaf. There is also to be credited to this government the apportionment of the duties under the Orders in Council which I have just cited, and the excise duty upon combination tobacco in such a way as to collect the duty in a reasonable way upon the foreign ingredients in the combination tobacco and also upon the home grown leaf entering into its manufacture. Having stated the legislation

that has been passed upon this subject, I deem it necessary to lay before the House the result of this legislation since the past few years. I shall begin with a statement of the quantity of tobacco manufactured in this country in the three classes of imported, Canadian and combination tobacco.

Mr. BRODEUR. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to state how much protection the tobacco manufacturers are receiving to-day ?

Mr. MONK. I have, I think stated, that in giving the duties in detail. If my hon. friend wants to know what further protection they require, I will come to that in a moment.

The following table shows the quantity of tobacco of each kind manufactured in Canada from year to year :—

Year.	Imported. Lbs.	Canadian. Lbs.	Combination. Lbs.
1896..	9,169,299	4,447,978	
1897..	7,980,884	668,627	
1898..	8,408,129	1,901,224	
1899..	7,349,270	2,093,883	368,019
1900..	6,931,132	2,368,935	1,173,839
1901..	6,761,532	3,106,662	1,201,759
1902..	7,109,309	2,932,043	1,282,806
1903..	7,361,575	3,151,724	1,770,767

That is to say, that within the past few years there has been less imported tobacco manufactured in Canada and a great deal more Canadian tobacco and a steady increase of tobacco manufactured partly with foreign and partly with native leaf.

Now, let us see in a second table how the industry stands in regard to cigars and cigarettes, imported, Canadian, combination, the same order as in regard to the manufactured tobacco.

Year.	Imported. Lbs.	Canadian. Lbs.	Combination Lbs.
1896.. ..	85,994,400		
1897.. ..	106,496,180		
1898.. ..	86,656,567	1,289,000	
1899.. ..	105,359,828		
1900.. ..	133,608,417	1,561,040	4,222,770
1901.. ..	258,514,867	2,383,966	6,581,640
1902.. ..	274,363,205	4,687,150	6,966,195
1903.. ..	335,222,014	2,881,360	6,622,288

This shows a considerable increase in the use of native leaf in the manufacture of cigarettes. Now, let us take the total manufactured tobacco :

TOTAL MANUFACTURED TOBACCO.

	Lbs.
Total manufactured tobacco in 1903..	12,688,775½
Canadian tobacco.	3,165,207 lbs.
Combination...	1,772,974 lbs.
Cigarettes with combination No.....	158,694
	5,596,875
	7,091,900½

In other words, if you substract from the total quantity manufactured the quantity of Canadian tobacco manufactured, you have a remainder of 7,091,900½ pounds, the exact amount of foreign tobacco employed :

There are some further figures which I desire to give in as brief a form as possible :

CIGARS MANUFACTURED IN CANADA, 1903.

Total of tobacco employed.. .. .. 3,131,377 bs.

Imported tobacco. No.	Canadian. No.	Combination. No.
162,397,342	2,935,560	6,663,330

TOTAL PRODUCTION OF TOBACCO BY MANUFACTURERS.

	Lbs.
Total of leaf tobacco produced in manufactures..	13,629,520
Leaf tobacco imported .. 8,341,685 lbs.	
Canadian leaf tobacco .. 5,287,835 lbs	
	13,629,520

All the figures that I have given are from page 82 of the report of the Department of Inland Revenue for 1903. I gather from these figures that the quantity of imported tobacco has diminished in recent years, while the quantity of home-grown consumed is greater. The reports indicate that the quantity of home-grown has improved, and the country, although consuming a great deal more tobacco than formerly, has imported less of the foreign tobacco and has used a greater quantity of native growth. This is a fact that is not generally known, but which it is necessary to make known in order that we may appreciate the motion that is now before the chair. In view of these important facts, it is understood, those engaged in the culture and manufacture of tobacco have represented to the government on several occasions and in a variety of ways, as by petitions, deputations and so on, that it is now absolutely necessary to do something more than has been done hitherto to foster and protect that industry. It is necessary, in order to give that most remunerative culture and industry the encouragement that is deserved, to take additional means to ensure its still greater development. The principal points submitted to the government and upon which tobacco manufacturers and growers have made representation I may mention in their order, and briefly that I may not take up too much time.

In the first place, the industry has represented to the government most emphatically that it is necessary to adopt legislation in order to suppress the monopoly of the American trust, the American Tobacco Company. It is known that at present we are threatened throughout the country, and particularly throughout the province of Quebec and large centres like Montreal and Quebec with the absolute monopoly of the tobacco trade, a monopoly which, as I am informed, can be traced to the great American tobacco trust which is represented here by two Canadian associations incorporated un-

der our own law, but which in fact, represent the American tobacco trusts ;—I refer to the American Tobacco Company and the more recently incorporated Imperial Tobacco Company. Conceiving that that monopoly is injurious to the trade and has a tendency to curtail the trade and to centre it all in the hands of this monopoly, the tobacco manufacturers have made representations to the government in order to have it abolished. Conceiving also that ultimately the monopoly will affect the tobacco growers of Canada as it will finally place in the hands of the monopoly control of the entire output of tobacco in Canada, the tobacco growers also have protested against this monopoly. The government, on several occasions have had deputations wait upon them, and, to some of these parties they have promised to put an end to the monopoly by legislation. In fact, last session, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in pursuance of this introduced an amendment to the criminal law having for its object the abolition of that monopoly. That amendment which was calculated to meet the existing difficulty, was abandoned. It is true that an amendment of an analogous nature has been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) since I gave notice that this subject would be brought up for discussion ; I will say a word about that amendment before I resume my seat. The tobacco industry has asked, further, as a means of encouraging this remunerative industry a moderate increase in the duty upon imported tobacco. I believe the deputation asked for an increase of ten cents per pound on foreign tobacco and fourteen cents per pound on the foreign manufactured article. This small increase is necessary under the British preference, for the great American tobacco trust has now more or less transferred the seat of its operations from the United States to England. We receive from England, particularly in recent years, very large consignments of tobacco, the property of this trust, which is sold here far more largely than before, under the rebate of the British preference, and at reduced cost of manufacture, I believe. In the third place the industry has asked for the use of a uniform stamp upon all tobaccos whether imported or not. The reason for that is that the green stamp used for Canadian tobacco solely, as experience shows, has the effect of rather impeding the sale of Canadian tobacco. As everybody knows there is, in some quarters a certain prejudice against the home-grown tobacco, and the colour of the stamp has the effect of preventing the sale of the home-grown tobacco.

I believe there are at the present time three stamps used by the Department of Inland Revenue, a black stamp, a red stamp and a green stamp, put upon the Canadian products. What they have asked is merely that stamps of a uniform colour may be used, and the testimony of all those versed on the subject is that it would be a great advantage in an indirect way to the cultivation of Canadian tobacco. They have asked in addition something which I think is of very great importance, and without which the industry to which I am referring cannot really prosper satisfactorily in this country. They have asked for the establishment—in connection with our experimental farms, I presume, would be the cheapest manner—of experimental stations where tobacco growers could obtain profitable information as regards the cultivation of tobacco, both for home and foreign market. Those acquainted with the subject know that our home market is insufficient, while there are large markets abroad for our tobacco which we can obtain with a little effort, there is no doubt whatever about that. They have therefore asked for these experimental stations conducted by the government itself, in order to encourage the cultivation of our own tobacco. Furthermore, they have asked for the establishment of a bureau of information in order to keep those engaged in the tobacco culture fully informed of the requirements of the home and foreign markets, exactly as is done at the present moment by the publication of bulletins by the experimental farm. The Central Experimental Farm gives the farmers information, both as regards the improvement of the growth of the products of their farms, and also in regard to the markets, domestic and foreign. There is no doubt that our tobacco growers, if information were carefully prepared by the government and given out to them in bulletins from time to time, could greatly improve and increase the output of tobacco.

Not long ago an important deputation came to Ottawa from my own province and laid all these matters very fully before the government. Without going fully into the details of their representations, I may say that the deputation was introduced to the right hon. the Prime Minister and to my hon. friends the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Finance. They asked for a small increase in the duty, they asked for a uniform stamp, for the reason I have stated, the establishment of experimental stations, the establishment of a bureau of information and for a law to put an end to the tobacco monopoly now in the hands of a trust. The deputation was introduced by my hon. friend from L'Assomption (Mr. R. C. Laurier). I find that the counties of Montcalm and L'Assomption were very well represented on that deputation by leading men, and among other delegates I may mention Mr. Wilfrid Legault and Mr. Claude, of the parish of St. Lau-

rent, in the county of Jacques Cartier, and there were gentlemen from other parishes. Mr. Legault is engaged in the manufacture of tobacco at St. Laurent, and has taken a very active part in the representations made to the government.

Now I wish to submit that the government has not acceded, so far as I can see, to a single one of those requests, though the government has repeatedly recognized the justice of those demands and representations. Now in regard to the monopoly, the government assured those who wished to put an end to it, that the moment the existence of that monopoly and its injurious effects were established, that moment legislation would be introduced to put an end to that monopoly. Judge McTavish was appointed by the government to hold an inquiry in order to ascertain—I believe that was the restrictive scope of the inquiry—whether such a monopoly existed. I moved last year for a copy of the report of Judge McTavish. It contained many interesting details in regard to the existence of this monopoly, but I will not take up the time of the House in referring to them fully. As a matter of fact, the finding of Judge McTavish was that the monopoly did exist. In his report he gives us the text of the contracts that are made by the American Tobacco Company with dealers, with what we call jobbers in tobacco, and the text of the contract which the Imperial Tobacco Company makes with the jobbers in cigars and cigarrettes ; and he arrives at the conclusion, which is very clear, in the light of the texts of these contracts and of the accompanying testimony given in the investigation, that the monopoly exists, and that it is impossible for those who deal in the goods of the trust to do so with any prospect of profit except by conforming to the exclusive regulations of the monopoly. The American trust has secured the very best brands of tobacco, the best brands of cigarettes and the brands that have most favour in the market, and nobody can obtain a sale of these articles from the company except by signing this contract, which has a monopolistic effect. Judge McTavish therefore arrives at the conclusion that the monopoly really exists. It has the effect, says the judge, of restricting the trade to a few hands. He was not able, nor had he instructions, to inquire as to whether it injured tobacco growers, but I think he says in his report that it must ultimately have that effect. Judge McTavish points out that in the state of Massachusetts where a similar evil exists, legislation has been passed to put an end to it, but that was so recently that he had not been able to find out what were the results. Well, that inquiry having been made and the report laid before the government, it became the duty of the government to introduce legislation to put an end to what they admitted themselves was an evil. Last year the Minister of Justice, as I have already stated proposed to add article 520a to the Criminal Code in the following terms :

520a. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable, if convicted upon indictment, to a fine not exceeding , and not less than , and on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding and not less than , who, being a manufacturer of or dealer in any class of goods,

(a.) makes a sale of any such goods to a person who sells or intends to sell goods of that class in connection with his own business subject to a condition that the purchaser shall not sell or deal in goods of a like kind produced by, or obtained or to be obtained from, any other manufacturer or dealer, or

(b.) makes such a sale upon terms that would in their application deprive the purchaser of any profit upon the sale of such goods, if he should so sell or deal, or

(c.) consigns any such goods to another person for sale upon commission upon such terms that the consignee can profit by such sale only if he does not sell or deal in goods of a like kind manufactured by or obtained or to be obtained from any other manufacturer or dealer : provided that it shall not be an offence under this section to appoint an agent or sole agent for the sale of goods or the making of contracts for the exclusive sale of goods.

That amendment, introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, acting, I presume, from the conviction obtained by the government from this commission that the evil existed and that it was necessary to put a stop to it, remained a long time before the House last year and was ultimately dropped, for what reason I do not know. I know that some question was raised as to the effect this amendment might have on other lines of business that had been subject to close scrutiny, but it might have been restricted to the tobacco industry, since the evil existed and since the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had promised faithfully that the evil would be remedied. The measure was dropped, and, as I stated a moment ago, the hon Minister of Inland Revenue, after I had given him notice of my intention to bring this subject before parliament, introduced a measure of an analogous nature which I do not think goes far enough. My hon. friend, in his proposed amendment, which is embodied in the resolution now before the House——

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend think this is a proper opportunity to discuss this amendment ? I do not think it would be regular on a motion to go into Committee of Supply to discuss the subject of a notice of motion.

Mr. MONK. I am not discussing that motion itself, but I am discussing the nature of the remedy which it is evidently the intention of the government to apply in regard to this complaint. I do not intend to dwell

at any great length upon it. We will discuss it when it comes up in regular way, but what he proposes is to give the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue the right, if he finds the condition of things to exist which is pointed out by Judge MacTavish in his report, which is alleged by those who complained to the government and which is described in the proposed amendment introduced last year by the hon. Minister of Justice, to withdraw the license from the licensed manufacturers who have a contract of that kind ; in other words, since the evil exists, since it has been recognized by the government, instead of applying the bare remedy which the government had promised to introduce, the Department of Inland Revenue has the power, if it finds that a monopoly exists, as it has been proved to exist, to withdraw the license from one of the licensees or one of the manufacturers. I will say at once to my hon. friend that I would rather see that done than nothing at all. The government should have the power at any time, if sufficient pressure is brought to bear upon it, to put an end to the evil in that way, but what I submit to the House is that it leaves the hon. minister the sole judge of the extent of the evil.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to know where the hon. gentleman gets that information, because I do not see anything of the kind in the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. MONK. This is the resolution of which my hon. friend gave notice on Friday last——

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing mentioned about the Inland Revenue Department or the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. MONK. This is what it says :

> Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, in providing that :
> (2.) Any license authorized by this Act may be cancelled in any case where a person who, being a manufacturer of any class of goods subject to a duty of excise, either directly or indirectly—

Then follow the clauses of the amendment introduced last year.

Mr. BRODEUR. It does not provide that this power is vested in the Department of Inland Revenue or in the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. MONK. It is vested in the government, at any rate. It is an amendment of the Inland Revenue Act, and I suppose that any action that is taken to put this amendment into force would have to start with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. Probably it would require to be confirmed by Order in Council, but all I mean to say is that instead of curing the evil, as was promised last year, this is simply legislation having for its object to allow the government to cure the evil if it sees fit to do so. This is another example, among many which I have known since I became a member of this House in 1896, of the government taking into its own hands power which, I submit, ought to be exercised by parliament alone. This is in regard to the great grievance which exists and which the government has often been requested to put an end to. Now, as a matter of fact, and as I think the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is aware, the trust or the monopoly has not remained idle since the holding of the inquiry by Judge MacTavish, but it has gradually increased its hold upon the trade, and it is threatening to get possession of the whole tobacco trade of Canada, in so far as the manufacture of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes is concerned. I find that the output of cigarettes in 1902 was 137,000,000, and that the American Tobacco company sold of this number 109,000,000 in Canada. Since 1901, I think it is admitted that the trust has seized hold of the manufacture of Canadian leaf under the name I have already indicated, of the Empire Tobacco Company, and by its exclusive contract, to which I do not like to refer at any greater length, but which is amply set forth in the report of Judge MacTavish, it is gradually getting hold of the whole business in tobacco, and it is a mere question of time when this huge corporation will be able to control absolutely the output of Canadian tobacco. Not only is that the fact, but those who are largely interested in tobacco growing and those engaged in the manufacture of tobacco, who are not dependent on the trust, and there are among these a great many experts, agree that that is the result to which we are tending now.

I do not think the government has a satisfactory record so far as the monopoly is concerned, and it is evidently because the government had a feeling of contrition and compunction, that, when they saw this question was going to be referred to in parliament, they judged fit to introduce the mild remedy of which the Minister of Inland Revenue gave notice last Friday. The government has refused to give any additional protection to the tobacco industry. All those interests in that industry agree that a little additional protection would be necessary, but the last deputation that came here to get additional protection was told by the government that it was too late this year, thereby giving them to understand that probably additional protection would be afforded at a later date. It is admitted on all hands that some additional protection would not diminish the revenue because the slightly increased rate of duty would amply compensate for the diminution of importations if such diminution would follow. Moreover, we must have foreign leaf in this country and Canadian leaf cannot by any possibility totally displace it. Even the most sanguine and enthusiastic supporter of the Canadian tobacco industry does not ad-

vance the pretention that the public demand will be satisfied with Canadian leaf alone. Canadian tobacco has been improved it is true, and we can send a great deal of it to foreign markets, but we cannot prevent the importation of the foreign leaf which is absolutely required in this country. There would therefore be no diminution of revenue and it seems to be admitted that the increase in the consumption of the commoner kind of tobacco would be a great help to the native industry. The demand of those interested, made to the government, that there should be uniformity in the stamps placed on tobacco is a most reasonable one. Dealers and growers have represented that the distinctive green stamp on Canadian tobacco creates a prejudice against it, and impedes its sale. They, therefore, ask that stamps of the same colour be used for all kinds of tobacco, and I do not think the government has given any sufficient reason why this demand should not be acceded to.

At One o'clock House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

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

Ottawa, 16th July, 1904.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Mr. Justice Sedgewick, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber, on Monday, the 18th instant at 4.30 p.m. o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) F. S. MAUDE, Major,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Mr. MONK. Did time permit, I should be very glad to be permitted to go further into Judge MacTavish's report, and I would have been pleased to read certain letters which I have received from tobacco manufacturers and tobacco growers in the province of Quebec, strongly urging the views which I am endeavouring to impress upon the government. I now shall say a few words upon the refusal of the government to establish experimental posts in compliance with the request made by those who have experience in the matter. I shall also refer to the absolute neglect of the governmnt to establish a sort of information bureau for the growers of Canadian tobacco, and which could be established at small expense. The government is in possession of a petition signed by all the influential people interested in the tobacco industry in my province, and which promulgate the views of which I have given a brief resume. Neither the report of Judge MacTavish, not this petition, which bears one thousand signatures, nor the very important report of Mr. Blaise Dugas have been printed and circulated for the information of those interested in the industry as they should have been. Mr. Blaise Dugas, whom I do not know personally, but who is, I am told, an expert, was sent to Belgium two years ago to obtain complete information on the possibility of there being a demand for Canadian tobacco on the European market. That report of Mr. Dugas, which I moved for in this House was brought down on the 27th day of May last. I do not wish in any way to minimize the importance of the scant information contained in Mr. Dugas's report, but I say that he supports very strongly the argument that I am advancing for the information of the government. However, Mr. Dugas's investigation was very incomplete and very superficial. The information contained in his report as to the value of the Belgium and Dutch market for our tobacco is of little practical use. Had the government sent over samples of our tobacco with instructions to our representatives in London, Paris and Belgium to make a report, an equally good result could have been obtained at much less cost. The fact, however, that the government did send over Mr. Dugas proves that strong pressure had been brought to bear and that the question deserved greater attention than the government had seen fit to give to it. Mr. Dugas took ten or twelve packages of tobacco with him; he submitted them to some leading dealers in Antwerp, London, Liverpool, Glasgow and elsewhere, and we have his views as to their opinions.

What is important is this—and it will no doubt surprise the House—that this tobacco, taken principally from the counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm, not cured, not packed, not prepared as tobacco should be in order to obtain a favourable reception in European markets, was most favourably received by those who were privileged to examine it. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by reading extracts from Mr. Dugas's report; but if the government sees fit to have it printed, as it undoubtedly should be, members of the House will at once see, to their surprise, I am sure, that in England there is a very good market for our tobacco. The merchants who were consulted by Mr. Dugas are men of great responsibility, commendable in every way; and from the observations they made to him it is evident that in the markets of England, Scotland and Ireland, which consume over 100,000,000 pounds of tobacco a year, there is a good opening for our tobacco, provided that proper attention is given to the cultivation of the plants, the curing and the packing. Now, summing up the observations of the Belgian, Dutch, Liverpool, Glasgow

and London tobacco dealers, I venture to say that they all agree that the samples which they inspected, which were brought over by Mr. Dugas would, with improvement, constitute a very good tobacco for sale on the British and continental markets. It appears, from the observations of these gentlemen, what most of us know, that what we require is not only an improvement in the cultivation of the tobacco, but proper training in regard to curing and packing it. But if these needs are provided, we have an unlimited market open to us in England and on the continent. In order to secure these ends it would be necessary for the government, as Mr. Dugas recommends in his report, and as all those who have any knowledge of the subject have earnestly urged upon the government time and again, to have some experimental stations. Members of the House will be surprised to hear, for instance, that most of the tobacco that is used in Belgium is grown in Wisconsin. The Americans have opened an immense market for their tobacco all over Europe; but they have spent far more than $30,000,000 in acquiring the necessary science in the cultivation of tobacco, and the curing and packing of it, to suit that great market. That is for us a very important point, because our market is strictly limited. The counties of Essex and Kent in Ontario, and the principal counties in the province of Quebec where tobacco culture is carried on furnish a sufficient supply for the needs of our own country; but if we had the means of introducing our tobacco upon the markets of Europe, a very much larger area might be cultivated with extraordinary success. Mr. Dugas, as I stated a moment ago, makes the suggestion in his report, that we should have experimental stations. I think these could be secured in connection with the existing experimental farms, the central farm and its branches, at a trifling cost; and it is impossible to appreciate the extent of the returns. In regard to the curing, there is no doubt that we would have to obtain the services of two or three experts from the United States, men conversant with the needs of the European markets. That would not be a very great expense, and most excellent results would follow. In order to do that I venture to say that our Minister of Agriculture would have to take a little more interest in the affairs of his department and a little less perhaps in the affairs of other departments; for, after all, with what great agricultural reform or progress has the Minister of Agriculture associated himself during his incumbency of the office? It was for a time boasted that he had invented cold storage; but everybody knows that the merit of the establishment of cold storage does not accrue to the Minister of Agriculture. He has merely perpetuated what he found when he came into office, and I venture to say that when the estimates of that hon. gentleman are discussed, I can establish that he has entirely failed to make that service what modern needs exacted, and as he has been asked time and again to do by those interested in cold storage, in my own province at any rate. He would have associated himself with a branch of agriculture, from which our farmers could derive infinite profit, if during his many trips to Europe, or while he has been here in the discharge of his functions as Minister of Agriculture, he had endeavoured to ascertain the cost of these experimental stations and establish one at any rate. The government in that regard has failed entirely to do justice to the demands of those who are interested in that branch of industry; and it has also completely failed, so far as I know, to establish a service of bulletins of information, with two or three experts in charge of the experimental stations, which we could create at a trifling cost. With the distribution of information, derivable at very slight cost, as regards the exigencies of the markets of Belgium, Great Britain and Europe generally, we would have seen the cultivation of tobacco increase throughout the country; we would have seen that great industry develop extraordinarily within the past eight or ten years, and the whole agricultural class of the country greatly benefited. As everybody knows, the cultivation of tobacco requires considerable care; and in our province, where a farmer, provided with all the information to which I have referred, cultivates four or five acres of tobacco with the large families with which we are blessed in the province of Quebec, that cultivation could be carried on at a trifling cost. It is almost incredible what profits our farmers would derive from the cultivation even if tobacco were selling at 10 cents a pound. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard), who takes some interest in this question, informed me a day or two ago that he had leased two acres of land at $10 an acre to a man expert in the cultivation of tobacco in his own county of Laval, and that the profit derived by the lessee at the end of the lease was over $365. This shows, what many of us do not fully realize, that the tobacco industry under conditions I have referred to would be a most profitable one in our country.

Now, Sir, I have glanced over the question of the increase in duties because it is possible that some members of this House would not view with favour an increase in the duties on foreign tobacco. Perhaps in 1896 that increase was less necessary than it is to-day, but as I stated the information I have is that this great tobacco monopoly has now taken a strong hold in England and tobacco instead of coming into Canada as it used to largely from the United States—I speak now of manufactured or cut tobacco—has been pouring into Canada in very large quantities from England for the

benefit of the tobacco trust, under the Canadian preferential tariff and decreased cost of production. Under these circumstances, I think it becomes the duty of the government, if they wish at least to continue to that industry the protection which they had in view in 1897, to make some provisions against this changed condition of affairs. Now, I think I have stated as briefly as possible the present grievances of this industry in this country. The effects of the existing monopoly are to-day conceded on all hands to be most detrimental not only to the industry, to the manufacturers and shippers, but to the farmers as well. This has been admitted by the government. They have recognized the justice of the claims of those who suffer from that monopoly, and they have time and again as I can prove by letters which I have in my possession, promised delegations and individuals that they would remedy these grievances. As a matter of fact they started out last session with an evident or apparent desire to remedy that grievance, but they have failed to do so and even if we had the whole measure of which notice was given, I am satisfied, from letters in my possession and articles in newspapers, that this is not the remedy which interested parties contemplated and which the government promised. I have no doubt whatever as to the part which the Minister of Agriculture could have played in the promotion of this industry, which might be so remunerative to the farmers. I believe that great assistance might be given by doing justice to the demands expressed by those who are interested in the cultivation of tobacco. We could without any material increase in expense, have experimental stations in connection with our experimental farms. We could at a very small cost have a service of information by the regular issuing of bulletins which would keep those interested in that industry absolutely posted as to the requirements of our own and of foreign markets. Above all things we could, with an expenditure altogether out of proportion to the vast results obtainable. secure as the Americans have done, the expert assistance of two, three or even four experts who would especially instruct those interested in this industry in the very difficult art of curing, preparing and packing tobacco. I say that the expenditure under these heads would be comparatively small, but the results as already shown, would be of very great magnitude indeed. The cultivation of tobacco, as those who follow the question a little know, has fallen off in the province of Quebec, prices have gone down, and this in spite of the increase in the duties. Therefore we cannot for a single moment expect that we will improve this important branch of industry by simply piling up the tariff or adding duties on foreign tobacco ; we must do as others before us have done who are now reaping the most beneficial results, we must instruct our people as to the best method of cultivating tobacco in order to secure that product which will give us an entry into those great foreign markets that are open, ready and waiting for us. We must learn how to cure and pack our tobacco in order to obtain our proper place upon the foreign markets. Then not only will our manufacturers and dealers, our commercial classes, greatly profit by what can be obtained, but I venture to say that the agricultural classes throughout the whole of Canada will see an immediate increase in the price of tobacco, a very great increase in the demand for that article and an increase in the cultivation of that plant with the very best results.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue). My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was good enough before recess to let me have the motion which he has just presented to the House and I am sorry to see that although he claims to be very friendly with the tobacco industry of this country he has been finding fault with the policy pursued by this government since 1896 upon the question of tobacco. We have tried since we have been in power to induce the farmers to produce tobacco and at the same time we have endeavoured to encourage the manufacture, not only of Canadian leaf, but also of the foreign leaf and I am glad to see that the result of this policy has been entirely satisfactory and has shown that the policy of the government in that respect has been the best that could be pursued. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was not in the House before 1896 ; if he had been here at that time he certainly would not have presented the motion which he has just introduced before this House. We remember, before 1896, the growers and manufacturers of Canadian tobacco sought by petitions and otherwise, to move the government of that day to give them greater protection. We remember that delegation after delegation came to Ottawa, in 1894, 1895 and 1896, trying to get from the Conservative government protection for the Canadian producers of tobacco. But, in spite of all these efforts, they did not move the government which seemed to be much more interested in giving protection to other lines of production than in protecting the farmers who grow tobacco. But, when this government came into power, we thought it was our duty to do something for this important industry, believing that it might become one of the most important in the country. And I am glad to say that my hon. friend, (Mr. Monk) by the figures he has given to the House, has shown what fine results have flown from the policy then adopted. I will endeavour, however, to supplement what the hon. gentleman has said in that respect and to show that the policy of this government has given to the farmers of this country at least $1,000,000 more than they were getting under the

Conservative regime. In 1896 there were twenty-seven factories engaged in the manufacture of foreign leaf. In 1903, there were only twenty-three of such factories, a reduction of four. Let us see how during the same period the factories engaged in manufacturing domestic leaf progressed. In 1896 there were only ten factories of domestic leaf, and last year that number had been increased to thirty, including those engaged in the production of combination tobacco. So, while we have decreased the number of factories of foreign leaf we have increased very largely those engaged in the manufacture of tobacco, of Canadian growth. In 1896, the tobacco manufactured from foreign leaf amounted to 9,609,194 pounds. In 1903, the last year for which we have the reports, the quantity had decreased to 7,726,316 pounds,—a decrease of 1,182,778 in the manufacture of foreign leaf to-day as compared with what it was under the Conservative regime. Now, take the figures for the Canadian leaf. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, would not give any protection to the Canadian leaf ; they would not do anything for the Canadian farmer. The result was that, when they were in power, in 1896 we manufactured only 474,205 pounds of Canadian tobacco. Last year we manufactured of Canadian tobacco no less than 4,983,181 pounds, an increase in the manufacture of Canadian tobacco of 4,463,376 pounds. In 1896 the quantity of Canadian tobacco manufactured in the form of cigars was 515,870 pounds, making a total manufacture of Canadian tobacco in that year of 990,075 pounds. If we estimate this tobacco at ten cents per pound we find that the Canadian farmers received for their tobacco $99,007.50. Last year, 1903, besides the 4,938,181 pounds of Canadian manufactured tobacco, we used for cigarettes, 2,300,081 pounds and for cigars 9,598,890 pounds, a total of 16,837,052 pounds, as against 990,075 pounds under the Conservative regime. Take this total quantity at ten cents per pound, and we find that last year the farmers of this country with the protection they enjoyed from this government, received for their tobacco, $1,683,705.20, or $1,584,697.70 more than they received in the last year of the Conservative regime. There is the result of the policy of the government. And I cannot understand how, in the face of results like these, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and hon. gentlemen opposite generally can complain of that policy. But is it fair to say that all hon. gentlemen opposite complain of the policy of this government ? Some time ago I heard my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) speak words which indicate that he does not share the views of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. Speaking of the government he asked: ' Why is it necessary that they should have surpluses to boast of from $14,000,000 to $16,000,000 ? They could get clear of a large portion by extending the reduction of duties from molasses to sugar. They could also make a reduction in the duty on tobacco, which would prove an immense boon to almost every man who contributes to taxation.'

Now who is right ? Is it the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) or is it the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) who has a right to enunciate the policy of the opposition since he is its financial critic? I am sorry he is not in his seat to-day ; but I suppose when the vote comes on he will be here to tell us on which side he stands. But that is not all. I have in my hands a circular which seems to have been issued by my hon. friends opposite, and which I will take the liberty of reading for the information of the members of this House. This is called ' Leaflet No. 4 ' and it is headed ' Put this in your pipe and smoke it.' I do not know whether the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had anything to do with the publication of this circular, but it is certainly published by the party sitting opposite, and I suppose before this debate is over they will repudiate it, because it is directly contrary to their motion :

PUT THIS IN YOUR PIPE AND SMOKE IT.

Every user of tobacco in Canada has been paying $4.75 more in taxes on tobacco as the result of Liberal rule.

How is the man who uses tobacco affected by its taxation under the Liberal government ?

Compare the taxes on tobacco collected by the present government with those collected by the Conservative government :

Liberal taxation on tobacco, 1897-1902.	
Excise	$23,485,642
Customs	2,661,875
	$26,147,517

Conservative taxation on tobacco, 1891-96 :	
Excise	$17,875,401
Customs	1,709,958
	$19,585,359

Increased taxation on tobacco by the Liberals in six years, $6,562,158.

The male population of Canada is 2,571,708.

Supposing 50 per cent of the male population of Canada are smokers, how does the increased taxation of tobacco affect each person using it ?

Under the Liberal government, each user of tobacco has been paying in taxation on tobacco alone $19.

Under the Conservative government, he was paying only $14.25.

Each smoker has been paying in taxes on tobacco alone $4.75 more under Liberal rule than he was under Conservative rule.

This increased tax on tobacco does not decrease the quantity used, and is quite unnecessary, even according to the government's own showing.

The government boasts that last year it had a surplus of $14,000,000. That is to say, it took $14,000,000 more in taxes out of the people's pockets than it had any need for.

If the revenues of the country are so much in excess of even the Liberal government's extravagant expenditure, why has the government imposed an additional tax of $6,562,158 on the users of tobacco since it has been in power ?

Have a quiet smoke, and think this over.

The Conservatives paid for their errors in 1896.

The Liberals must expect punishment for their vastly greater sins, and the government that succeeds theirs must be dealt with on its merits. In other words, turn out one government after another until the message can go out to the world that the conscience of Canada is awakened.

Now let us read the motion of my hon. friend :

The government has not given to the tobacco industry of Canada the protection and encouragement that it is entitled to.

The circular says there is too much protection, while the motion says there is not enough protection. Who are we going to believe, the hon. member for Pictou, who says : Reduce the duty on tobacco, or the hon. member for Jacques Cartier who says in his motion : Let us raise the duty on tobacco, or this famous circular which says : The Liberals are putting too high a duty on tobacco ? I leave to my hon. friends opposite the impossible task of reconciling these contradictory positions. I hope my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will realize the false position in which he finds himself now. This sort of politics may do for his county, may entertain the people of St. Laurent where there are some tobacco growers ; but I think the time has come when we should denounce this kind of political warfare. I hope the Conservative party will be brave and courageous enough to come before this House with a uniform policy for the whole country instead of one policy for one section and another for somewhere else. My hon. friends opposite owe it to their party to repudiate that circular and to declare that it is not a faithful representation of the sentiments of their party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown by the figures I have just read that instead of having neglected the tobacco industry this government has done its best to develop it. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says that the preference is affecting tobacco imported from England, and that when it is manufactured by the American Tobacco Company in England it would be subject to the preference. I suppose my hon. friend has not read for some time the clause in the statutes relating to the preference. He will find in 60 and 61 Vic., chapter 16, the following proviso in the reciprocal tariff :

Provided, however, that these reductions shall not apply to any of the following articles, and that such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in schedule A, viz.:—Wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol ; sugar, molasses and syrups of all kinds, the product of sugar cane or beet root ; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

My hon. friend must have forgotten that part of the statutes relating to the preference, as otherwise he would not have made this argument in connection with tobacco imported from Great Britain. We have a right to expect now that my hon. friend will repudiate the statement that he has made that the duty on tobacco imported from Great Britain is not the same as on tobacco imported from foreign countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been in favour of a duty for the protection of the Canadian industry, we have also made a change which has been very beneficial to that industry. Before 1896 the Canadian growers and manufacturers asked our friends opposite several times to permit the mixing of Canadian tobacco with the foreign leaf. Several petitions to that effect were presented to the Conservative government, but in every instance they were refused. When the Liberal party came into power we permitted the mixing of Canadian tobacco with the foreign leaf, and the result has been a very large increase of the Canadian consumption of Canadian tobacco. In 1895-96 no cigars were manufactured in this country from mixed tobacco, but in 1902-03 we manufactured 6,660,330 cigars. So far as the tobacco itself is concerned, we had none in 1895-96, but last year we manufactured 1,772,974 pounds. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that this policy of permitting the mixing of Canadian tobacco with foreign tobacco has been fruitful, has given the best results and has contributed to a large extent to the increased consumption of Canadian tobacco. The reason for that is easy to understand. You cannot put on the market a very good brand of cigars unless you use a wrapper of the finest leaf. In the United States they generally use Sumatra leaf for wrappers and in this country they also use Sumatra to a large extent. By permitting the use of Canadian tobacco with foreign tobacco we enable the manufacturers to put into the inside of the cigar Canadian leaf which is just as good as foreign leaf and then wrap this tobacco with Sumatra leaf. The result has been that whereas formerly we were manufacturing very few cigars we are now manufacturing them by the million.

Now, coming to the question of the exclusive contract of the American Tobacco Company, I see that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has stated that I gave notice of my amendment to the Inland Revenue Act to prevent those contracts being made by

the American Tobacco Company only after he had given notice of his motion. The hon. gentleman is certainly mistaken in that respect because he will find that in the speech which I delivered on the 15th of June, in the debate on the budget, I made a statement in answer to him to the effect that this policy of the government would be carried out. If I happened to give notice the other day of my amendment it was simply because I had to give notice before the end of the session. The session is drawing to its end and it was important that notice of this amendment should be given as soon as possible.

Mr. MONK. I think I am right in saying that my hon. friend gave notice of his legislation after I had told himself and the right hon. Prime Minister that I intended moving this motion and that was after the right hon. Prime Minister had on two occasions stated that the government had no more legislation to bring down this session.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister stated the other day when the question was put to him for the first time that there would be certain Bills to be introduced to the House and some departmental legislation. My hon. friend, when I addressed the House on the 15th of June, heard me declare as positively as it was possible to declare that we were going to do something in regard to these exclusive contracts. It has been the policy of the government since last year to introduce some legislation in respect to that matter and we think the best way of preventing these exclusive contracts is by the way which has been suggested by this notice of motion; that is to say that we shall declare that the licensees of the government be not permitted to carry on any combine or trust in this country. The reason for adopting this procedure is very obvious. The question has been asked as to why we should not meet this condition by an enactment in the Criminal Code. Under the Criminal Code we could only condemn these persons to certain penalties but I think the measure which is before the House in regard to these exclusive contracts will be more effective than if proceedings were carried on under the Criminal Code. Under the Criminal Code you would have to take proceedings day after day. Under the proposal which is now before the House if persons are found to be carrying on business on the strength of these exclusive contracts their license can be cancelled and consequently the remedy is more effective than if it were provided for under the Criminal Code. Therefore, I say that it was not on account of the declaration made by my hon. friend the other day that we introduced that legislation but it has been done in pursuance of the policy declared last year by the government, declared to some extent by myself on the 15th of June last, and declared by the notice which I gave the other day.

My hon. friend, speaking on the question of tobacco, said that we should provide for uniformity in stamps. He asked for a declaration of policy on the part of the government in regard to that subject. There is much to be said in favour of having a uniform colour of stamps for foreign and Canadian tobacco. I had thought at first that this question might be solved simply by departmental regulation but I find that it cannot be dealt with very conveniently in that way and that if treated in that way it would not prevent frauds upon the revenue. The best way to deal with this question would be by legislation and it may be dealt with by providing different scales of duties applicable to different kinds of tobaccos. We cannot deal with the question this year because certainly the session is far advanced. But, I may say that this question has engaged the attention of the officers of my department. The general inspector of tobaccos is now considering the question and if it should prove to be possible and feasible to have this change brought about it may be carried out, although I make this statement without making any formal promise to the House. There is not unanimity among the Canadian tobacco manufacturers in this respect. Some are in favour of the change while others, and perhaps the most prominent ones, are opposed to a uniformity of stamps because they believe that Canadian tobacco is gaining such a reputation for its quality that before long it will be in very great demand. I do not know whether that statement is correct or not, but at all events I may tell my hon. friend there is a great divergence of opinion even amongst manufacturers of Canadian tobacco.

In regard to the experiments carried on with respect to the cultivation of tobacco I may tell my hon. friend that the reflections which he has made upon my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) are not at all deserved. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is now seriously examining that question and under his direction some very important experiments were carried on at the experimental farm. I may also add that this spring he sent to the state of Wisconsin two gentlemen with instructions to observe how they seed the tobacco there and I understand his intention is to send these gentlemen back to Wisconsin in the fall to find out the best way of curing it. They have been well received by Governor Hoard, of Winconsin, and this cordiality has resulted in the establishment of very satisfactory relations between the Wisconsin authorities and the Department of Agriculture upon this subject.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the hon. gentleman who these parties are who are sent to Wisconsin and if they have made a report ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think their names are Mr. Dugas and Mr. Denis. I do not exactly remember the names but I know that two gentlemen were sent to Wisconsin to find out the best way to cultivate tobacco in this country.

Mr. MONK. Have they made any report ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know ; perhaps not because I suppose the report will cover the whole year. They have been there during the seeding time and I suppose they will go there during the summer and during the fall to see how the tobacco is cured. The reflection cast upon the Minister of Agriculture is not deserved, because no man could do more than he has done to facilitate tobacco culture in this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) must not forget that we have had an experimental station at St. Jacques, so to that extent we are carrying out the policy he advocates. I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has wrongfully censured the government, and endeavoured to unburden on it his own want of devotion to the interests of the Canadian tobacco industry. The policy of the government has been fruitful of good, and it has been thus fruitful without adding any increased taxation upon the Canadian consumer.

Mr. GOURLEY. How much tobacco was grown in Quebec last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not the figures by provinces, but I shall endeavour to get a detailed statement for my hon. friend. I was about to say that in spite of the increased duty on foreign leaf, the Canadian consumer is now paying less than formerly for this tobacco, as the figures will prove. In 1896 he paid for domestic plug chewing tobacco 81 cents, and this year he pays 53 cents for the same quantity of tobacco.

Mr. CLANCY. And the same kind ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I suppose it is the same kind. I am not a smoker, but I am told by those who do smoke, that Canadian tobacco is very much better than the foreign tobacco. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) apparently does not accept that statement, but I make it on the authority of a gentleman who changed from foreign to domestic tobacco, and he now says that the Canadian tobacco is the better. When hon. gentlemen opposite become more Canadian than they are now, they will perhaps give up the foreign leaf and smoke our own good Canadian product. Let me continue to quote the figures. In 1896 plug smoking tobacco cost eighty cents when it now costs fifty cents, and in 1896 foreign smoking tobacco cost $1 when the smoker can now get the same quantity for forty-six cents. In these three kinds of tobacco the consumer is now paying in one case fifty-three cents less, in another case sixty per cent, and in the third case seventeen per cent less than he did formerly. And why is this the case ? It is because instead of smoking foreign leaf tobacco which is pretty heavily taxed, the consumer now smokes Canadian tobacco on which the tax is only five cents per pound. The net result of the policy of the government is that we have given to the Canadian producer a large amount of protection which encourages the growth of tobacco in Canada to the value of $1,500,000 more than under the Conservative regime, and at the same time we have reduced to a very large extent the price of the tobacco itself.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it the policy of the government, of which the Minister of Inland Revenue is so distinguished a member, in raising the duty on tobacco to especially encourage the growth of Canadian tobacco in Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly that was the purpose and intention. The purpose was to favour as much as possible the growth of Canadian tobacco, and the figures I have quoted prove that the policy of the government in this respect has been a sound policy, which ought to meet with the support of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY. I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) sincerely, that by the introduction of this motion he has drawn from the government the first clear honest distinct and manly statement in favour of a protective policy, that I have heard since I came to parliament. I congratulate the Minister of Inland Revenue for casting aside the hypocrisy of his party, and in a manly way stating his own policy in reference to this question. If members of the government would always admit that they looked with horror upon their past and promised to do right things in the future, I would cease to berate them, and would endeavour to help them on in their career. I believe that in the end Canadian tobacco will be found to be of the most superior quality, because every product that can be grown in this northern country is of the highest excellence. We grow the best men and women in the world, and the country that grows the best men and women will grow every inferior product in the highest excellence. What are the Ontario members doing in this debate ? Do they know that in 1896 their province raised 11,000,000 pounds of tobacco, and that last year it raised only

3,000,000 ? It would seem from these figures as if the policy of the government was helping Quebec, while it was destroying poor Ontario, and yet there is not a man of them opposite who seems to be aware of the condition of the tobacco industry in that province. I recently searched through the reports of the Dominion statistician and I discovered that in 1902 we raised 500 pounds of tobacco in Nova Scotia, 30,000 in Prince Edward Island and 61,000 in British Columbia. There are no returns from Quebec, but I suppose Quebec is so much on top now that it need not be mentioned in statistics. In 1896, Ontario raised 11,000,000 pounds of tobacco leaf, mostly in the county of Kent and Essex, while in 1902, the last year for which we have returns, it only raised 3,000,000. I do not understand how this result can come from the policy of the government, because if they afford adequate protection it is bound to strengthen the growth of tobacco all over the country. No man who has seen the benefits of protection as conferred upon the United States of America can doubt that a wise system of protection would encourage Canadian industries. I congratulate the Liberal party in coming around to that sane view. I was somewhat surprised however, that the Minister of Inland Revenue, who is somewhat liberal in his views, should attempt to make a little political capital out of this question. He should remember what befell the Postmaster General a few days ago, who, when he was discussing the Peterborough lock tried to introduce a political issue, and before he got out of it he was the worst whipped man I have ever seen in the House of Commons. I thought the Minister of Inland Revenue had more discretion ; I thought he had the French discretion, never to attack until he was sure to win ; I thought he had the Napoleonic genius to win or retreat, but he seems to have been off his guard this afternoon. Why the Conservatives could not hold by the policy they had. Such were the continued and persistent attacks of the Liberal party that the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster, showed awful weakness in going back from his policy of high protection and making sugar and several other articles free. What happened ? From that day I lost confidence in Foster—in everybody connected with the government. It did much to defeat the Conservative party, because the opposition told the people that the government had never believed in their policy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did I correctly understand my hon. friend to say that he lost confidence in Mr. Foster because of the action he took in connection with the tariff in 1896 ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What has he to say about the gentleman who wrote the leaflet on tobacco which he read a moment ago ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I am coming to the leaflet. I say I lost confidence, and I am frank in that. There is nothing like frankness among friends, and I say the Conservative party showed awful weakness in betraying their party by giving into you people—giving into your endless talk about things you never believed in for one moment—instead of going on building up and strengthening their tariff. They would have been in power to-day if they had done that instead of playing into your hands. You evidently do not intend to be defeated by any of your free trade nonsense, because you are abandoning every shred of it and throwing it to the winds, and adopting protection. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue is the advance guard in declaring that the old policy of the Liberal party is gone forever, and that protection, pure and simple, is its policy to-day. I want to tell the Minister of Finance, when he goes to Nova Scotia, not to wear the mantle of hypocrisy which he has worn so long, but to throw it off and to appear in the costume which the Minister of Inland Revenue has put on and worn so worthily to-day. With regard to that circular, I do not think the Minister of Inland Revenue should have pursued the course he did. In this country—and unfortunately we have many illustrations in the province of Quebec—there is a class of people who are always advocating a sectional policy. I know nothing about it. I have been brought up in an atmosphere where that humbug could not last for a moment. I admire the French Canadian people in many ways, and I wonder that they have not a man strong enough to take those people who are talking sectionalism and shake the life out of them, as Chapleau did the people who were talking sectionalism at the time of Riel. It is a pity they have not a strong French Canadian who would do the same thing to-day.

Mr. SCOTT. Haven't you got Mr. Tarte ?

Mr. GOURLEY. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it, and when I see people in Ontario licked into being national men instead of sectional men, I want to see a big, powerful man in each province able to destroy sectionalism of every kind. However, I was going to say that I think it unfair that the Minister of Inland Revenue should have brought that little bit of a circular into this discussion. I venture to say it was written in Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will tell me who published the circular, I will withdraw my speech.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have never read or seen it ; but I say it was very wrong for a minister of the Crown to attempt to read a

circular which has no authority, so far as I know, and which does not bind me or anybody else. Probably no man in this House ever saw it. Some man who wished to earn a few pennies writes something which he thinks may be in the interest of his party or the country, and the Minister of Inland Revenue brings it forward to bind the great Conservative party. It binds nobody and deceives nobody. It does not dignify the debates of parliament to introduce matters of that kind. It is a good tu quoque argument, if arguments of that kind are to prevail in Canada. It may do to catch somebody at a public meeting, but it does not mean anything.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How about the hon. member for Pictou ?

Mr. GOURLEY. He has a right to inveigh against surpluses if he wishes, and if his constituents believe in that kind of thing. I believe we should have far more surpluses in this country ; but we should spend them in the development of the country. You people are afraid of expenditure, you are not attempting to develop this country at all. We want two or three thousand miles of railway in Nova Scotia, and you will not build any. The whole country is undeveloped to-day, while you people are piling up surpluses. I do not object to surpluses, but I object to your not spending them in the development of the country, but giving them to your friends and encouraging boodle.

Mr. BRODEUR. But my hon. friend must see that the hon. member for Pictou was advocating a reduction of the duty on tobacco.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, he did specifically mention the subject of tobacco. Well, my hon. friend has been here ten or fifteen years, while I have been here only four years, and he may have got impregnated with the notions which you people have been preaching. I have not ; I steel myself against them ; and you have so improved in your conduct that we perhaps need less will-power to do so now. But even a man of good sense who was here before 1896, and who listened to the distinguished men leading the opposition talking the twaddle they did for ten years, might have lost some of his intellectual virility, and Mr. Bell may have suffered in that respect. However, I support the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in advocating a strong duty to give the Canadian tobacco-grower absolute protection against all comers, until he shall get his industry into that state when he can face the world alone. I believe the time will come when the Canadian will face the world and conquer it in a fair field of battle. But this is not the moment ; we have not the capital, nor the skill, nor the training. I support the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and I say the Minister of Inland Revenue will not be able to convince the people of Quebec that it is a sufficient answer to his argument to quote a circular written by nobody, and representing nobody's views on this side of the House that I know of.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). It was mailed from this House to members of parliament.

Mr. GOURLEY. That does not bind anybody. Suppose you mailed a warrant to hang me to-morrow, that would bind nobody.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). What about the franking of it ?

Mr. GOURLEY. People have a right to send any material they like to the country. That is a very weak argument. If my hon. friend has taken the correct course the people of Ontario should be up here inquiring seriously into the question how their province has been deprived of this industry. This industry has been stricken down from 11,000,000 pounds of tobacco to 3,000,000 pounds in three or four years. That is a question for the people of Ontario. You stand jeering and laughing at the quibs and jokes of the Minister of Inland Revenue which would be very timely and appropriate in addressing school boys. He did that well but I am sure that he fancied he was addressing school boys rather than serious men or he would have produced arguments more timely and suitable than those which he advanced. The reason I desire some information about the province of Quebec was to find out whether a similar loss had occurred in that province. In Ontario the industry has declined from 11,000,000 pounds to 3,000,000 pounds, and if there had been a similar decline in Quebec it would fully justify the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I am attempting to master the beautiful language which my hon. friend speaks as his mother tongue, and when I do master it I am going to the province of Quebec to ask the people of that province whether it was sufficient answer to the charges of my hon. friend Jacques Cartier for the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to read to the House a circular which he found somewhere.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY. It is rather refreshing to hear the Minister of Inland Revenue declaring the new doctrine of the Liberal party. He has now become quite a protectionist. In answer to my question he declared in unequivocal terms that it was the policy of the Liberal party to give protection to the tobacco interests, to encourage the growth of tobacco in Canada and that for that reason the increased duties were imposed in 1897. I think I understood the hon. gentleman to say that in the most unequivocal terms.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will permit me, what I said was that the policy of the government has had for effect to encourage the production, the growing of Canadian tobacco.

Mr. CLANCY. Then I have not misunderstood the hon. gentleman. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that he has marched in the ranks of the Liberal party for many years declaring that protection had ruined the farmers? Have hon. gentlemen forgotten that they went up and down the back concessions declaring that when the Conservative party imposed duties upon every article produced by the farmers of Canada these duties were utterly worthless to help the farmers of this country? Does he deny that that was the policy, the doctrine, as preached by his own party—and by himself as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) suggests. When did he become convinced that farmers should have more protection? Let me read to my hon. friend what the Minister of Finance said when he introduced the revision of the duties in 1897. The hon. minister should have consulted the Minister of Finance before he made his statement this afternoon.

ROYAL ASSENT.

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

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires and awaits the attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the Home Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Lake Huron Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

An Act respecting the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Brantford and Hamilton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.

An Act respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act providing for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, repecting the punishment of Fraudulent Debtors.

An Act respecting the James' Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Hudson's Bay and Northwest Railway Company.

An Act respecting certain patents of the Canadian General Electric Co., Limited, and others.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal, Nipissing and Georgian Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting a certain patent of E. A. Small.

An Act respecting certain patents of Lewis E. Curtis.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Artillery Association.

An Act to incorporate the Chicoutimi and Northeastern Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Navigation of Canadian Waters.

An Act respecting the Real Estate Title Guarantee and Trust Company.

An Act to incorporate the Monarch Life Assurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Bessemer and Barry's Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Fund.

An Act to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

An Act respecting certain patents of William A. Damen.

An Act respecting certain patents of Seigfried Gironcoli.

An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

An Act respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Ottawa Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting certain patents of Edwin R. Cahoone.

An Act for the relief of Andrew William Mann.

An Act to incorporate the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.

An Act for the relief of Jennie Davidson Moore.

An Act for the relief of Eliza Robertson.

An Act respecting the Northern Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Okotoks and High River Lumbering and Development Company.

An Act to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Similkameen and Keremeos Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Rio de Janeiro Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.'

An Act respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.

An Act to amend the Pilotage Act.
An Act to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.
An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Yukon Territory Act.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the year ending 30th June, 1905.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Mr. CLANCY. I think I shall be able to make it perfectly clear to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), that the policy of the Liberal party in 1897 was not to protect the tobacco industry. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) has told us that that is the policy now. But there has been no announcement of a change, and, where there is a difference of opinion among the ministers on a fiscal question, we must accept what is told us by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. By the way we have heard the announcemnt of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that it is impossible to protect the farmer. The policy of the Liberal party, he told us, was to raise a revenue. If protection was afforded by a revenue-raising tariff, it was a mere incident and something which the hon. gentleman has always felt called upon to apologize for. The necessity for raising a revenue he always acknowledged but he would not acknowledge the necessity of protecting the farmers, but grudgingly allowed them to get the benefit of whatever protection might be afforded by a tariff for revenue purposes. I had better read to the Minister of Inland Revenue the policy of his party in 1897, and ask him to revise his views, unless the party has changed its policy since that time without announcing that change. In 1897 the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said :

> How far it is possible for our growers to displace foreign leaf was much disputed before the tariff commission——

That was a committee of the members of the cabinet which received the representation of those who desired to show how the condition of the country could be favourably affected by tariff amendments.

> —but, if the Canadian producer can as a result of this duty get some advantage, we see no reason why he should not have the same opportunity afforded him as has been afforded by other industries. Our main purpose is to get revenue. But, at the same time there is no objection to the growers of tobacco in Canada receiving the advantage from this resolution.

In other words it was a matter of pure indifference——

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not wonderful, Mr. Speaker, how little comfort satisfies that hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) ? Here is a plain statement from the Minister of Finance that the object is simply revenue, but, if they get the revenue, the government will not object to the farmers getting an advantage. That is the plain English of the whole thing. The Conservative party has set forth its views in 'Leaflet No. 4' to which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) draws attention. The hon. gentleman need not withdraw a single sentence. He read sound literature. It is true from start to finish and in every detail. Let me read——

Mr. PATERSON. Will the hon. gentleman inform us where he got that leaflet ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will be more frank with the House than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was about his 'Pointers No. 3.' The hon. gentleman had literature prepared in his own office ; yet, though that matter was under discussion here for two evenings, he could not tell us where that literature came from. I will tell the hon. gentleman that this 'Leaflet No. 4' was prepared, owned and circulated by the Conservative party. And it is literally true—every sentence of it. There is nothing to conceal about it. Let me make reference to what is contained in that literature :

Liberal taxation on tobacco, 1897-1902..	$26,147,517
Conservative taxation on tobacco, 1891-1896..	19,585,359
Increased taxation on tobacco by the Liberals in the six years..	$ 6,562,158

I would ask the hon. Minster of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) if that is true ? I wait their answer.

Not a single syllable from these hon. gentlemen. What does that mean ? That sum of money was taken out of the pockets of the people of this country as a mere matter of revenue, as stated in the most explicit terms by the Minister of Finance. Neither of these hon. gentlemen can deny it for it is a plain positive fact. But how is it about the protection to the farmer ? If the Conservative party were giving aid to an industry, it would give it, not as a mere incident to the raising of revenue, or as if it were ashamed to own it, but openly and for the purpose of developing the industry. But hon. gentlemen opposite insist upon taking the money from the people by taxation, and, if, as a result of that, protection is given to a Canadian industry they apologize for it—until the statement of the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) here to-day. Hon. gentlemen have increased the taxation, but they have not given the corresponding protection to the Canadian tobacco grower to which he is entitled. The hon. Minister (Mr. Brodeur) has read with approval from this leaflet No. 4, the statement that the Liberal policy has had the result of

taking $6,000,000 from the people in six years more than was taken from them under the former government. Will he now say that the tariff that has taken so much from the people has in it that measure of protection to the tobacco-growing industry the protection to which it is entitled to ? The hon. gentleman talks about cheap tobacco. But who pays this large amount of increased taxation ? The hon. gentleman is mum again—not a word to say. I think we can leave these two hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to settle the question between themselves, and, when they settle it, I will be delighted to withdraw every word I have uttered on this subject.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Monk).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Blain,	Monk,
Borden (Halifax),	Morin,
Brock,	Richardson,
Clancy,	Roche (Marquette),
Clarke,	Sproule,
Earle,	Thomson (Grey),
Gourley,	Vrooman,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
LaRivière,	Wilson.—19.
MacLaren (Perth),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macpherson,
Brodeur,	McCool,
Champagne,	McLennan,
Christie,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Davis,	Matheson,
Douglas,	Mignault,
Fielding,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fitzpatrick,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Paterson,
Gallery,	Préfontaine,
Galliher,	Proulx,
German,	Puttee,
Gibson,	Riley,
Girard,	Roche (Halifax),
Harwood,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Ross (Yukon),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Russell,
Johnston (Lambton),	Scott,
Kendall,	Sifton,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Sinclair,
Law,	Stewart,
LeBlanc,	Talbot,
Macdonald,	Tolmie,
MacKinnon,	Turgeon,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),	Wade.—50.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Hyman,	Bruce,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wallace,	Tisdale,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Lovell,	Kendry,
Tobin,	Ball,
Thompson (Haldimand),	Kemp,
Beith,	Tolton,
McGugan,	Bennett,
Costigan,	Birkett,
Gervais,	Casgrain,
Grant,	Armstrong,
Holmes,	Broder,
Lavergne	Ingram,
(Drummond & Artha.)	
Mackie,	Calvin,
McIsaac,	Carscallen,
Dugas,	Tarte,
Sutherland (Essex),	Smith (Wentworth),
Brown,	Robinson (Elgin),
Bureau,	Lennox,
Lemieux,	Northrup,
Copp,	Hale,
Guthrie,	Cochrane,
Demers (St. John),	Hughes (Victoria),
McCarthy,	Culbert,
Power,	Gilmour,
Archambault,	McGowan,
Geoffrion,	Rosamond,
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Wright,	Lavell,
Haszard,	Daniel,
Lang,	Hackett,
Bickerdike,	Roddick,
Campbell,	Barker,
Fisher,	Osler,
Gould,	Alcorn,
Heyd,	Avery,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Kidd,
Loy,	Bell,
Smith (Vancouver),	Boyd,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Turcot,	Léonard,
Tucker,	Robinson, (Northumberland),
Reid (Restigouche),	Johnston (Cardwell),
Bazinet,	Seagram,
Lewis,	Kaulbach,
Erb,	Clare,
Desjardins,	Donnelly,
Meigs,	Lancaster,
Morrison,	Ganong,
Stephens,	Maclean,
Ross (Ontario),	Porter,
Malouin,	Halliday,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Haszard) has not voted.

Mr. HASZARD. I was paired. If I had voted I would have certainly voted against an increase of the duty on tobacco.

DOG-FISH PEST.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion is carried, I would like to inquire of the government whether the report of the Commissioner of Fisheries with regard to the dog-fish pest and other matters, has been laid on the table of the House. I observe that eleven weeks ago to-day the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) stated, in

reply to a question from the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), as follows:

1. The Commissioner of Fisheries was authorized to hold an investigation into the dog-fish pest and other fishery matters on the shores of northern New Brunswick. The investigation concluded on April 21st.
2. The report is in preparation, to be laid before me in a few days.
3. The report referred to is awaited before deciding the question of a dog-fish bounty.
4. A large number of suggestions are before the government, and steps will be taken when the report referred to is presented.

I have inquired more than once of the officers of the House, and I cannot find that this report, which was to be brought down within a few days, on the 2nd of May, has been brought down yet. I would like to inquire the cause of the delay.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). At the time that answer was made it was expected that the commissioners would meet and prepare their report. Some members of the commission are members of this parliament, and unfortunately they have been unable to attend to this question during the sitting of the House. Their preliminary report is not yet ready, but I will make inquiries and see whether it is possible to have it down before the vote is taken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it seems a little surprising that a report which at that time was to be presented within a few days has not been presented after eleven weeks. I suppose the constitution of the commission was known as well then as it is now. The minister has not referred to any unexpected circumstances, or any cause which would seem to me sufficient to justify the delay. It is of great importance that this report should be brought down. I have had many communications on the subject, and I have desired more than once to address the House on the subject, but I have waited from time to time until the report should be brought down, because it seemed unadvisable to enter into a discussion when we were daily expecting the report. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he has any idea, any expectation that the report will be laid upon the table of the House in time to have a discussion on the subject before the conclusion of the present session. It is a matter of very great importance indeed to the fishermen of the maritime provinces; it is one which has attracted a great deal of public attention there and elsewhere, and it is highly important that this report should not be longer delayed, unless there is some very grave reason for it. Therefore, I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to expedite this report, and let us have it within a day or two, if possible. The answer which I have read did not mention any others of the commissioners, but referred to the fishery commissioner only. It was said that he was making an investigation, and would be prepared to make his report almost at once, which would be laid on the table within a few days. Now my hon. friend refers to some other members of the commission who are not mentioned in this answer at all. I see no reason, for my part, why this report should not have already been before the House.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As regards the commissioner of fisheries, Mr. Prince, I may say that we have already in the department an exhaustive report from him on that question. The question has been taken up, not only by himself but by the other members of the commission who sat during last winter, investigating this matter as well as some others. In the department we understand perfectly well that this is an important question, and it is because of its great importance, and the great number of suggestions that have been made to us, some contradictory of each other and others tending to involve the government in a very heavy expenditure, that we are studying this question very carefully before we make a report which would be practicable. At the present time I do not think that any of the suggestions made to the commissioners have been found practicable. Of course it is only reasonable that they should confer together before coming to a conclusion. I will inquire to-morrow of the commissioner of fisheries whether he is in a position to make, if not a complete report, a temporary report on the question. We do not ignore the importance of the subject, and when the papers are before the House the hon. gentleman will see that we have been dealing with it in earnest, and the volume of correspondence and information which has been gathered will show that we have neglected nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. Who composes the commission?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. So far as I remember, it is composed of Mr. Prince, Col. Tucker, Mr. Copp, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Bowers, and one or two others whose names I forget at the moment. They were appointed a few days after the close of last session.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they been engaged ever since in making a report?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have made preliminary reports on other questions, but on this, the most important of all, they have not yet made a report.

ITALIAN IMMIGRANTS AT MONTREAL.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he has sent his deputy minister to Montreal to investigate the circumstances of the Italians who have arrived in that city and are said to be in destitute circumstances. Has a report been made to him, and if so, when will it be laid on the table of the House? It is also stated in the press that this matter has been referred to Judge Winchester to investigate and report upon, and can the hon. gentleman give us any information on that point?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I sent the Deputy Minister of Labour to Montreal to endeavour to ascertain how these Italians that were reported to be stranded in Montreal, came to Canada. He endeavoured to ascertain the facts, but he found a great deal of conflicting testimony. He came to some conclusion upon the subject, but I cannot say that he made a report, because the testimony was contradictory, so much so, that I recommended to Council, in order to get at the facts, that Judge Winchester's commission should be enlarged so as to embrace this subject. Accordingly his commission was enlarged, and I expect that Judge Winchester will begin to investigate this subject as soon as he is through with the inquiry in regard to alien labour troubles in Montreal, Judge Winchester is to-day in the city of Montreal. I am most anxious that he shall first complete the inquiry into the Grand Trunk alien labour question, and the moment that is done, he will take up the other question, perhaps during the present week, but on that point I am not quite sure.

Mr. WILSON. Will the minister produce any report that was presented by his deputy?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I can hardly call it a report. It was a memorandum made to me. I am not sure whether it was of a confidential character or otherwise, but I think it rather went to the extent of saying that he could not satisfactorily determine anything, because of not being able to compel witnesses to give evidence under oath, and to submit to cross examination.

Mr. WILSON. If it is not confidential, will he lay it upon the table?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, because I do not think it is of the slightest value. My hon. friend can look at it and see for himself. The very fact that my deputy could not get the evidence shows that it is of no special value, nor do I think it will prove of much value to the commissioner himself.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec, general legal expenses, $3,000.

Mr. CLANCY. When this matter was under consideration on a former occasion the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) promised to bring down the instructions given in regard to the survey of Walpole island. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has that information now.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). I will give the hon. gentleman a statement of what is taking place:

On the 22nd December, 1900, the authority of His Excellency in Council was obtained to spend $2,250 and $750 from the capital funds respectively of the Chippewas and Pottawattamies of Walpole island for surveys. The reason for making the expenditure is stated to be the impossibility of properly administering the lands and roads unless the islands are properly surveyed. Instructions were issued to G. W. McGeorge, Esq., of Chatham, on the 13th September, 1901, a copy of which is attached. When the attention of the department became known, the Indians petitioned that the work be not undertaken, alleging as a reason that their funds would not bear the cost. The department having used the argument that it was intended for their benefit and would undoubtedly lead to good results and a more businesslike administration of their property, a memorial was received in June last from the chiefs and councillors representing the chief agricultural Indians of the island, requesting to have the survey proceeded with. The surveyor has done some preliminary work, chiefly laying out the road allowances about the island and tracing the internal roads, and 'picking up the points of the lands of the Indian locatees.'

I have an extract from the letter of the surveyor which substantially gives instructions which were given to him.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman might state shortly the plan upon which the survey is to be made.

Mr. SIFTON. The instructions given were as follows:

The Indian holdings as they now exist are to be surveyed and permanently posted, making only such necessary changes as may be required to straighten boundaries and this should not be done without the concurrence of the chief and councillors and the owners of the holdings affected. If any such change is objected to and you think it is very desirable, you should by argument endeavour to remove the objection. Wherever possible the rear boundaries of two or more holdings should be one straight line. For this purpose additions may be made to the holdings.

The present roads should be made as wide as possible up to and not exceeding 66 feet in width. They may be diverted, changed or closed as may be decided on consultation with the agent, chief or councillors. All new road allowances should be 66 feet wide.

That is the plan in substance.

Mr. CLANCY. What provision is there for lands unclaimed ? The hon. gentleman knows that there is a very considerable quantity of land which is neither occupied nor claimed, and when the holdings are surveyed there will, of course, be a considerable quantity of land which is neither occupied nor claimed. The department have no doubt taken into consideration what the effect of the survey under such circumstances will be.

Mr. SIFTON. The instructions further provide that :

After the Indian holdings are surveyed and posted, you should lay out the remainder of the lands in double fronted concessions. The lots should contain 80 acres. The distance therefore across a concession of regular width will be 80 chains and the width of regular lots 20 chains, allowance for side roads should be made where considered advisable ; generally not nearer than every five lots.

An hon. member on the other side of the House, who is not in his place at present, asked me for some information respecting the improvements made by squatters on the Doncaster reserve. I have a statement, which I will lay on the table of the House.

Nova Scotia, salaries, $1,225.

Mr. SPROULE. What are these salaries for ? Are the people who receive them teachers ?

Mr. SIFTON. The Indian agents and their salaries in Nova Scotia are as follows :

John Lacy, Annapolis	$ 50
James Purdy, Digby	50
Chas. E. Beckwith, King's	50
Charles Harlow, Queen's and Lunenburg	100
Rev. Chas. E. McManus, Halifax	50
A. Wallace, Hants	50
Thos. B. Smith, Colchester	50
F. A. Rand, M.D., Cumberland	50
Rev. J. D. McLeod, Pictou	100
John R. McDonald, Antigonish and Guysborough	100
Rev. John Fraser, Richmond	100
D. Macpherson, Inverness	100
A. J. Macdonald, Victoria	100
D. K. McIntyre, M.D., North Sydney	75
W. H. Whelan, Yarmouth	50
R. G. Irwin, Shelburne	50
Rev. D. MacAdam. Sydney, C.B.	75
Total	$1,225

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the duties of these gentlemen ?

Mr. SIFTON. The duties of the agents are to have an oversight over the Indians generally, to provide them with medical attendance and to report to the department anything that requires the attention of the department, as, for instance, special medical attendance, or occasionally they have some work to do in connection with getting wood for the Indians, or providing wood lands or something of that kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have a communication now and then informing me that their lands are being entered upon. I brought two cases before the minister, both in regard to reserves in my own county.

Mr. SIFTON. We have had complaints that the Indians had trespassed on the timber lands of other people, and the opinion of the Justice Department was that the party should be left to their own recourse, and that the government was not liable. That is rather a poor remedy against the Indians, but we have exercised all the persuasion we can to endeavour to prevent it happening.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The complaint I had was that the Indian timber was taken by other people.

Mr. SIFTON. In that case we have no difficulty in finding a remedy for we can seize the timber and make them pay a penalty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Indian chief complained to me in the case I refer to, and on making representation to the department I had a very prompt reply from the minister stating that he would send an officer to investigate it.

Mr. SIFTON. The deputy minister went down there, and it was found that parties were cutting timber on the Indian reserve, and we seized the timber.

Mr. SPROULE. It used to be a very common thing for certain parties to take timber from the Indian reserves. What is the punishment for that?

Mr. SIFTON. The practice is to seize the timber and compel the parties to pay double dues and costs. In cases where timber is valuable and that penalty would not be adequate, we take the timber away from them altogether and proceed for other penalties as well.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the dues for timber on Indian lands?

Mr. SIFTON. It varies as to the kind of timber. The timber seized is required to be put up at public competition. There is a schedule for each kind of timber, but what the details are I do not remember. We charge double dues and costs if we consider they are trespassing.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very inadequate punishment for such an offence. In the case of hemlock for instance the double dues would only amount to $2 or $3 a thousand.

Mr. SIFTON. If a trespasser cuts timber of any value before he is discovered we seize the timber and sell it, and in addition fine him. It may happen that a man who

has lumber alongside the Indian reserve may trespass unintentionally, and we would let him off by charging double dues. If a man knowingly cuts timber which he has no right to, we proceed against him for other penalties.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that it is a common practice to take Indian timber, and that often the department knows nothing about it. The ordinary value of timber is far more than double the dues, so that such a penalty is not adequate.

Mr. SIFTON. The timber on Indian lands is well and carefully protected. Wherever such an offence has occurred full satisfaction has been demanded. I think I may say there is practically no trespass on Indian lands.

Mr. SPROULE. That shows how little the minister knows about it.

Mr. SIFTON. Will the hon. gentleman give me the information ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that men have taken Indian timber in large quantities.

Mr. SIFTON. Where ?

Mr. SPROULE. In the Georgian bay district.

Mr. SIFTON. When?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know the exact date, but it is some years ago.

Mr. SIFTON. Probably when the Conservatives were in office.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but since the present government has come to power, and I am told that persons have come down here to try to settle these cases. I have been told that some people take the Indian timber, pay the penalty, and go back the next year and do the same thing. It is distinctly an injustice to the Indian. It is no punishment to the man who has taken the timber, because after he pays the double dues, he has a very large profit.

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend will specify the time and place that it has taken place, I will have the matter looked up, and will show that he is not correct.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not my place to play the detective.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend has not a right to say that a man is stealing timber from the Indian lands without giving particulars. The same inspector is in the department who was there when I took office. His work is particularly to look after the timber on the Indian reserves, and I am perfectly satisfied that his work is well and carefully done, and I should be very much surprised to find that there has been any loss of timber. I remember one case of trespass on a very valuable limit, but the matter was settled in such a way as to prevent loss taking place.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend says I have no right to say what I did. I have a right to state in this House what is common rumour from reliable sources, and I will exercise that right, regardless of whether it pleases the minister or not. If it were necessary, I could give the names of parties who have done this in the past. I have always held that that punishment was no adequate punishment whatever, and as evidence of that, I cite that fact that the same men have been punished in the same way more than once, and have gone and done the same thing again.

Mr. CLANCY. We have passed from the item concerning the province of Ontario ; but I have been looking over the report which the hon. gentleman sent to me, and I do not find any report upon which the Order in Council of the 22nd of December, 1900, was based. There is the report of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, but I assume that that is based upon some report with regard to the conditions upon the island. Can the minister tell the committee whether he has the report upon which this Order in Council was based, setting out the facts contained in the report of the Superintendent General ?

Mr. SIFTON. I am not aware whether there was a formal report or not. If there is, I will let my hon. friend have it.

Mr. CLANCY. There must have been some report made by somebody connected with the Indian Department. The surveys branch would have nothing to do with that. Can the hon. gentleman call to mind who would likely have made a report of that kind ?

Mr. SIFTON. I cannot remember.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid my hon. friend has had no report.

Mr. SIFTON. What I said was that we proceeded on representations from the lands and surveys branch as to the difficulty of administering the affairs of that reserve without a survey.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman send one of the officers up there to investigate the matter ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not remember.

Indians, N.S.—relief and seed grain, $2,700.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much is relief and how much is seed grain ?

Mr. SIFTON. About one-third is for seed grain and about two-thirds for relief.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many Indians are in Nova Scotia ?

Mr. SIFTON. 1,930.

Indians, N.S.—medical attendance, $3,700.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much was expended last year?

Mr. SIFTON. The expenditures were: in 1900-01, $3,658; in 1901-1902, $3,696; in 1902-1903, $3,542.

Indians, New Brunswick, salaries, $1,308.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In connection with this item I might bring to the attention of the minister a communication from Alexander Prisk, an Indian Chief, bearing date Bathurst, 29th March, 1904. It is as follows:

I am herewith inclosing you a communication I received from Ottawa in reference to fishing privileges belonging to our reserve on the Nipisinquit river. You will note the contents. I know nothing of our fishing privileges on this reserve having been leased for our benefit at a rental of twenty-five dollars a year. If so, I would like to know to whom the money was paid and what was done with it as none of it has been received by us. I would like to know also if we can fish in this or rather in these waters, they having been leased without our knowledge or consent. I would be obliged to you if you would bring this matter up and have an understanding about it for me.

Respectfully yours,
ALEXANDER PRISK,
Chief.

P. O. Chief Alexander Prisk,
Bathurst, Gloucester County, N.B.

Then there is an inclosure as follows:

Ottawa, 23rd March, 1904.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 19th instant regarding the disposition of fishing privileges on the Nipisinquit Indian Reserve, I beg to say that in 1896 the Indians surrendered the fishing privileges on this reserve to be leased for their benefit and under said surrender the department leased the said privileges to Mr. Henry Bishop for a ten year term at an annual rental or $25. The agent of your reserve was fully advised of the granting of the lease.

Your obedient servant,
J. D. McLEAN,
Secretary.

Chief Alexander Prisk,
Bathurst, N. B.

I thought it advisable to allow this matter to stand until the hon. gentleman's estimates came up but I have received another communication asking why I am not doing something about it. I would be glad to receive some information about the matter.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend will see that at page J—149 of the Auditor General's report a credit for the amount received and the particulars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He wants to know what their rights are and whether they still have the right of fishing in those waters.

Mr. SIFTON. I could not speak positively but I think they have surrendered all powers. Under this correspondence they have surrendered the right to fish and unless there was a special reservation in the surrender to keep for themselves the right to fish they cannot fish.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course I cannot expect the minister to give me the particulars at once, but perhaps he would have the officers of his department prepare a little memorandum and send it to me so that I can inform the Indians what the position is.

Mr. SIFTON. The only point would be whether the surrender reserves the right of the Indians themselves to fish.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The chief also seems to know nothing of the surrender. We might have particulars as to how the surrender was accomplished. I do not know the practical details and I would simply like enough information to make it plain to him that the Indians surrendered their rights and that nothing was done unjustly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many Indians are there in New Brunswick?

Mr. SIFTON. 1,699.

Medical attendance and medicines, $3,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems that with very unfailing regularity the medical attendance for the Indians throughout the maritime provinces costs about $2 a head all around, from year to year. It never seems to vary much from that.

Indians, P.E.I., salaries and travelling expenses, $300.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any Indians down there?

Mr. SIFTON. 361.

Mr. SPROULE. You tax them a dollar a head for agents and travelling expenses.

Relief and seed grain, $925.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give an explanation as to how the grain is distributed?

Mr. SIFTON. We have a local agent there and it is practically left to his discretion.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are these Indians farming and if so why do they need seed grain every year?

Mr. SIFTON. The maritime province Indians do not go very extensively into farming.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then why do you call it seed grain if they do not go into farming? This is a large amount of money to spend for seed grain. We have Indians in Ontario, but I do not see anything for the Indians in Ontario.

Mr. SIFTON. If you will look at the head of this page you will see that the Indians of Ontario receive as much as the other Indians.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They are farming now more extensively than ever before but still only to a limited extent. They are building their houses, and cultivating patches for themselves more than ever before.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the policy of the goverment to supply the Indians with seed grain every year? What do they do with the grain which they grow?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They feed their cattle.

Mr. SIFTON. In the case of the maritime province Indians the position of the government is just this. We simply have to exercise a sort of paternal supervision over them, and have to do the best we can in each case as it arises. The agents do their best to induce them to follow such vocations as will enable them to be self-supporting. But, where there is a case of distress, the distribution of seed grain and so on is carried out, and this must be largely at the discretion of the agents. No hard and fast rule can be adopted, and more than a hard and fast rule can be adopted for the relief of distress in Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. The government seem to have some sort of rule, because the same amount is voted every year.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the condition of the Indians there that they should be differently treated from those in the other provinces? This is an old settled province. Have the Indians been taught habits of industry, and have they learned to farm or carry on any other productive labour? What is the reason for this condition on the part of the Indians? It surely cannot be lack of opportunities for employment. Is the difficulty in the administration? There must be something wrong. Perhaps the hon. minister will explain the condition and tell us why these Indians should be distinguished from other Indians under apparently similar circumstances.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). When they put in their little crop they move about from place to place sometimes making butter tubs, sometimes barrels, and so on. Then, when the hay is about fit to be cut, they move back to their little farms. The crop that they raise they feed to their few cattle and horses. I am intimately acquainted with the habits of the Indians in my own county.

Mr. CLANCY. That is hardly an explanation. These people are supposed to be able to sustain themselves. I can understand that, as the Minister of the Interior says, there must be a certain yielding to circumstances, that no hard and fast rule can be laid down. But it seems very strange that these Indians are not to sustain themselves in a province where employment can easily be had.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They never hire out.

Mr. CLANCY. The sooner the hon. gentleman teaches his constituents a lesson in industry the better.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). My constituents work, but not the Indians.

Mr. SIFTON. In the maritime provinces we have about 3,900 Indians altogether. The total appropriation for these three provinces amounts to about $16,000. So, while this may seem a fairly large appropriation for the purpose of giving assistance, we cannot be said to do anything that is to be regarded as supporting the Indians. The government does not assume that duty. We simply give assistance where we think it absolutely necessary. In Ontario the circumstances are somewhat different. Some of the Indian tribes in Ontario have valuable lands and have settled down and become farmers, and are quite independent. But the Indians in Nova Scotia have not taken to farming to the same extent, and, while they do not receive very much more from the government, they do receive some more. I do not think the conditions can be improved at present. The difficulty lies in two things—in the first place the Indians have not land of a character to support them; and in the second place, they are of a roving disposition, and my hon. friend knows that it is utterly impossible, in the case of a tribe that has the habit of roving to induce them to settle down.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. As the Indians have received this for years, does not the hon. Minister think that they will regard it as a perquisite and that, on that account, it will be very hard to take it from them?

Mr. SIFTON. For my part I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière). I think the Indians regard it as he says, and I do not think we are paying more money than we ought to pay.

At six o'clock Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Indians, P.E.I.—relief and seed grain, $925.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like the minister to give us some explanation of how this grain is purchased, what kinds of grain are purchased, and whether, at the close of the year, there is an investigation to find out if the Indians are pursuing the business of grain-growing in a proper way, whether they are improving or remaining at a standstill?

Mr. SIFTON. The seed is purchased locally by the agents. The quantities purchased in any particular place are very small. It

would be inadvisable to buy large quantities, because we do not require large quantities. It is mostly garden seed, seed potatoes, and things of that kind. We get reports from the agents annually as to the condition of the Indians. There is very little change in their condition, it remains about the same as it was twenty years ago. The Indians in the maritime provinces are of a somewhat different class from those of Ontario, they are engaged in different avocations and move about.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any effort on the part of the government to educate the Indians in farming, or is this contribution simply made to keep them alive? Is there any expectation that they will ultimately become self-sustaining in respect to grain-growing?

Mr. SIFTON. We do not carry on any system of farm instruction for these Indians as we do in the Northwest. The Indians understand agriculture fairly well, in a small way, and it would be no benefit to give them farm instruction.

Indians, P.E.I.—medical attendance and medicines, $650.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that item for medical attendance paid to local doctors; and, if so, to how many?

Mr. SIFTON. I can perhaps explain best that matter by referring the hon. gentleman to the explanations that were given in the House last year. In the Auditor General's Report we have a statement of the sums paid to each doctor. To one, $17.50; to another, $76.20; to another, $19.50; to another, $24—it runs along in that way. The work is not sufficient to justify putting them on a salary, and when cases of sickness occur doctors are called in. Their bill is certified by the agent, and if it is found reasonable it is paid. We have a standing difficulty with medical practitioners about the size of their bills, and the department has a good deal of difficulty in keeping the expenditure within limits.

Indians, Manitoba and Northwest Territories, —annuities, $143,475.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I notice a decrease of $1,210 in this item since last year. How many Indians are there now in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories who are in receipt of annuities?

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend will understand that before the payment of an annuity can be made under the treaty, we have a calculation made each year upon the census returns received from the agents, and which vary slightly from year to year. In making up the total on the basis of the returns in our hands, it is this year some $1,200 less than last year. We do not always expend the exact amount that is voted, but we make an estimate upon the basis of the returns which we receive, the money is sent out, and if the number of Indians that are returned by the agents do not appear to be paid, of course the balance unpaid comes back.

Indians, Manitoba and Northwest Territories —implements, tools, harness, hardware, lumber and building material for Indians, $6,700.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the minister explain this item?

Mr. SIFTON. The commissioner gives us a statement of what he requires under each head, whether flour, or bait, or hayforks, anything of that kind, all that goes into the bill. The amount is made up for each agency, and the estimate is based upon that. I have here a list of the sums that are paid in each agency: $50.40, $60.70, $476.75. Take the Clandeboye agency, $50.46, it is made up of such articles as scythe snaiths, scythe stones, grind stones.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are they purchased by tender?

Mr. SIFTON. These small articles are not. For supplies that are purchased in large quantities we advertise annually a list of the articles we require. Then we receive tenders, which set out what each article can be supplied for. Of course, the hon. gentleman will understand that in the case of a large number of these small articles it would be impracticable to purchase by tender; for instance, when a man says in one of his requisitions that he wants harrow teeth, or a trace chain, little miscellaneous things in each agency, that it would be wholly impracticable to purchase by tender and local competition. Large supplies of food are all purchased by tender. These small articles are purchased by the agents at the ordinary current prices.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The purchases are not made all at the same time?

Mr. SIFTON. No. For instance, at Portage-La-Prairie we require this year a hay rake at $35 and a hay fork at $7.26. When we want such articles as these the agent buys them at the ordinary retail price.

Seeds, field and garden, $1,933.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is this an expenditure which changes from year to year?

Mr. SIFTON. It is pretty much the same every year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is an increase of $716. Is that because the farming and gardening operations of the Indians are being conducted on a larger scale?

Mr. SIFTON. In this case we receive from each of the agencies a requisition and of course as the farming operations increase on the part of some of the reserves we require to get an increased amount for seed. I may just give my hon. friend an illustration of the way in which we get these requisitions. We get a requisition, for instance, from the Pelly agency, where they

require 80 bushels of wheat for seed. The agent sends in a requisition based upon the fact that the Indians will have a certain amount of land prepared for crop. There is no way of keeping it at any fixed amount. A requisition will come in one year and it could not by any possibility be the same as a requisition in another year. The commissioner exercises his supervision over the matter and if he thinks the amount asked for is unreasonable he makes a recommendation to the head office and it is finally adjusted.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are the Indians improving in their farming operations, and are they indulging in farming operations to a greater extent each year?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, I think I may say there has been a very great improvement in the last few years. The improvement depends almost entirely on the character of the agent. We have some agents who are extremely successful and some who are not. We have from time to time to change our agents around. We find that one agent is not getting along well with a band, that he is not suited for the work which he has assigned to him and we make a change. We have had to make quite a number of changes recently. The greatest improvement that has been made in connection with the agencies in the Northwest Territories, which are under the charge of Mr. William Graham at the File Hills. He has been in the department for a number of years. He took charge some years ago and he was very successful with the Indians in the File Hills, with the result that the Indians upon that and one or two neighbouring reserves raised 65,000 bushels of wheat. He has been so successful in connection with cattle raising that we are buying a considerable number of heifers which we require for the Indians on the reserves in his inspectorate. We have made him an inspector which will enable him to extend his work to the whole inspectorate. Mr. Markel has lately been promoted to the inspector of the western division and it is hoped that he will be able to bring about a very great improvement in connection with the farming operations of the Indians in Alberta. There the Indians have very fine reserves and great scope for carrying on the business of cattle raising, and it is expected that we will be able in a short time to make them become self supporting as a result of the work that will be carried on under Mr. Markel's supervision. Upon the reserves that have been in charge of Mr. Graham the improvement has been so great that we have ceased to distribute rations to the Indians as was formerly the custom. In Manitoba the improvement is not so marked. The scope for improvement is not so great there. I am not able to speak with the same degree of positiveness as to the improvement there, but in the Territories generally speaking there has been a very considerable improvement.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—live stock, $40,395.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is a very large increase for live stock.

Mr. SIFTON. I will give my hon. friend a statement of the purchases to be made and which are to be paid out of the vote which is asked for here. We require for the Northwest Territories 8 stallions, 14 oxen, 72 bulls, 1,036 heifers. We are estimating for the oxen $50 to $80 per head, bulls $75 to $125 per head, stallions $250 to $350 per head, heifers 27 to 28 per head. As to the stallions two are for the Piegan reserve, two for the Blood, two for the Blackfeet, one for the Duck Lake reserve, and one for the Touchwood Hills reserve. It has been arranged that the stallions shall be bought locally by the agents because we find that range bred stallions are more satisfactory. Of the oxen four are required for Moose Mountain, 6 for Pelly, 1 for Berens river, 1 for Fort Frances, 2 for Clandeboye. Of the bulls we require 4 for the Manitowapah agency, 2 for the Pas, 1 for Birtle, 1 for Assiniboine, 2 for Qu'Appelle, 2 for Touchwood, and 3 for Pelly, 2 for Duck lake, and 2 for Carlton, 2 at Sadie lake, 3 at Edmonton, 2 at Hobbema, 6 for Blackfoot, 30 for Bloods, 10 for Piegan. Of heifers we require 1,136 altogether, 200 for the Piegan, 30 for Blackfeet, 6 for Assiniboine, and 900 for the Blood reserve. The members of the committee will see from the statement I have made that quite a number of cattle are going to the reserves in the Alberta district where we are trying under the department's supervision to get the Indians to engage in cattle raising to such an extent that they will soon become self-supporting. So far as direct dependence on the government is concerned, though a comparatively short time ago they were rather backward, they are improving very much in their temper and spirit. There is great difficulty in getting them to engage in farming operations, but it is hoped that they can be rendered self-supporting by keeping cattle.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who purchases these animals on behalf of the government, and who fixes the prices?

Mr. SIFTON. The prices are fixed by officers of the department, in most cases. I will give my hon. friend, if he likes, a statement showing where they have been purchased; and the prices paid for them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to have that, because I know that many have been supplied by individuals, and unless the matter is thrown open to competition, these gentlemen may get a good deal more for their animals than they are really worth.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend will see that it would be practically impossible to buy

cattle as you would buy tea or coffee, which is bought at so much a pound for a certain specified quality. An animal must be valued according to its worth. The cattle bought in the west were personally inspected by Mr. Markle, who is a good judge of live stock. A considerable number were bought at the Calgary spring sale, where the stock breeders sold the animals by auction. Mr. Markle bought 33 bulls at an average price of $117. That was lower than we paid for the animals bought farther east, taking freight into consideration. He bought six stallions at $160 a piece.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I presume most of these high-priced animals are thoroughbreds ?

Mr. SIFTON. All pedigreed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The object, then, in supplying the Indians with these well-bred animals is to improve their stock, and not merely to increase the number ?

Mr. SIFTON. Both to increase the number and improve the quality.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The reason I desired to know who on behalf of the government made these purchases was this. For instance. I mentioned the other day that a certain gentleman who is now the Liberal candidate in one of the constituencies supplied many animals to the government. As he gets a pretty good price for his stock when sold to private individuals, I presume he would not get less from the government ; and I wanted to know how the government purchased the stock, who inspected them and who fixed the prices.

Mr. SIFTON. Last year we thought we would make an improvement in the method of purchasing by placing Mr. Markle in charge of all the purchases in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is Mr. Markle who used to be at Birtle ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

Indians, Manitoba and Northwest Territories —provisions, clothing, ammunition, twine, medicines and medical attendance for Indians, $173,068.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the hon. minister state how much has been expended under each head ?

Mr. SIFTON. Last year the estimate was $193,472. The great effort this year has been to make a reduction in this estimate, the purpose being to supply a relatively large amount for the purchase of cattle. This item is made up of the following : Food supplies, clothing, ammunition and twine, medicine, medical attendance, hospitals, freighting supplies, and some special amounts aggregating altogether $9,000 or $10,000. The reduction shown refers principally to the supplies of beef and flour on the Sarcee, Stony, Blood and Peigan reserves. The decrease on the Blood reserve is $8,019; on the Blackfoot, $2,940; on the Peigan, $936; on the Sarcee, $987; and on the Stony reserve, $474. The reduction is in pursuance of the attempt to reduce the food supplies to the Indians, and endeavour to make them see the necessity of making themselves self supporting. These supplies are in large quantity and they are all purchased by public tender.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—triennial clothing, $2,698.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are these supplied under treaty ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes ; regular distribution under treaty.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—day, boarding, and industrial schools, $303,292.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I wish to ask the minister if the policy hitherto followed by the government with regard to industrial schools is being changed ? I understand that one of these industrial schools in Manitoba and another one in the Territories, are being closed, and that boarding schools on the reserve are substituted in lieu thereof. Is that a new policy on the part of the government ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have discussed this question of industrial schools in the House several times before, and I stated what my views were. My views have not changed, and the policy of the department is just the same as it was when I explained it on a previous occasion. My own belief is that the system of industrial schools as I found it in operation when I took office, is not the best, or the most effective, or the most economic way of improving the condition of the Indians. I thought the system adopted was an artificial system. I found that Indian boys and girls were being kept in these schools in some cases until they were 23, 24 and 25 years of age. The Dominion of Canada is not under any obligation to conduct a system of education for an Indian tribe, under which the education of each child becomes so expensive and so artificial. I put in force a rule that children were not to remain in the schools after the age of eighteen, and that rule has been followed except in a very few cases where for special reasons it has been relaxed. We have substituted a less elaborate system ; a system of what we call boarding schools where a larger number of children can for a shorter time be educated more economically and generally more effectively. What we desire to do is not to give a highly specialized education to half a dozen out of a large band of Indians, but if possible to distribute over the whole band a moderate amount of education and

intelligence, so that the general status of the band would be raised. While some of those engaged on behalf of the different churches in Indian education, were not of my view at the time, I believe they have pretty well come to that opinion now. I did not think it was justifiable for me to change the policy which had been deliberately entered upon and in regard to which a large amount of money had been expended, so I stated to the House that while on the whole I held that view, I was not prepared to discontinue the industrial schools which existed. I thought I was bound to continue them much on the existing lines, but that the rule should be enforced that pupils should not remain to an advanced age. I held, however, that in the establishment of further institutions, the principle should be followed of conducting a boarding rather than an industrial school system. My hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) is probably aware, that the authorities of St. Boniface industrial school have found that the principle I have advocated was the principle which should be applied in the carrying out their work, because the department accepted a proposition of theirs by which they agreed to take off our hands at a valuation the buildings and the property of the industrial school at St. Boniface, and to build three boarding schools in lieu thereof. They agreed with my opinion that the boarding schools, where a less elaborate and lengthy system of education would be carried on and a larger number of children benefited (these schools being placed at different points upon the reserve) was much more beneficial than the carrying on of one industrial school at St. Boniface. We are carrying on the industrial school which exists at the present time. Our desire is not to multiply them, but to inaugurate boarding schools wherever additional educational facilities are required. Experience shows that in order to get really effective results, the boarding school must be resorted to. In some places where we have day schools, and where we cannot incur the expense of a boarding school, the results are not as satisfactory as we could hope.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do I understand that the boarding schools are as effective as the industrial schools? I would remind the hon. gentleman that the education of the Indians does not merely consist in teaching them to read and write, but that in addition they have to be civilized. In that case if you keep the Indians within their reserve I am afraid the civilization of the Indians will not be attained. I believe that the best way to civilize them is to remove them from their reserves and get them to lead a civilized life at least for a certain length of time. I fear that the civilization of the Indians will not be attained by keeping them on their reserves, removed from the knowledge and influence of civilization. I do not think that the question of cost should be taken into consideration in such a cause, and I fear that we are going back on a system that was found to be good. I see from the last report of the deputy superintendent of Indian Affairs that he proclaimed the system of industrial schools to be far better than the other system on that very account.

Mr. SIFTON. The result of my observation and study in connection with the industrial schools was this, that the attempt to give a highly civilized education to the Indian child, keeping him in a school until he was 22 or 23 years of age and attempting to teach him a trade, was practically a failure. I have no hesitation in saying—we may as well be frank—that the Indian cannot go out from a school, making his own way and compete with the white man. Experience shows that when you give an Indian every possible chance until he is 22 or 23 years of age you cannot afford to turn him loose to look after himself; you will get no satisfactory result, an Indian cannot succeed in competition with other people. That was why the teachers in some of the schools insisted on keeping the pupils after the age when they ought to be sent out. When I asked: Why do you keep these pupils here? The answer was: We did not know what to do with them. If they go out they must either attempt to compete with other people or go back to the reserve. I have no doubt myself that a system between the day school and the industrial school, whereby any child would be taken in at a moderately early age and kept for four or five years of training in the school, is the system under which you will get the best results. I may say that in the inspectorate of Mr. Graham, the Qu'Appelle inspectorate, this system has been inaugurated. Mr. Graham has set apart a portion of the reserve where the pupils from the industrial and boarding schools are encouraged to settle and take up allotments, so that they have practically a separate settlement, one being alongside the other they have a certain amount of encouragement to continue a civilized life. That system has been in operation for a comparatively short time, but Mr. Graham is satisfied it is going to prove successful and I myself am satisfied on general principles that it will probably be the most successful way of bringing about a higher state of civilization amongst them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Might I ask the hon. minister if it is the intention to continue the Elkhorn industrial school and are the trades still being taught to the Indian pupils in that school?

Mr. SIFTON. No change has been made in the Elkhorn school except that we are

trying to cut down the expenses. The expense has been very high, I think unreasonably high, and there has been a contest between the head office and the commissioner in regard to keeping it down. The expense was cut down a little during the past year. My hon. friend will find in the report of the department the following statement :

We are encouraging the boys to take up agriculture, as we feel that this is the most important industry that can be taught them. The boys are instructed in carpentry, painting, bootmaking, baking, farming and gardening. A number are also constantly employed in the general work about the institution, and in keeping the grounds in order.

The girls are taught cooking, housework, laundry work, dressmaking, plain sewing, knitting and crocheting. They perform all the necessary household duties, in all of which they show great aptitude.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I notice an item on page J—71 of the Auditor General's Report :

Legal expenses, T. G. Mathers, Attorney General vs. Garrison.

I do not ask for an explanation of this item for legal expenses on account of the amount, which is very small, but I would like to know the cause of that legal expense being incurred. Was it in connection with the case which I brought to the attention of the minister a few years ago where Garrison had purchased a printing plant from the industrial school and sold it to a fellow-Liberal for the purpose of conducting a Liberal newspaper in the constituency of Brandon, and, having received his money, did not pay the government the original purchase money ?

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend I am afraid is responsible in a way for the item.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I hope so.

Mr. SIFTON. He brought to my attention the fact that a printing press had been sold and not paid for. I gave directions to have proceedings taken to recover the amount and this is the expense of suing Garrison. We found, however, that he was not worth anything, and we got nothing.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have you anything else beside the judgment ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have you the cash ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is a remarkable statement. Several years ago I brought this to the attention of the minister. When the printing trade was being done away with in the industrial school a printing plant was left on the hands of the government. A Mr. Thompson desired to lease this plant from the government for the purpose of conducting a paper. He had many advertisements contracted for by the tradesmen of the town and the government agent there leased the plant to Mr. Thompson with the stipulation that he could cancel the contract by giving six months' notice. Thompson, however, was to have the first option of purchase. In a few months Thompson was notified by the Indian commissioner that at the end of six months his contract would cease. He desired to purchase the plant, but the government refused to sell it and it turned out that the reason was they had arranged with Garrison, the editor of a Liberal paper in Virden, to take over this plant. Garrison purchased the plant from the government, but he sold it to another gentleman, Mr. Wildman, who is now using it in the publication of the Griswold 'Ledger,' in the hon. gentleman's own constituency. Wildman paid Garrison, but Garrison has not paid the government to this day. I brought this matter to the attention of the government on several occasions and two or three years ago the acting minister (Mr. Sutherland) promised to investigate the case. I do not know if he has done so, but it seems strange if an investigation has not been held. The attention of the government has been drawn to this thing several years in succession, but the furthest advance they have made to the present day is the expenditure of $21 for legal expenses to get judgment against the man who sold the plant and pocketed the proceeds. It is, I say, a remarkable statement and it seems strange that Garrison, who has been running a paper in the interests of the hon. gentleman in the town of Virden, is not worth the few hundred dollars for which he sold that plant. It is a direct loss to the government. The judgment, I am sure, will not put anything in the treasury and I think the government are deserving of severe condemnation for the very great laxity they have exhibited in connection with the collection of this money, especially since they erred in the first place in refusing to Thompson the opportunity to purchase the plant when he was willing to pay for it. I would like some explanation from the minister.

Mr. SIFTON. The first time the hon. gentleman brought the matter up I promised an inquiry, and I think I brought the correspondence down several years ago. My hon. friend will remember that the late Indian commissioner, desiring to close up the office, gave instructions to have the press sold. It was sold to this man, Mr. Garrison, The first time my hon. friend called my attention to it I said no proceedings were taken, but when he called my attention to it again I found that proceedings had been taken, and we got a judgment. The stock

did not realize the amount, and consequently we had to collect the money.

Mr. CLARKE. Could'nt you get the press back?

Mr. SIFTON. The press disappeared.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The press has gone into another town where it is published in the interests of the hon. minister, so he has now the privilege of having two papers supporting him at the expense of the public treasury. When Mr. Thompson asked the Indian commissioner why he was not permitted to purchase the printing press, the Indian commissioner put all the onus on the minister, and said his instructions were from headquarters to sell the plant to Mr. Garrison, not to lease it to Mr. Thompson. When I brought the matter up in the House a few session ago, the minister put the onus back on the Indian commissioner. I think the minister is the guilty party.

Mr. SIFTON. Whatever my course may have been in relation to the matter I am prepared to take the responsibility.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—surveys, $7,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I desire to ask for an explanation in reference to the Crooked Lake Reserve. I asked the minister a few weeks ago if it was the intention of the government to throw that open to settlement in the near future, but his reply was not a definite one. The reason I am asking for a definite reply is because representations have been made to the settlers, residents and intending locators in that portion of the country, that this reserve, or a portion of it, will be opened in the near future, and the people there are very anxious to know whether it is the intention of the government to throw that open.

Mr. SIFTON. I understand the question covers the lease that lies north of the town of Broadview. The people there represented that they were desirous that a portion of the territory north of the town should be opened to settlement. The officers of the department have been for some years past desirous of procuring the consent of the Indians to the opening of a portion of that reserve, not the whole of it, perhaps a third or a quarter of it. We have not yet formally submitted the question to them, because as my hon. friend will know, if you submit the question of the surrender of their land to an Indian band they will vote against it, and it will be impossible to get them to agree to it after that. They probably consider that it is a point of honour with them to stick to the decision that they have taken. It is therefore extremely imprudent to submit a question of that kind to them unless you feel sure that you are likely to get a favourable decision. In this particular case the officers at Winnipeg have instructions to take such steps as may be deemed desirable. The agent is moving in that direction, and will ask for their consent just as soon as he has reason to expect a favourable conclusion. We have in that case, and one or two others, a statement of the disadvantages under which the towns are labouring from a portion of the surrounding country being practically uninhabited Indian reserve. I understand it is very desirable to get a settlement if it can be obtained.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I understand the government have adopted a policy whereby all these little patches of land known as reserves may be thrown open, in the more settled parts of the province of Manitoba and the Territories and an equivalent found elsewhere. They are an impediment to colonization, and are not in the best interests of the Indians themselves. It is not desirable that the Indians should live in the midst of a settlement, because they will not improve, and they will contract all the bad habits that are practiced by their neighbours. In fact I see by reports here from all these small reserves near ordinary settlements that complaints are made by the agents that cases of intoxication from the use of liquor are becoming much more numerous among the Indians. But a step in the right direction has been taken with respect to the Indian reserve at Roseau River. A portion of the reserve has been thrown open for settlement. I see it stated that the land was sold at public auction, and it realized somewhere in the neighbourhood of $13 per acre. It is valuable land for settlers, but useless for the Indians because they do not cultivate it. If the balance of the Indians at Roseau River were removed and the rest of the reservation thrown open for settlement, it would be in the best interest of the country and of the Indians themselves. I see by the report of last year, that of $99,000 realized from the sale of that portion of the Indian reserve at Roseau one-tenth has been spent and applied in the interest of the Indians themselves. I do not know that there are any records of that expenditure, but I would like to know what was bought with the money.

Mr. SIFTON. Just a word with regard to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) says as to the general question of policy. Whatever may be deemed desirable or otherwise, the fact of the matter is that the Indians own these lands just as much as my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) owns any piece of land for which he has a title in fee simple. The faith of the government of Canada is pledged to the maintenance of the title of these Indians in that land. Under the arrangement that we have made with them, our faith is pledged that we will not disturb them in the occupation of the land which has been reserved for them, except upon

their own consent being given in a specified form. We follow the policy of getting the consent wherever we can when we think it will not interfere with the means of the livelihood of the Indians; for we realize, as my hon. friend does, that it would be to the interest of the Indians that the land should be thrown open for settlement and sold, and that they should be paid the interest on the proceeds rather than keep the land while putting it to no use. But my hon. friend recognizes the fact that we have to proceed in a diplomatic way and get the Indians to surrender their lands when they are willing to do so. The officers of the department, having constant dealings with the Indians, know how far it is safe to go in each particular case. In the case to which my hon. friend refers, that of the Roseau reserve, after urgent requests had been made by the settlers, with some difficulty the inspector, Mr. Marlatt, I think it was, secured the consent of the Indians to sell a portion of that reserve. Under the law, the Indians are entitled to be paid in cash ten per cent of the proceeds of the land sold for distribution among themselves. I presume that the original intention of putting that in the statute was to offer a sort of inducement to the Indians to sell, for the Indian, like some whitemen, has a fairly good appreciation of cash in hand, and the fact that they were going to secure something might be an inducement to them to surrender, when possibly they would not surrender if they were not going to get something immediately. The rest of the money goes to the fund held for their purposes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Was that distribution of ten per cent made in money or in kind?

Mr. SIFTON. Part of the money was paid, the accountant tells me, in cash and the balance in goods, which were purchased by Mr. Marlatt at their request. And Mr. Marlatt makes a report, which will appear in detail in the Auditor General's Report.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—Sioux, $5,659.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the explanation of that item?

Mr. SIFTON. The Sioux Indians are at the Birtle agency, Assiniboine agency, Qu'Appelle agency, Carlton agency, and a few in the Portage la Prairie agency.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has there been any treaty with the Sioux Indians?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not think so. They have not been recognized as Canadian Indians. These are the Indians, or the descendents of the Indians, who came over from the United States at the time of the Minnesota massacre. They are not recognized as Canadian Indians, but the government thought at the time that, rather than have them in a discontented state, while not paying them annuities, and while no treaty obligations exist, it would be well to set apart reserves for them, appoint agents and furnish certain small supplies to enable them to get along. There about 600 of them altogether.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—Mills, saw and grist, $4,327.

Mr. SIFTON. There is an increase here of $2,065. This includes the establishment of a saw-mill at Pas agency and a contribution for a saw-mill at the Norway House agency. These mills are for the purpose of cutting lumber, and are operated by the Indians themselves.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Do they cut timber on the reserve?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, where there is timber available on the reserve; but where there is no timber on the reserve, I give them a permit to cut on Dominion lands.

Mr. WILSON. Is this merely to pay for the building of the mills, or is it to pay for their operation?

Mr. SIFTON. At the Pas agency we give $1,800 for a saw-mill, consisting of a 25-horse-power engine, with shafting, belting and all the necessary outfit.

Mr. WILSON. For the mill alone?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes. Then we make a contribution of $1,000 for establishing a mill at Norway House. The Indians themselves will pay the rest.

Mr. WILSON. What will the one at Norway House cost altogether?

Mr. SIFTON. As it is a long way to Norway House it may be a little expensive—$2,000 or $2,200 delivered there. The Indians at Norway House are outside the treaty limits, but they are fairly well advanced. They are pretty well civilized—as much so, perhaps, as any other Indians in Manitoba. The rest of the vote consists of small items for repairs and supplies in connection with the mills we have at the other agencies.

Mr. WILSON. How many mills are there altogether?

Mr. SIFTON. Ten altogether.

Mr. WILSON. Are they all sawmills?

Mr. SIFTON. There are three sawmills and six combined saw and grist mills and one grist mill.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories—general expenses and management, $166,852.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is the increased estimate this year owing to the increased cost of managment resulting from an increase in salaries and other expenses in connection with the management, or what particularly constitutes the increase in the estimates?

Mr. SIFTON. The total increase is $7,561. There are the following increases in salaries in the commissioner's office : Mr. McKenna, from $2,400 to $2,600 and Mr. Paget, from $1,700 to $1,800. That vote will not be required at all. These estimates were made up last fall. The main estimates are made up before the beginning of the new year. I have since decided to remove Mr. Paget to the inside service and a special vote will have to be taken in the supplementary estimates for his salary. Mr. Lash is increased from $1,700 to $1,900, Mr. Betournay from $1,200 to $1,250, Mr. Jean from $1,000 to $1,100, Mr. Richardson from $900 to $950 and a stenographer from $480 to $550. The increases amounting to $770 altogether. In treaty No. 8 we have an inspector named Mr. H. A. Conroy.—Treaty No. 8, the last treaty that was made and comprising the Indians away north in the district of Slave Lake. Mr. Conroy is the inspector in charge of that inspectorate and takes out the money to pay the annuity payments that are made and makes an annual trip for that purpose. We are increasing his pay from $1,800 to $2,000. Then we are putting up buildings at Norway House agency costing $4,000. On the Pelly agency we are increasing the farmer's salary from $600 to $660, appointing a farmer at Cote's reserve at $600 and putting up new agency buildings costing $4,000, the increase at the Pelly agency being $4,660. At the Crooked Lake agency we are increasing the farmer's salary from $600 to $660. At the Saddle Lake agency we are increasing the farmer's salary from $540 to $600, at Edmonton from $480 to $540, at the Stony agency we are increasing the agents salary from $900 to $1,000, the Sarcee agency we are increasing the agent's salary from $1,000 to $1,100, at the Blackfeet agency we are increasing the farmer's salary from $600 to $660, these increases totalling altogether $10,170. There are items in the estimates of last year amounting to $2,609, which are not required and this makes the net increase $7,561.

Mr. CLARKE. When the item of 'schools, day, boarding and industrial,' was up, I intended to ask the hon. minister as to the percentage of Indian children that pass through the Indian schools who retain the veneer of civilization which they receive there ? I visited the Indian school at Brandon, was very much interested in the work, and would like to know from the hon. minister if these children after passing through the school are sent back to the reservation, and if so how many of them lapse again ? How many of them retain the polish they get in the schools, and what becomes of them?

Mr. SIFTON. I could not off-hand give the hon. gentleman the exact statistics.

Mr. CLARKE. I just want the hon. gentleman to state generally.

Mr. SIFTON. Speaking generally the result has been that the pupils of the industrial schools have not been able to go out in ordinary life and compete with white men. I have stated my opinion as to what was the result and what was likely to be the result of this form of Indian education. I am perfectly satisfied that you cannot take the child of the ordinary prairie Indian, put him in the industrial school, keep him there until he is twenty-one years of age and turn him loose to make his living amongst white men. He has not the physical, mental or moral get-up to enable him to compete. He cannot do it. The result has been that to a large extent the Indians who have been educated in this way have gone back to the reserves. I do not think that this work has been in any way lost because I can say to my hon. friend from my own knowledge, having lived in the Northwest since 1876, that there is the most marvellous change in the general character of the Indian bands.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that the result of the infusion of educated civilized Indians into the reservation ?

Mr. SIFTON. I think that is very largely the result of the educational work that is being carried on. I think we have got less per dollar from the money we have expended in the industrial schools than we have from any of the other schools. I believe in the day and boarding schools. We have got a great deal more for the money which has been expended on these schools. While we have not educated them to such a high point, we have infused a great amount of education amongst a larger number. A very promising experiment is being made by Mr. Graham, the inspector of the Qu'Appelle agencies, who has been most successful in bringing about a better state of affairs amongst the Indians under his charge. He has made good practical farmers out of them ; they raised 65,000 bushels of wheat last year ; we are buying cattle from them for supplying other reserves ; they are most successful, and we have ceased the distribution of supplies amongst them. Mr. Graham has adopted this plan : He has set aside locations on certain portions of the reserve, and he encourages the young men and the young women who come from the schools to marry and settle down upon these locations. He endeavours to see that they are not interfered with by the rest of the Indians. As a matter of practice, one of the most serious difficulties in improving an Indian band is that just as soon as an Indian couple show an inclination to thrift and gather a little property around them, all their Indian relations think it is not necessary for them to work just in proportion as this couple is prosperous. Their relations

take their supplies, and consequently they have no encouragement to accumulate property. Mr. Graham has been most successful in this experiment. A few years ago I put him in charge of three different agencies and lately I have promoted him to be inspector, so that he has a larger scope for his activity. I believe Mr. Graham will solve the problem if it can be solved, and he will solve it by endeavouring to promote settlement in a separate locality of those who come from the schools, and where they can have as much higher type of civilized life than they could if they settled amongst the other Indians.

Indians, British Columbia—salaries, $21,540.

Mr. EARLE. There is an increase of $500 here over the vote of last year.

Mr. SIFTON. That is explained by an increase of $300 in the salary of Mr. W. MacLaughlan, senior clerk in the commissioner's office in Victoria, and an increase of $200 in the salary of Mr. Stevens, of the same office. These increases are made upon the report of Mr. Vowell, the superintendent. Mr. MacLaughlan was appointed in 1891 and Mr. Stevens in 1900.

Indians, British Columbia—relief, $8,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the cause of the increase of $3,500 in this vote ?

Mr. SIFTON. Mr. Vowell, the superintendent, reports that the vote in previous years did not cover the expenditure, and that this amount more approximates the outlay. Mr. Vowell says that although every effort is made by the agencies to curtail the expenditure, yet many sick and helpless Indians, without friends and relatives, would be in a very bad state if it were not for the kindly interest taken in their welfare by the department. The fact is that in a province like British Columbia, when population advances we come more into touch with the Indian tribes at different places, and our officers become cognizant of cases of distress that did not come under their attention before.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are the British Columbia Indians increasing in number ?

Mr. SIFTON. The number is practically stationary.

Indians, British Columbia—day schools, $10,000.

Mr. EARLE. How many of these schools are there ?

Mr. SIFTON. Thirty-three.

Indians—industrial and boarding schools, $78,550.

Mr. EARLE. How many of these schools are there in British Columbia ?

Mr. SIFTON. Seventeen.

Mr. EARLE. What is the explanation of the reduction of $3,100 in this vote ?

Mr. SIFTON. Last year we voted several sums for building and repairs at some of the schools, and we do not require that vote again this year. We have this year increased the allowance for the Indian boys and girls at Metlakatla, Port Simpson and Alberni, and the increase deducted from the decrease leaves the reduction $3,100.

Indians, British Columbia—travelling expenses, $5,600.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. For whom is this expense incurred ?

Mr. SIFTON. It covers the travelling expenses of all the agents and the superintendent of the staff. There is no separate appropriation for each agent.

Indians—British Columbia—office and miscellaneous (including hospitals, irrigation, dyking and suppression of liquour traffic), $14,620.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the cause of the increase ?

Mr. SIFTON. This is made up as follows : Contingencies, and unforeseen expenses in connection with the Indian office at Victoria, $2,600 ; grants to hospitals, $2,500 ; to provide for the prevention of the sale of intoxicants to Indians and the punishment of offenders, $1,500 ; to provide for dyking and irrigation of land, $5,000 ; for agent's residence at Hazelton, Babine Indian agency, $5,000. The item of contingencies is intended to cover all contingencies at the Indian office at Victoria and the different agencies, such as repairs, light, rent, fuel, &c. In addition to the office at Victoria, there are nine agencies. The amount is not more than sufficient to meet the requirements. It is the same as that of last year. The item for hospitals explains itself. The number of patients treated during the year was : at Lytton, 298 ; at Port Simpson, 70 ; in the case of the others, the details are not given. The vote for dyking and irrigation is taken for the purpose of enabling the agents to undertake small works of that character where they are necessary in order to enable the agents to engage in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. EARLE. Where is it proposed to carry on the irrigation and dyking ?

Mr. SIFTON. My officers tell me that this vote of $5,000 is taken from year to year. There are no definite plans for the work of this year. The work done last year was at Cowichan on the Cowichan river, amounting to about $500.

Mr. WILSON. We ought to have an explanation of the kind of work done, and why the vote is taken every year and not expended.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend is perfectly right. I overlooked the fact that there was not a detailed statement of the work re-

quired to be done with this vote. I have no objection to the committee reducing it, though perhaps it had better be allowed to stand. It can only be expended on such a requisition as we had before from the superintendent showing the necessity of the work. I will see that it is overhauled next year, and that we have a detailed statement of what is required.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the minister if any progress has been made in the removal of the Indians from the Songhee reserve.

Mr. SIFTON. Not a bit. We are not a particle further than we were before. When I last spoke about it in this House my hon. friend will remember that I went to an enormous amount of trouble and a good deal of expense to get the matter in to shape, and we were in a position to make a bargain with the Indians, but unfortunately we could not come to terms with the then local government. The local government at the last moment set up a claim which made it impossible for us to carry out the arrangement. I am quite prepared at the present moment to carry out the proposition I made then, but unless the local authorities are willing to co-operate with us we are unable to act. I am quite prepared to instruct the officers to go on and carry out the proposition made then, but unless they co-operate we cannot do that. I am satisfied that if the local government would join in the proposition I made some years ago it could be carried out.

Mr. EARLE. I noticed some time ago that the local government had taken steps to select a site for the Indians and that there was a possibility of the matter being settled.

Mr. SIFTON. They have not given us any advice as to that.

Indians—Yukon—relief and medical attendance, $8,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is an increase of $3,000.

Mr. SIFTON. The number of Indians actually located in the Yukon Territory is estimated at 702. The expenditure for destitute Indians for 1902-3 was $6,118.40, but accounts remaining unpaid on the 30th of June would bring this to over $8,000. I may say that we have no Indian service in the Yukon and we simply spend this money under the direction of the commissioner of the territory. In connection with the vote of $5,000 to provide education for the Indians of the Yukon, I may say that last year we spent under this head $2,029.66. The department has not established any per capita rate for boarding schools or day schools within the territory, but last year gave a total grant in consideration of certain educational work being done in the district. The work is principally carried out by the Church of England at Forty-Mile, Caribou Crossing, Selkirk and Moosehide. The number of pupils enrolled at these schools is 100. The most important school is at Forty-Mile and is a combination of day and boarding school. We have not put up any buildings, but simply give the Church of England a small grant for this work.

Indians generally, P. H. Bryce, medical inspector, part of salary, $1,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This item requires explanation.

Mr. SIFTON. The increase is caused by the appointment of Dr. Bryce, late secretary of the Ontario Provincial Board of Health. I have appointed him as chief medical inspector of the Department of the Interior and Indian Affairs. A portion of his salary, $2,200, is charged to the department of the Interior, and $1,000 to the Department of Indian Affairs. The intention is that his time shall be divided between the two departments, and this $1,000 is therefore charged against the Department of Indian Affairs for the time he devotes to its service. The intention is that Dr. Bryce shall take a tour of inspection and endeavour to improve the medical attendance and the sanitary arrangements on the various Indian reserves. Hon. gentlemen who have taken any interest in the discussion of Indians affairs from year to year, particularly in the discussion of medical attendance on Indian reserves, must have observed that this question came up repeatedly. It was largely in consequence of these discussions and the opinions I formed upon them that I decided to endeavour to bring about some improvement in that direction. While we have an efficient service as far as medical attendance is concerned, there was a lack of supervision by a medical authority; the only supervision that was possible heretofore was given by officers in the department who are not medical men and therefore I thought it was desirable that we should have a medical man to make visits of inspection and report all necessary improvements. I appointed Dr. Bryce after a good deal of consideration, and I have no doubt from the experience we have already had with him that he is a very efficient officer. I am sorry to say that up to the present time, he has not had very much time for the Indian Department. This of course is the busy season with the Immigration Department, and as he has had to reorganize a system of thorough medical inspection of the immigrants of whom we are receiving a very large number, his time has been fully occupied. However, after the busy season in connection with immigration is over, he will devote some months to im-

proving the medical service on Indian reserves. The item of $1,000 for salary is, for a portion of his salary and the increase of $1,000 in the next item in connection with travelling expenses is to pay for his travelling expenses.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will not cure the infirmity of his appointments by the appointment of Dr. Bryce. The hon. gentleman has been a long time in his department and he knows the Indian character very well. He knows perfectly well that nothing disturbes matters upon a reserve so much as a change of physicians. It takes the Indians a long time to become acquainted with their physician, but if they once have confidence in him then they will call upon him. If they have not that confidence they will allow their children and wives to remain without any medical assistance.

Now, the hon. gentleman has been making changes in some of the reservations, and appointing men on purely party grounds. I am very sorry to learn that party spirit has gone so far that the hon. minister feels bound to yield to the pressure brought to bear on him and to make these undesirable changes. I am personally aware that some of these changes are not in the interest of the Indians. Without offering criticism on the appointment of Dr. Bryce, I can scarcely see how he is going to remedy the difficulty the hon. minister refers to. I take the case of the appointment at Walpole Island. Dr. Mitchell was the medical attendant there. But I believe he was guilty of being a Conservative, and that was sufficient reason, in the opinion of the hon. minister, why he should be decapitated, and the hon. gentleman did not hesitate at the operation. Another gentleman was put in the position, a gentleman against whom nothing can be said. But the change meant that the Indians went on employing the physician they had been accustomed to employ. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) would cease dismissing Conservative physicians he would not find it necessary to try this new remedy of his under Dr. Bryce. I would like to know in what particular he expects that Dr. Bryce will be able to overcome the difficulty that the minister himself has created. The hon. minister tells us that there is a good service. If he is convinced of that, why Dr. Bryce? It would look a little as if the additional $1,000 for Indians is a pretext, rather than a reason, for giving Dr. Bryce an addition to his salary. It is a rather ingenious thing to divide that salary between the Indians and immigration, especially when the hon. minister tells us that Dr. Bryce cannot attend to one of them, to say nothing of giving attention to both.

Mr. SIFTON. The appointment to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) principally refers to was made a good many years ago——

Mr. CLANCY. Not so many.

Mr. SIFTON. Well, six or seven years ago, and the Indians have had time, since then, to apply my hon. friend's theory and become acquainted with their doctor. I will not go into a lengthy discussion of the case, because my hon. friend and I have had it out already several times in this House. Leaving that aside, I think my hon. friend will admit that there is room for a considerable amount of systematic work in the way of improving the sanitary conditions on the Indian reserves. The question was brought up frequently in this House, especially last year in connection with the Brantford reserve. After that discussion I secured the services of Dr. Bryce, who was not then an officer of the department, to investigate and make recommendations as to what should be done. After considering his report and going into the matter with my officers, I came to the conclusion that we could well afford to incur the additional expense involved in engaging a competent medical inspector, who would take hold of these questions, look at them from a scientific standpoint and, with the assistance of local physicians, make regulations and provide instruction for the Indian councils. For, in many cases the councils of the Indian bands would be perfectly willing to make sanitary regulations and, to a certain extent, appreciate and carry them out. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) shakes his head. Upon this very Brantford reserve they have a board of health amongst the Indians, and they have sanitary regulations which the Indians endeavour to carry out. But it is largely by reason of the fact that there is no competent superior officer to point out the difficulties and the means of remedying them, and also to give direction and encouragement, that better work is not done. I am satisfied that, in the course of three or four years—of course, it must be a matter of time—the difficulties I refer to would be fairly well overcome. With a competent man undertaking it—and we have the right man in Dr. Bryce—we shall make satisfactory improvement.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) says the matter to which I referred has been pretty well threshed out. It is not so very long ago that this change of appointment was made, but I must say it was carried out at the very first opportunity that offered for work of that kind. I have been waiting for six years for the hon. gentleman to offer either an apology or a reason for what he did, but up to this time I have not had either. As to the sanitary condition, that is a thing much to be desired. But the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that, while you may have a board of health, it will do no good if it is a board of health only in name. It is a very difficult matter to enforce any sanitary regulations on Indian reserves. I am well persuaded that, no

matter how laudable the hon. gentleman's object may be, he will find himself entirely helpless in the enforcement of any sanitary regulation. Those who know the Indians and their condition, realize that long after the hon. gentleman has ceased to do work in the department, there will be little change in the condition of the Indians in that direction. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would be able to give us some more practical reason for employing Dr. Bryce—a very estimable gentleman, I may say, but that fact alone does not justify him in being placed in a service where no substantial good can be shown as likely to arise from it. Men who have some knowledge of the Indian character will expect but little to come from the scheme that the hon. gentleman has outlined. I suppose that the only thing that we can do is to assume that the hon. minister has been more upright in this than he was in the dismissal of the Tory doctors in the past.

Mr. WILSON. I see that $1,000 of Dr. Bryce's salary is charged to the Indian Department and the balance to the Interior. I see also that $1,000 is allowed here, in the Indian votes, for travelling expenses. How much will be charged against the Interior for travelling expenses ?

Mr. SIFTON. Dr. Bryce's salary will be $3,200, of which $2,200 will be charged to the Interior and $1,000 to Indians. There will be no fixed charge for travelling expense to the immigration branch—travelling expenses will be paid out of the general vote.

Mr. WILSON. You pay in travelling expenses from the Indian Department $1,000 and the balance, whatever it may be, from the Interior ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have not made myself clear. The salary is $3,200, of which we charge $1,000 to the Indian Department, because, roughly speaking, it is expected that about one-third of Dr. Bryce's time will be given to the Indians. The vote of $1,000 is taken for travelling expenses. Against this vote we charge travelling expenses, whatever they may be, in the Indian Department. If he is doing Indian work his expenses will be charged to that vote.

Mr. WILSON. And if they are more, they will be charged to the department.

Mr. SIFTON. If they are more they cannot be paid, because we won't have the money. Whenever he goes away on a trip, as he constantly does go to seaport towns, his travelling expenses are paid out of the general immigration vote.

Mr. WILSON. When the immigration matter comes up I hope the minister will be able to give us more reasons why the immigration requirements are put into a bulk vote, while the details are given in the other estimates. My own impression is that the immigration vote should be separated into details as well as the other votes.

Indians—New Brunswick—additional amount required, $1,200.

Mr. SIFTON. This is the only supplementary item that is required, and is to pay expenses incurred last year. It arises from an outbreak of small-pox that occurred in the summer of 1903 in the town of Woodstock and the county of Carleton, twenty-eight cases in all.

Mr. SCOTT. Before we leave the subject of Indians, there is a matter that I wish to bring before the attention of the committee. It may be remembered that at an early stage of this session I essayed to discuss the claim of a gentleman named Jean Louis Legaré, of Willow Bunch, who more than twenty years ago was instrumental, at the time following General Custer's war with the Indians in the American Northwest, in inducing Sitting Bull and his Indian band to leave Canadian territory and to surrender to the United States authorities. At that time I was not permitted to make a full explanation, nor do I intend to-night to deal with this matter except in the shortest possible way. Certain of the facts in connection with this matter are indisputable. It is an admitted fact that Mr. Legaré was the person instrumental in inducing Sitting Bull and his band of Indians to leave Canadian territory and go back to the United States and surrender to the United States authorities. Mr. Legaré did this at large expense to himself, with much loss of time, but chiefly in the loss of a whole year's trading supplies. He was at that time a trader at the Wood Mountain mounted police post, about 100 miles south of Moose Jaw.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was his object in acting as he did ?

Mr. SCOTT. He was a trader in that neighbourhood, and a large number of turbulent Indians came into Mr. Legaré's neighbourhood. Originally, I suppose his object was self protection, and his interest in the other people in that neighbourhood. At all events the Indians ate up all his year's supplies, and later on, at the instance I believe, partly of the agents of the Canadian government and more largely at the instance of the agents of the United States government, Mr. Legaré, proceeded with his efforts to induce Sitting Bull to go back to the United States, and finally he was successful. He alleges that his losses in time and supplies were in the neighbourhood of $46,000. The only payment so far as I know that he has ever received, was $2,000 which the Canadian government voted him shortly after, not by way of indemnity or compensation, but merely as a recognition of the service which he had rendered, not alone to the United States government, but to the government of Canada. He filed a claim against

the United States government amounting I think to about $46,000. He filed this claim 20 years ago, and last year the estimates presented to the Congress in Washington included an item of $8,000 for Mr. Legaré in satisfaction of that claim. It was only during this last session of Congress that the item was voted. The latest information I have, which came to me about six weeks ago or two months ago, was to the effect that up to that time Mr. Legaré had received no part of the $8,000 voted by Congress, and when we remember that legal agents had been in charge of the matter for so many years, the probability is that none of the money, or at least a very small portion of it, will ever reach Mr. Legaré.

That I may say, will explain why this matter is brought up here more than twenty years after the event. Up to the present time it was hoped by Mr. Legaré and his friends that the United States government would do what was proper in the way of satisfying his claim. But now he and his friends are aware of what is to be done or not done by the United States government and the fact remains that he is to be left without any substantial satisfaction as far as the United States government is concerned. About twenty years ago, in addition to the $2,000 voted by this parliament as a recognition of Mr. Legaré's services, it was intimated to him, not officially, but by men prominent in connection with the government at that time that an additional consideration would be given him in the way of a grant of a township of land. What I am going to suggest to the committee now is, that, even at this late date, now that the government and parliament know that Mr. Legaré is obtaining practically no satisfaction from the government of the United States in regard to his claim of $46,000, in view of the fact that it was promised to him even though unofficially about twenty years ago that in addition to the $2,000 that was voted to him as a recognition of his services a township of land would also be granted to him and in view of the fact that this township of land was never granted to him, the people and the parliament of this country ought to do justice to themselves as well as justice to this citizen who at that time rendered what was undoubtedly a very great service to the country at great risk and loss to himself by carrying out the promise made to him unofficially twenty years ago and giving him a grant of a township of land.

Mr. SIFTON. I do not want to pass my hon. friend's remarks over without the courtesy of a reply, but I simply want to refer my hon. friend to the fact that he has already urged these considerations upon me a very great number of times and that heretofore I have not seen my way clear to do anything in the direction which he suggests. It has been intimated that our friends are desirous of adjourning early on account of the sultry weather and if the item of civil government is passed we will adjourn.

Civil Government—Department of the Interior—salaries, including C. H. Beddoe, $2,300; F. S. Checkley, $2,000 and J. B. Bollard, $1,200, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $137,056.50.

Mr. SIFTON. The explanation of the increases is as follows:

	Increase.
Promotion of F. S. Checkley to a chief clerkship at $2,000 from the 1st class, at $1,850	$ 150
Increase to accountant, Mr. Beddoe, in addition to statutory increase	100
Promotion of Mr. A. Chisholm to 1st class	50
Promotion of P. Marchand, in addition to statutory increase	200
Promotion of Mr. G. P. Pope, in addition to statutory increase	250
Appointment of J. D. Bollard to 2nd class	1,200

Then there are the appointments of five temporary clerks to the third class who are entitled under the Civil Service Act of last year to be transferred from the temporary to the permanent list. This does not increase the staff but places these clerks under this vote. They are as follows:

Miss E. N. H. Mercer	$642 50
Mrs. A. Macmaster	600 00
Miss M. Casey	600 00
T. W. Hodgins	557 50
J. M. Larkin	512 50
	$2,912 50

Appointment of one additional junior 2nd class clerk, A. Masson, $800.

Then there are the following statutory increments:

Chief clerks: 3 at $50, 3 at $25	$ 225
Technical officers, 2 at $50	100
1st class clerks: 8 at $50, 4 at $25	500
2nd class clerks: 16 at $50, 13 at $25	1,125
Junior 2nd class clerks: 28 at $50, 1 at $37.50, 13 at $25, 3 at $12.50	1,800
Messengers, 2 at $50	100
Total	$3,850

These increases total altogether $9,512.50. Then, there are the following decreases:

Difference between salary of Mr. C. J. Steers, promoted to 1st class at $1,500, and salary of Mr. F. Clayton, deceased.	$300
Difference between salary of Mr. Connelly, promoted to 2nd class at $1,200, and salary of Mr. C. C. Rogers, deceased	200
Difference between salary of Mr. Surtees, promoted to 2nd class at $1,200, vice Mr. Steers, promoted	150
Difference between salary of Mr. Robt. Addison, to be appointed to junior 2nd class at $800, vice Mr. Connelly, promoted	150
Total decreases	$800

This makes the net increase $8,712.50. The total vote of last year was $121,691.50. The increase which takes place consequent upon the provisions of the Civil Service Act of last year is $6,652.50, making a total of $128,344, and the increases which I have just enumerated bring this up to $137,056.50.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. minister will be able to tell us how many officials he has in the inside service altogether.

Mr. SIFTON. As nearly as my deputy can state the number is 290.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman spoke about placing some of the temporary employees on the permanent staff. I would like to ask him if any others have been put on in their places as temporary employees ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr CLANCY. There are no temporary employees in the hon. gentleman's department ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not say that. We have not put all the temporary employees on the permanent list by any means. We have put a number of them on. When my supplementary estimates come up for consideration I will have a vote for 28 or 29 more temporary clerks who are being transferred. Under the Civil Service Act of last year you will find that the minister may, with the concurrence of his deputy, appoint any officer who is a temporary clerk to the permanent staff. We are endeavouring to work out a plan upon which that can be done satisfactorily although I am bound to say to my hon. friend that it is very difficult. We have a large number of employees all fairly efficient and to arrive at any plan whereby those who are more efficient can be picked out from those who are less efficient is not an easy matter. But my deputy has made certain recommendations which I will explain when the vote comes before the committee.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the policy of the department is to finally place all the employees on the permanent staff as far as possible ?

Mr. SIFTON. That is the policy of the Act. The policy of the Act, I think fairly construed, is that these officials should not be left on the temporary list but that when the deputy has decided that their services are required and that they are not likely to be discontinued within any reasonable time they are entitled to be on the permanent staff.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand there are in all the departments a large number of temporary employees who have been there for a number of years, who have not passed the civil service examinations, but who are deprived of promotion and statutory increases.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. SIFTON. The word 'temporary' is somewhat confusing. Some years ago the third-class clerks were abolished, but that grade is now reinstated. We employed what was called temporary clerks, but they were required to pass the civil service examination and they get a statutory increase of $30 a year. These employees were made third-class clerks. They were not temporary employees who had no fixed status in the service, but to all intents and purposes they were members of the service. However, their salaries were voted in a lump sum and their employment was renewed by Order in Council from time to time.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there not a large number in the Interior Department who have not passed the examination, but who are nevertheless very efficient clerks and who have remained for years temporary employees.

Mr. SIFTON. I do not know the history of the employment of those who were there when I took office, but practically none have been appointed since without passing the examination, except two or three in the Dominion Lands Branch who do special work. There were, I think when I took office a number of lady employees who had not passed any examination, and some of them will be appointed permanently under this rule.

Mr. CLANCY. Will they be required to pass an examination before they come in?

Mr. SIFTON. The Act of last year does not require them to pass an examination.

Mr. WILSON. Does this $290 include temporary clerks or only the permanent staff.

Mr. SIFTON. Everybody.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SIFTON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. What business will be taken up by the government to-morrow.

Mr. SIFTON. There may be some Bills, and I shall be going on with the balance of my estimates.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The third reading of the Railway Act will be taken.

Mr. WILSON. Do you intend going on with the immigration estimates before the committee reports ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not know what stage the committee is in.

Mr. WILSON. It is almost ready to report. I do not see the use of taking evidence if you cannot use it in the House.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) has had the evidence for some time and he does not need to wait for the report.

Mr. WILSON. If the minister will look at the rules of the House he will find we cannot use evidence taken in the committee until it is reported to the House.

Mr. SIFTON. We had better discuss that to-morrow when the time comes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 19, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

SCHOOL OF MUSKETRY.

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

For copies of certain papers referring to the School of Musketry at Ottawa.

He said : These are papers in connection with the statement made in this House a few days ago by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes). The hon. member for North Victoria made the following statement :—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have received a communication to the effect that the young men who have come here to learn musketry are being taxed for the maintenance of clubs, for the maintenance of an extra mess, and for extra furnishings generally. I am also informed that privates are called upon to act as servants to officers, and that these young men who are brought from the farms to learn musketry are subjected to prison discipline. They cannot leave the camp grounds unless they get a pass and they must be in at a certain hour in the evening or they are disciplined. I am told that a number of officers and men were informed that they need not bring extra clothing or bedding, but that they had to purchase them here at considerable expense. I do not know whether or not the officer in charge of the musketry school is responsible for this. This officer goes on to say that he thinks the country pays the Cartwright family dearly enough without having the men who come to take the musketry course taxed by this extra expense. I do not think the people of this country want the young gentlemen, privates or officers who come here, to be subject to prison rule. I do not believe that a young man who comes here and chances to be a private, should give up one hour of his time to act as servants to any officer, nor do I think that the country should pay these men to act as officers' servants. I direct the attention of the minister to these grievances which I believe are founded on fact, and which should be stopped at once. I do not ask him to give any answer to-day, as I have not had time to give him notice that I would bring it up.

To which I replied :

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This school of musketry has been in operation for a couple of years, and this is the first time I have heard any complaint. I was not aware that the system in force this year differed from that of previous years. I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) saw fit to make the reference he did to the Cartwright family. I scarcely see what that has to do with it, and I am sure that my hon. friend himself would be the last man to say or to insinuate that any charges that may be imposed on officers attending the school could go into the pocket of as honourable a gentleman as Col. Robert Cartwright is known to be. I am sorry that he made that gratuitous slip. I am very glad, however, that he has called my attention to the fact, and I will make inquiry and be prepared to make a statement on the subject.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a memorandum addressed by the commandant of the school, Colonel Cartwright, to the Adjutant General. It reads as follows :—

Rockcliffe, Ont., 14th July, 1904.

From the Commandant Canadian School of Musketry to the Adjutant General, Headquarters.

Statement by Col. Sam. Hughes, M.P.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that my attention has been called to a statement in regard to the Canadian School of Musketry made in parliament by Col. Sam. Hughes.

In order that no time may be lost in disabusing the public mind of misconception in regard to the Musketry School, which might be conceived by the public if this statement were left unanswered, I forward herewith for your information :

1. A marked copy of the musketry regulations for the Canadian militia, showing the camp bedding, &c., allowed to each officer, non-commissioned officer and man.

2. An extract from the regulations and orders in regard to servants at the Musketry School.

3. Nominal roll of the non-commissioned officers and men of the Royal Canadian Regiment present at the Canadian School of Musketry, showing the capacity in which each non-commissioned officer or private is employed.

4. Parade state, showing the number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men at the Canadian School of Musketry.

In regard to the above papers, I might say first that the officers' mess is managed by a committee. Preliminary arrangements, subject to their approval, have to be made with caterers, who have everything in order to proceed with the mess from the first opening of the school. The fees are of the most moderate description and will bear the closest possible inspection.

The staff-sergeants have a mess, other non-commissioned officers have a mess, and the private soldiers have a mess. These messes are managed by a committee, in the same manner as all similar messes are managed in the service. They are spending their own money under the supervision of the adjutant.

Private Soldiers.—There are no privates taking the course at the Canadian School of Musketry. There are, however, privates from the Permanent Corps, sent down to Rockcliffe for fatigue purposes. They are used in various ways, as shown in the attached schedule. It

will be observed that the proportion of officers' servants to officers is much smaller than that allowed by regulations. It would be a great hardship to prevent these men making extra money as officers' servants, most of the men count on making extra in this way when coming to Rockcliffe.

Bedding.—In regard to bedding, the full allowance of bedding as laid down, has been allowed to officers at this camp. Owing to the fact that at a previous camp officers were allowed sheets and pillow-cases, there may have been some disappointment on this score, but all the officers to whom I have spoken on the subject consider that sheets and pillow-cases are unnecessary for camp life. In any cas it is not a very great hardship for an officer desiring these luxuries to provide them for himself.

Clothing.—In regard to extra clothing, the officers have been given specially to understand that while at musketry work they may wear out their old uniforms. A certain number of fatigue suits have been procured from stores to issue to officers and non-commissioned officers desiring to use them.

When proceeding to Ottawa in uniform officers are required to be properly dressed. As yet, however, the adjutant has not had reason to order any officer or non-commissioned officer to procure extra uniform.

Passes.—Passes are only required for extraordinary circumstances, such as men wanting to stay out all night, or aftr 12 o'clock, or to get off some parade or other duty.

Officers are expected to sleep in camp, as at other camps.

It is, of course, thoroughly understood that officers or non-commissioned officers misbehaving or showing indifference to their studies will be sent home.

The Musketry School affairs, mess accounts, and expenditure are simply arranged and easily investigated, and the more they are investigated or examined the more the absurdity of the attack on the management of the school will appear.

I do not bear Col. Sam. Hughes the least animosity in regard to the statements he has made, because it is clear that he has been misinformed by some malicious person, who ought to know; and probably by this time does know, that he has made a series of absurd and misleading statements.

The question as to whether officers attending a course of instruction should be permitted the use of a soldier servant is a matter of general policy, upon which there may be a difference of opinion.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) R. CARTWRIGHT,
Lieutenant-Colonel,
Commandant, Canadian School of Musketry.

The Hon. the Minister,

Forwarded. I concur in the above. (Sd.) Aylmer, Colonel, Commanding Canadian Militia.

15.7.04.

I shall not detain the House by reading the rest of this report, except to read the list of officers. The list of officers now in charge of the school is as follows :

Lieut.-Col. Cartwright, commandant.
Capt. Kemmiss Betty, adjutant.
Capt. Groves Contant.
Capt. de la Ronde, Q. master.
Surg.-Lieut. Birkett, M. O.

In addition to this, I have the following letter addressed by the commandant of the school to the Adjutant General :

Rockcliffe, Ont., 15th July, 1904.

From the Commandant, Canadian School of Musketry, to the Adjutant-General, headquarters.

Statement by Colonel Sam. Hughes, M.P.

Sir,—I have the honour to report, for the information of the officer commanding the militia, that the under-mentioned non-commissioned officers paraded this morning before my adjutant, and, upon being interviewed individually, each made a protest against the statement made by Colonel Hughes in the House, and which was published in the 'Citizen' of the 13th July. (Clipping attached.)

Each stated that he considered the same both inaccurate and misleading, and as unjust to himself as a student and to the staff of the Canadian School of Musketry.

Each was asked whether he had any complaint whatsoever, and whether his liberty had at any time been curtailed, and each non-commissioned officer replied in the negative, emphatically denying that there was any shadow of reason for complaint.

They requested that this protest be forwarded through the proper channel, in order that the same may be brought to the notice of the Minister of Militia, and that the insinuations contained in the remarks of the member for North Victoria be denied in the House, from whence they emanated :—

C. Sgt. Parkhill, 13th Regiment.
" McMaster, 21st Regiment.
" McMurphy, 26th Regiment.
" Kuhn, 41st Regiment.
Sergt. Blakeney, 43rd Regiment.
" Turner, 91st Regiment.
" Street, Ottawa Engineers.
" Milne, 26th Regiment.
" Ferguson, 43rd Regiment.
" Denny, 43rd Regiment.
" Cowan, 43rd Regiment.
" Menzies, 43rd Regiment.
" Waters, 43rd Regiment.
" Johnstone, 41st Regiment.
" Morrison, 43rd Regiment.
Corporal Andrews, 43rd Regiment.
" Workman, 43rd Regimnt.
" Kemp, Ottawa Engineers.
" Filion, 43rd Regiment.
" Shaw, 43rd Regiment.
" Learoyd, 43rd Regiment.
" McGuiness, 43rd Regiment.
" O'Neill, 43rd Regiment.
" Bindon, 43rd Regiment
" Mitchell, 43rd Regiment.
" Simkins, 13th Regiment.
" Worrall, 13th Regiment.
" Zimmerman, 13th Regiment.
" Marsh, 13th Regiment.
" Morgan, Ottawa Engineers.
" Cottee, 43rd Regiment.
" Heinrichs (J.), 43rd Regiment.
" Heinrichs, (F.), 43rd Regiment.
" Swallow, 13th Regiment.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. CARTWRIGHT, Lt.-Col.,
Commandant, Canadian School of Musketry.

Deputy Minister.

Forwarded in connection with previous correspondence.

(Sgd.) AYLMER, Colonel,
Commanding Canadian Militia.

18, 7, '04.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say that the hon. member from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was called away to attend the funeral of an old friend, but he will probably be back to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 159) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.—Mr. R. F. Sutherland.

SUPPLY—DOG-FISH PEST.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion is carried, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) whether he has any further information on the subject I mentioned yesterday. Is he quite sure that the commission to which he referred, of which the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) is one and some other gentlemen whom he named, is the commission formed for the purpose of dealing with this particular subject and is not a commission formed for the purpose of dealing with some other subject ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In answering the question put yesterday by the hon. gentleman, I referred to the report of Prof. Prince, which is published in the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1903. His report is very voluminous, and goes over the whole question, showing that two years ago this matter was brought under the notice of the department, and a special study made of it by Prof. Prince. It covers about thirty pages of the departmental report of last year. Now as regards the study of this question which has been made by Prof. Prince, I will read from his report showing what was done during last year :

In view of the pressing importance of the dog-fish nuisance on the Atlantic coasts generally, the members of two commissions have been authorized to take evidence from the fishermen and report. One of these commissions, consisting of Professor Prince and Mr. Morais, held sittings in Gloucester and Restigouche counties in April last, and made recommendations based on the statements laid before them ; but this commission, however, was very limited in its scope.

The second commission, consisting of Colonel Tucker, M.P., as chairman, and Messrs. Copp, Armstrong, Bowers and Venning, with Reverend Father Turbide as a member in respect of the Magdalen islands, held sittings at various points on the Magdalen islands and the Bay of Fundy, and as the commission was authorized to inquire into the herring, sardine and lobster fisheries, as well as other important matters, it has been impossible to cover the whole ground as yet, and until the close of the second sittings this summer, it will not be possible for that commission to make final recommendations.

The question is a very large one, which will involve very considerable expenditure of public money to properly cope with it, and it is plain therefore that reliable recommendations can be made only after a very wide survey and a considerable amount of evidence from different parts of the coast has been received.

The erection of reduction works has been suggested, and it is possible that an experiment may be started at once with a view to utilizing the dog-fish for oil, fertilizing and food purposes, and the department is in communication with important parties with a view to arriving at this end.

The department has already carried on some experiments with dog-fish as lobster bait ; but these have so far not proved very satisfactory, and should be carried on in a more extensive way later in the fall

E. E. PRINCE.

I may add that I have a report of the experiments that have been made, and which are very interesting. Experiments are being carried on on a still larger scale at the present time, and instructions have been given to the men employed on the fishery protection boats to see what can be done to alleviate the nuisance that is complained of. As regards the intention of the government on the subject, it will be seen within the next few days that numerous suggestions have been made. One of them, for instance, was to offer a premium for each dog-fish caught, the premium suggested being 1½ cents each. While the department were considering this suggestion, we received very valuable information showing that to cope with the difficulty in the way suggested, by offering a premium for each dog-fish, would cost an immense sum of money, and involve an expenditure of over $100,000 a year. The department therefore has come to the conclusion to put a certain sum of money in the supplementary estimates in order to erect reduction works where the dog-fish can be treated for oil and for fertilizing and other purposes. I repeat that the department is fully aware of the importance of this question, and will adopt all practical means to abate this nuisance. In dealing with a question of this kind, certain studies have to be made and certain experiments carried on. This nuisance is not new, it has existed in the waters of various countries, and it has been dealt with in different ways. On the coast of France, for instance, they use the flesh of the dog-fish as food, and it appears that in certain countries the people have no objection to eat that kind of fish. They find it a little coarse, but still it is palatable. But in Canada up to the pre-

sent time people have strongly objected to use the flesh as food. Gradually, however, it may be that as a result of the experiments that will be carried on, people may come to find the flesh of the dog-fish as wholesome a food as some others ; and I think it will be found that the taking of this fish can be made a profitable commercial pursuit. Under these circumstances, I think the House and the country will be satisfied, when the supplementary estimates come down, that we have not ignored the importance of this question, and that we are trying in the most expeditious manner to give satisfaction to the fishermen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The subject is certainly one worthy, not only of the immediate attention but of the immediate action of the government. The reason I thought it necessary to bring this subject to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was as I explained yesterday, because I found that on the 2nd of May we were promised the report of the commission within two or three days, and we have heard nothing more of the matter from that time till this. I do not believe that the people of the larger provinces of Canada realize the importance of the fishing industry to the Dominion as a whole. In speaking of the fishing industry, I am speaking of course more particularly of the fishing industry of the maritime provinces with which I have been endeavouring to make myself acquainted during the last two or three years. There has been a great deal of encouragement given to the different industries throughout this country in various ways during the last quarter of a century ; but certainly the inshore and deep-sea fishing industries of the maritime provinces have, on the whole, received as little encouragement in proportion to their importance as any of the great industries of Canada. I hope to live to see the day when the provinces of Ontario and Quebec will be fully supplied with the best fish in the world from the fisheries of the maritime provinces ; and until that day comes, and until even that market is extended much further west than the provinces I have mentioned, I for one will not be satisfied. As I mentioned last year, I think that one difficulty under which we labour in the maritime provinces with regard to this matter is that our fishermen still pursue very much the same methods that they pursued fifty, or sixty, or seventy years ago. Not very much advance as I understand—and I am speaking subject to correction by those in the House who understand the subject possibly better than I do—not very much advance has been made in our methods of catching fish. Possibly there may have been some advance but not much. But I understand from those who are qualified to speak on the subject that not much advance has been made in the methods of curing the fish. I am told by those who are engaged in the business that herring prepared in Norway sell at a much larger figure than our herring, and that the herring caught and cured in Scotland sell at a much higher figure than ours. So far as that part of the industry is concerned, the supply of fresh fish to the markets of Quebec and Ontario has made some progress. But that market is still in its infancy, and it cannot be much improved until better means of transportation are provided than exist at present, and I believe those means can be very much improved.

But this is only in passing. The industry as a whole is in very great danger from the invasion of the dog-fish. I have read the report of Prof. Prince to which attention has been called by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think he is under the apprehension that the pest may prove only temporary. As a matter of fact it has been scourging the fish and the fishermen on our coasts during the past six years from about 1898 and during the last two years it has been particularly destructive. In order to give the House some appreciation of what this destruction is, let me quote from the report of Prof. Prince, at page 52, of the 36th Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the year 1903. His words are as follows :—

> The direct harm that a plague of dog-fish can do is well nigh incredible. Thus in 1882 the pack of cured herring in the Shetland Isles was 134-000 barrels, whereas in 1888, owing to the presence of dog-fish, the total quantity fell to 99,-000 barrels, and in 1889, even lower *i. e.* not more than 47,000 barrels or only about one third of the pack two years before and representing therefore an enormous total loss.

Then, quoting press reports, further on he says this as to our own fisheries along the Atlantic coast :

> Every week brings reports from widely different points about the trouble by dog-fish, which are far more formidable pests by sea than the potato-bug is by land. Therefore some people contend that the government should take the matter up and do something to exterminate the invading swarms of dog-fish, or make them scarcer. Now let it be remembered that the fisheries department is not altogether unmindful of the loss suffered each year from this source. The officials, as we remarked before, have been instructed to collect information and tender advice. That was the proper thing for a preliminary step, and the parties applied to should have responded to the best of their ability, but it cannot be learned that many of them did so.

I may say that as far as I am personally concerned, I have not had the difficulty which Prof. Prince mentions in his report, because I have applied to some people familiar with the subject and I have in every instance received full and comprehensive and very practical reports, some of which I propose to submit to the House before I sit down. Prof. Prince's report is quite exhaustive and it is of course so long that I

could not venture to inflict the whole of it upon the House. He says at page 57 of the report :

The government has been urged to offer a bounty for the capture of a dog-fish. In some parts of the world dog-fish are caught for their oil, but the industry is not very profitable. It is claimed, however, that if a bounty was offered the fishermen would make systematic efforts to destroy this pest, that as the dog-fish were killed off the value of the fisheries would increase and that in a few years the bounty could be withdrawn without injury to the fisherman.

Then he goes on to mention about a dozen suggestions which have been made to the government. Some of these do not commend themselves to my judgment and apparently they do not commend themselves to the judgment of Prof. Prince. After dealing with those suggestions he goes on to say :

If, as seems clear, the commercial products yielded by dog-fish bring such low returns in the market, that it will not pay oil and fertilizer factories to utilize them, and cannot therefore pay the fishermen to fish for them or even to save them when caught accidentally, then a bounty paid by the government seems to be necessary. The livers of dog-fish bring to the fishermen 25c. per pail and at least 50 dog-fish are required to make a pail of livers, and the loss of hooks, bait, and time, have all to be included, hence only the encouragement of a bounty will ensure the energetic and continuous destruction of these fish. Certainly the suggestions numbered 1, 2 and 3 would probably harm the schools of valuable fishes as much as the detested dog-fish, while the employment of a few vessels or government cruisers would not suffice to deal with so general a pest as the dog-fish on our shores. Reliance can be placed only on the co-operation of the fishermen all along the coast stimulated by a bounty fairly and effectively distributed on a workable basis. Unless, indeed, the dog-fish in the meantime take the course they have so commonly done in former times and on other coasts, and disappear as suddenly as their hordes originally have appeared. The problem would then solve itself.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House, because the suggestions which are here made may be of assistance to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in dealing with the subject, a communication which I have received from a gentleman who is very well known in Nova Scotia and who is very largely interested in the fish business. This is Mr. Howard Smith, of the firm of N. & M. Smith, of Halifax. I asked him in the month of January last to give me his views on the extent of the pest and the best way to deal with it, and Mr. Smith was good enough to write me a letter, dated the 28th January, which is as follows :—

Dear Mr. Borden :—As promised, I send you herewith a few ideas and suggestions as to how best to combat this bête noir of our coast fishermen, the voracious dog-fish. I do not speak from experience as a practical fisherman, merely repeating sundry scraps of information picked up from the hardy toilers on our shores, who, on good grounds, consider this their worst enemy.

I think that Mr. Smith's modesty has led him to probably undervalue the information upon which he speaks, because I happen to know that he has devoted a good deal of time and study to this question and has taken a great deal of interest in it. He goes on as follows :—

Nor are they alone suffering from its ravages. Reports to hand this year from Norway, state that the fishery there was greatly handicapped on account of the enormous schools of dog-fish following the codfish, &c., as they swam over their favourite haunts and feeding grounds. Newfoundland fishermen also view with alarm his first appearance last year in small schools. Our American neighbours have awakened to the injury done, particularly their inshore fishery, and the Gloucester newspapers, and fishing gazettes, cry aloud for government action to eliminate, as far as possible, the evil.

I have lately read that 'Mr. Irving Field' of Harvard University, under the direction of the United States bureau of fisheries, has devoted the summer to the study of the scarcity of lobsters and their destruction by other denizens of the sea. He has brought out the fact that dog-fish is one of the fiercest enemies against which the lobster has to contend, working more destruction than any other of the finny tribe. This species of shark is very voracious, and is declared to be no small factor in depleting the number of lobsters on the coast.

'Mr. Field by the examination of the stomachs of several hundred of the dog-fish, found that next to the rock crab, and the spider crab, the lobster is the chief article on which the dog-fish feeds. In several of the stomachs were found lobsters partially digested, which measured over seven inches in length, and the presence of two smaller lobsters in a single stomach was not uncommon. If this be true, an additional reason exists for making wear upon the dog-fish.

'Mr. Field also experimented with dog-fish as food, and declares it to be an article of great merit. Both himself and colleagues partook of it, and pronounced the fish savoury and palatable. It was afterwards served in the marine biological station to hundreds of students and professors engaged in scientific work, without their knowledge of the species, and all pronounced it one of the finest flavoured of fish. It is a favoured fish with those natural epicures, the Japanese, and it is also used as a food by the inhabitants of the Bermudas, by whom it is called 'Nurseflesh.' The name, and difficulty in preparing the fish is the chief objection to its use as an article of diet.'

I have been repeatedly told the fish is an excellent article of food, if care is taken to keep from deteriorating until cooked. Unless put on ice, it turns bad in ten or twelve hours, the flesh being particularly rich. Our herring or mackerel exposed in the same manner would keep at least 24 hours. Its possibilities as an article of food to be put up in any quantity, are yet in an experimental stage. Personally, I think it is only a question of prejudice due to the name and the depredatory habits of the marauders.

One thing sure, and that is, they can be used as a fertilizer, after the oil has been extracted from the liver, and the skin can be dried for sand-paper purposes, the latter giving an almost indestructible surface for polishing. Moreover,

the fins, by simply boiling in water, produce the finest glue. One ounce of glue is said to be obtained from seven ounces of fins.

Now here is the germ of my ideas. Bonus fertilizing factories, say at the rate of $2 to $3 per ton output, whenever a certain proportion of their output is dog-fish residue; pay the fishermen ¼c. per dogfish to enable them to fit out and attack, this, their natural enemy.

Mr. KENDALL. How much?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Smith says a quarter of a cent. I do not know whether that is adequate or not.

Mr. COWAN. That is cheap fishing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a bounty, my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) must understand. Although my hon. friend seems to regard this as a humorous subject as I have observed by his conversation when I was speaking, let me tell him that this is a subject of some moment to the people of the maritime provinces, and that possibly it would be well for him to try and get a little information on the subject rather than to spend his time in jeering while the subject is being discussed.

Mr. COWAN. It is an inspiring subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN:

For the above remuneration, I feel sure, they would make a dead set on it, and you, or any other politician, instrumental in securing such a measure, would be their ideal representative.

These factories could be under the supervision of the fishery wardens or government fishery agent, in each county, the bonus to the fishermen to be paid through the factory owners, who would be solely responsible to their shippers, i.e., to the people supplying them with the dogfish. They would be remunerated by the government paying them 25c. per 200 for the dog-fish horns, i.e., ¼c. for each dog-fish, two horns being on each fish). I mention 'horns' because the tails, heads, or other part of them could be imitated from other fish, not so the horns. These could be burnt, or easily destroyed afterwards.

In this way you would be encouraging a new industry, manufacturing fertilizing, glue, &c., fostered under a policy that you advocate, and the fishermen would be profitably employed when the dog-fish virtually stops all other work. There is no question of the damage done, which, measured in dollars runs up to the hundreds of thousands.

These dog-fish first appeared on our coast about the time the so called Cape Shore mackerel fleet from Gloucester, came down fishing from Yarmouth to Canso in the spring. The fish seemed to follow these vessels swallowing all the entrails, &c., of the mackerel, as thrown overboard. They usually remain here until the run of fat mackerel in the late fall, principally feeding on what are called 'bait fish,' i.e., the younger schools of herring, mackerel, caplin, &c., and, as Mr. Irving Field states doing irreparable harm to the infant lobster. If this is so, you can readily see the damage done is simply enormous.

I direct attention to this part of the communication and I have no doubt that many of my hon. friends on the other side of the House from the maritime provinces will be able to substantiate what Mr. Smith says:

Take a case like last year, when the fall schools of fat mackerel passed southward to their winter feeding grounds in the vicinity of Florida (or wherever else it may be). The dog-fish unfortunately infested our shore, and were on the inside of the schools of fish with the result that the body of mackerel kept miles off shore, and the expected harvest for our hardy toilers, passed along, virtually untouched. In former years, with no dog-fish, it was not an unusual thing to hear of 10,000 barrels of mackerel being taken in a day between Halifax and Lunenburg.

Hon. gentlemen will note that Mr. Smith is speaking simply of a single day's catch.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Ontario). What is the value of a barrel of mackerel?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mackerel have very much increased in price during late years; my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) can give you reliable information as to that.

Mr. KENDALL. The value ranges from ten to fifteen dollars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would represent from $100,000 to $150,000 for one day's catch along that portion of the shore between Halifax and Lunenburg. As Mr. Smith explains these fish remained off shore last year for the reason that the dog-fish got between the mackerel and the shore, so that the mackerel were driven off and the fishermen could not catch them. Mr. Smith continues:

The same remarks apply as to herring, codfish, &c. Our inshore fisheries are no longer profitable, and this is the only explanation so far forthcoming.

Now, why I advocate the establishing and encouraging of fertilizing works is this. If the fishermen are bonused per 100 to catch these fish, after cutting out liver (for the oil) and saving the token, i.e., tail, horns, or whatever else it may be, they would throw the rest overboard. Now, bitter experience has taught us that this method of polluting the fishing grounds is dangerous in the extreme, witness the total disappearance for years from Fortune bay, Newfoundland, of herring that every fall came there in countless millions to feed. The careless throwing overboard of herring that fishermen had caught, attempted to freeze, and weather turning mild caused them to deteriorate, so poisoned the favourite haunts of the fish that they left years ago, and have not yet returned in any quantity, and a most profitable industry was thereby ruined. Most stringent laws in Newfoundland, now govern this feature of the question, and as a result, Bay of islands, Newfoundland, where these same herring now go, gives up every fall from its depths, sixty to one hundred thousand barrels of pickled and frozen herring.

I may say that Professor Prince in corroboration of what Mr. Smith has said,

states in his report, that these dog-fish seem gifted with an exceptionally keen sense of smell; that they frequent portions of the coast where fish offal or dead fish are thrown overboard, and that this practice has the effect of attracting dog-fish to the locality. Mr. Smith continues as follows:

To come nearer home, and to the question at issue with us. Years ago the Cape Ann fishermen were greatly troubled by dog-fish on their haddock and hake grounds. The dog oil was profitably handled then, and when the fishery was interfered with by these dog-fish, they rigged trawls to catch them for their liver alone, throwing the body overboard,—result, no fish of any kind will feed or breed on these fishing grounds.

Mr. Smith continues by saying that if some scheme on this line were worked out, he thinks such progress would be made in exterminating the dog-fish as would before long afford a very desirable relief from this pest. I also communicated with another gentleman in the maritime provinces who has very great experience in matters relating to the fishing industry. I asked his opinion on the subject, and although his views differ slightly from those of Mr. Smith, still, as he is a man of very great experience, and as this question is to be considered by the government, and as I know a number of my friends in the maritime provinces take a very keen interest in the subject, I will read a portion of this gentleman's suggestions to the House, in order that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries may have them before him if he sees fit to consider them, and possibly make some use of them. The gentleman to whom I now refer is a man of the firm of A. Wilson & Sons, of the city of Halifax, who are large dealers in fish.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). Is that Mr. Robert?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Messrs. Wilson, of Halifax, well known fish dealers. My hon. friend is no doubt well acquainted with them.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). I am well acquainted with them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend will agree with me that they are men of excellent business standing, and men of excellent business judgment in every way.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). Certainly; that is the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Wilson says:

That you may the better understand the position of the fishermen to-day with reference to this matter, it is necessary to state that they have always been more or less annoyed by dog-fish, but previous to the past six years or so the dog-fish would visit a section of the coast and after a brief stay move away to some other section or off shore and very probably would not again appear on that particular section during that season. This condition was of course very annoying as it destroyed either partially or totally the gear in the water at the time of the arrival of the dog-fish and prevented operations during their stay.

This was borne with christian fortitude (?) by the fishermen as something that could only be removed by an act of God. During recent years the prevalent conditions on nearly all parts of the coast of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have been a continued annoyance from dog-fish during the fishing season.

They have been particularly destructive to nets and traps and as these supply bait for other kind of fishing, they have in that way greatly interfered with line fishing.

During the mackerel fishing last fall the dog-fish seemed most numerous and turned what is usually the most remunerative branch of shore fishing into a ruinous operation for most fishermen by destroying more gear than their catch would pay for.

This was certainly a very bad phase of the trouble, but what is we believe a more serious one is the fact that these dog-fish that were caught by nets, traps and lines were thrown back into the water dead, and in that way polluted the fishing grounds which has in many instances made some of the inshore grounds less productive and in other cases practically non-productive.

This is a very serious phase of the case because fishermen very naturally will throw these dog-fish back into the water if they cannot put them to any profitable use. Professor Prince, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Wilson all agree as to the absolutely fatal results to the fisheries that will be produced by continuing a practice of that kind; yet it does not seem to me that this practice is likely to be discontinued unless you can give to the fishermen some inducement to bring the fish to shore, so that they can afterwards be profitably used for fertilizing or for their oil, or for some other commercial purpose. It is not only the damage that the dog-fish themselves do, but it is the fact that when caught they will be thrown back to pollute the fishing grounds, which has to be taken into consideration by the government. Mr. Wilson continues:

These conditions did not obtain in former years when fishermen brought their dog-fish ashore for the sake of getting the oil from the liver.

In recent years dog-fish oil has been so low that fishermen would not bother handling the dog-fish, which they abhor, for the remuneration they would receive from the oil.

It is a fact that the inshore fisheries do not now produce anything like the quantity of fish that they did formerly, and the fouling of the grounds by dumping dead dog-fish is one of if not the chief reason for this.

In view of the foregoing we think that some effective measures should be taken at once to exterminate the pest.

We have every reason to believe that a market could be made for the dog-fish if they were properly cured and dried for export to the West Indies, Central and South America

and the Mediterranean. We are advised that the dog-fish caught off the cost of Norway are cured and marketed in the Mediterranean ports.

I think Professor Prince reports that these dog-fish have been caught off the coast of Norway for a great many years, and that not only have they been utilized for their oil, but also for food purposes in the manner suggested by Mr. Wilson. This letter continues.

We tried last December to get a sample of these dog-fish sent out to us to verify the fact that they were exactly the same kind of dog-fish as we get on our shore, but were too late applying for samples as all had been disposed of. We think there is little doubt but that they are exactly the same, because we know that what few dog-fish are taken by British North Sea fishermen are identical with ours. We noticed by late editions of our newspapers that the Department of Fisheries intended looking into this dog-fish question through or by the biological society during the coming season.

This appears to us to be putting the matter off for another year at least for no earthly good that we can see, and which will work considerable harm as it will give the dog-fish another year in which to multiply.

No amount of scientific research will in any way lessen the scourge, and we think their life and habits are sufficiently well known. Now we would like to suggest the following course instead of that proposed by the Department of Fisheries.

That a sum of say ($10,000) ten thousand dollars be set aside for the purpose of having a quantity of dog-fish caught, cured, dried and exported with a view of making a market and commercial value for any and all dog-fish that can or may be caught hereafter.

That the Department of Fisheries select a thoroughly competent practical fish curer to put this test through. That he be empowered to select as many competent curers (fishermen or others) at as many different points along the affected coast to supply a stated quantity of properly cured dog-fish under a guarantee of say two dollars per quintal for only fish that come up to the standard. Any badly canned fish to be the canner's loss. These fish to be gathered together at Halifax or some other suitable shipping point for distribution to the different markets as a trial. This would enable the government to use up in the vicinity of 5,000 quintal of dog-fish this year; and if the experiment proved a success in the selling markets, as we believe it would, it would not cost the country one cent, because they would get the total cost of fish back in returns, and would probably do away with the necessity of the giving of a bonus for the destruction of the dog-fish by demonstrating that they had a commercial value.

There have been numerous other suggestions put forward for the destruction of the dog-fish, but all so far as we have heard, have been in the nature of recommending a government bonus or bounty without a reasonabe recommendation for the utility of the dog-fish when caught, except that of manufacturing glue from the skin, oil from the liver, and fertilizer from the balance.

This scheme would be workable only at points where large fleets operate, because it would only be at such points that a sufficient quantity of dog-fish could be had to warrant any concern erecting and operating a plant. This as you are aware would cover very few points on our coast where the fishing villages are so numerous and yet so small. Then, again, the advocates of this plan assert that a bounty of not less than $4.50 per ton would pay them, which we conclude means that they would want that bounty paid them as long as they operated.

A bounty may yet be necessary, but we think not, if our suggested experiment is tried in a businesslike manner through a thoroughly competent man.

Then he makes some criticism about the way in which such matters have been handled, which I will not read to the House. I have also made an inquiry of and had a conversation with another gentleman who is very well known in the fishing industry of Nova Scotia—Mr. E. C. Whitman of Messrs. A. N. Whitman & Sons, of Canso. He discussed the matter with me more fully than he has written to me on the subject. His opinion as conveyed to me in a personal interview was decidedly in favour of a bounty, and the erection of reduction stations in order to utilize the fish for fertilizing purposes, after first extracting the oil, and making use of any other products of the fish that might be commercially profitable. I may, however, read what he has written to me on these and other matters, in response to my request to give me a memorandum of what he thought might reasonably be done by the government to place the fishing industry of the maritime provinces on a better basis than it occupies to-day. His memorandum of requirements is as follows:

1st. Improved transportation between the east and the west by better refrigerator cars and faster time.

That undoubtedly is absolutely necessary if we are to supply the markets of Quebec and Ontario with fresh fish, as the abundance of these fish in the past would amply justify us in expecting that they could be supplied.

2nd. Have an exhibit of our fish and fishery products at the St. Louis exhibition.

3rd. Have an exhibit at all important fairs in western Canada annually, and during the exhibition have fresh ocean fish properly cooked and tastefully served to visitors.

This is of course for the purpose of impressing our friends in Quebec and Ontario, and especially my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan) with the advantages to be derived from an occasional diet of fish from the maritime provinces.

4th. Establish one or more experimental fishing stations where the most improved methods of catching, curing and marketing fish may be demonstrated. At one of these stations operate for a year a modern steam trawler (as is now being done by the South African government), as well as a steam herring drifter, to demonstrate whether these

methods of catching fish are as superior here as they have proved themselves in other countries.

I believe this proposal has not altogether found favour with some of the fishermen themselves. They have some objection to or prejudice against it. I am not myself in a position to say whether it would be advisable to adopt it or not; but the methods of catching fish in the maritime provinces might certainly be improved, and it is beyond question that the methods of drying and curing fish might also be improved, and it only needs a little assistance to the fishermen to enable them to adopt these improvements. The fishermen along the coasts of the maritime provinces are as intelligent and adaptable people as are to be found anywhere in the Dominion of Canada or on the continent of America, and if they are given the means of learning improved methods, I have not the slightest doubt that they will at once avail themselves of them. He goes on to say:

> At these stations all waste material, such as offal and non-edible fish should be utilized and converted into fertilizer, oil and glue.
>
> 5th. Pay a small bounty for the destruction of dog-fish to the fishermen or to reduction works established to make fertilizer and oil from them.
>
> 6th. Enlarge the scope of the biological station and make it a permanent structure on the plans of the United States Fish Commissioner's Station at Wood's Hole, Mass. Make it of sufficient importance and interest to attract each year our best scientific men to investigate the fisheries and to discuss them.

I have thought that the importance of this subject justified me in bringing these suggestions to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There is no doubt that this pest has continued for five or six years and that up to the present time no means have been taken by the country as a whole to do away with it beyond the recent investigations which have been made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We have not the report of these investigations before us; but the consensus of opinion, so far as I can gather it, seems to be that in order to accomplish the destruction of the dog-fish, or at least an abatement of their numbers, so that they will not interfere materially with the fish which frequent our shores, some aid by way of bounty or otherwise will have to be given to the fishermen to catch them. That seems to be the consensus of opinion on the part of those whom I have consulted or with whom I have conversed on the subject, and who are well qualified to speak with authority on a question of that kind. I admit that it is not a matter into which the government should plunge hastily. I realize fully that proper experiments and investigations must be had before the subject is dealt with; but I would respectfully submit to the government, and especially to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that nearly three months have elapsed since his answer to which I have referred was given in this House, and the government seem to be making haste, not simply slowly, but altogether too slowly in this regard. The fishing season of this year will very soon be past, and it is important that some means should be taken to abate this scourge during the past season. I therefore trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give his early and earnest attention to this subject, and if possible do something by which the fishing industry of the maritime provinces will be placed once more not only in as good a position as that which it formerly occupied, but even in a better position. If this is not done, and if the prediction of Prof. Prince that the dog-fish will disappear should prove to be unfounded, the results will be disastrous to a very important industry in the maritime provinces and indeed to the country as a whole; because this industry is valuable not only for the wealth it produces, but also for the hardy race of mariners which it sustains. In view of all these considerations, I trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will move a little more rapidly in this matter, and that some effective measures may be taken during the present season.

Mr. A. J. S. COPP. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss this matter, but merely to refer to a misunderstanding that seems to exist with regard to the two commissions which have been appointed. The commission of which Prof. Prince is a member is, I believe, in a position to report, and has already reported on this question. The commission of which I am a member is not in a position to report. I may say that we had no means of meeting until after the last session of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend explain the exact object of the commission to which he belongs?

Mr. COPP. The scope of that commission embraces the lobster question, the herring industry, and I think also the dog-fish. We only assembled after the close of last session and as matters of great importance had to be attended to in the Magdalen Islands, the commission first went there and settled the question as to the spring season of the lobster catch. We then, in December met at St. Andrews and proceeded to Grand Manan. My hon. friend will remember that last winter was probably one of the worst in the history of Nova Scotia and it was very trying for us moving around in St. Andrews Bay. We found that it was impossible for us to hold our meetings with any success. We then held a meeting at

North Head, Grand Manan and also two meetings at Grand Harbour. Finding that we could not make any headway we concluded to adjourn and to meet again at the call of the chairman under instructions from the Minister of Marine. It is, I believe, the intention of the commission to assemble immediately after the close of the session and I am in hopes that we will be in a position to make a report that will commend itself to hon. gentlemen of this House, and probably in some way solve this question of the extermination of these pests. There seems, however, to be a great difference of opinion as to how the bounty shall be applied. I do not think there is any question as to the need of a bounty, the great question is how shall that bounty be given. That is the question upon which we shall be called upon to report. I feel as the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) feels, that this is a question of great importance to the fishermen and people of the maritime provinces. I do not agree with him that the Minister of Marine is not dealing with this matter; I think he is dealing with it in a way that will commend itself to the fishermen of the maritime provinces, but it takes a little time. It is an entirely new question and is one that in my opinion should not be dealt with hastily. The question as to whether the bounty shall be paid to the fishermen direct or to fertilizing factories or in some other way is one that should receive consideration and be dealt with not in a hasty manner, but in a way that will commend itself to the people who are most interested.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR. Would my hon. friend inform the House who are the members of the commission to which he belongs?

Mr. COPP. The commission of which I am a member consists of Col. Tucker, chairman; Mr. Denis, assistant commissioner of Fisheries, Mr. Armstrong, of St. Andrews, Mr. Bowers, of Westport, Pictou county and myself.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to join the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in pressing this very important matter on the attention of the government. I would have done so earlier in the session but I was aware that the government were dealing with this question and endeavouring to solve it. As was remarked by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) it is not a question with which we ought to deal hastily; it is one of great difficulty. I expect that the government are overwhelmed with suggestions to deal with the matter in one way or another, but while it is easy to suggest, it is very difficult to apply practical remedy. For example, the editor of the 'Coast Guard,' one of the most important fishing newspapers, has stated that a bounty of one and a half cents per dog-fish would probably involve an expenditure of $50,000 a day. That was his estimate, provided that one quarter of the fishermen who might engage in dog-fishing would drop their other work and attend to the catching of dog-fish.

Mr. CLARKE. What would be the advantage to the country?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The advantage of course might be the preservation of our fish. The fisheries are of so much importance that it is worth while spending a great deal of money for their preservation. We have in Canada the most valuable fisheries in the world; we have a coast line on the eastern shore, between the international boundary and Labrabor, of something like 5,600 miles.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The estimate which my hon. friend has given of $50,000 a day as the cost of a bounty of 1½ cents per dog-fish, seems to be a very large estimate. It would mean nearly three and a half million dog-fish a day.

Mr. KENDALL. That estimate is rather under than over.

Mr. FIELDING. Fishermen might make a specialty of catching dog-fish rather than other fish.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am told by fishermen that dog-fish are easily caught. A clever fisherman can catch from 500 to 1,000 a day and with a bounty of 1½ cents per dog-fish he could make good wages. Probably 1½ cents would be high. At all events that is the estimate of Mr. Nickerson, who is an expert in fishery matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Smith suggested only ¼ of a cent.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is very small. If a fisherman caught 1,000 a day that would give him only $2.50. 1,000 a day is probably too large an estimate, but it would not be difficult to catch 500. The great difficulty is that these fish are not Canadian fish, they come here from the coasts of the United States. They start from the Gulf of Mexico and come along the coast of the United States, arriving here late in the season. This ought to be an international question. The United States ought to assist if we are to deal with this question, because they own more dog-fish than we do, and it is their dog-fish that our fishermen are worried by, when they come here and maraud on our coasts. They have been talking of this question in the United States and a number of proposals have been made, but nothing more definite has been done in the United States than in Canada. During the last session of Congress this question was up and in the Massachusetts legislature a Bill was introduced to pay a bounty of 2 cents per dog-fish, but it was defeated; the authorities there thought it was too large a contract to undertake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They do not charge any export duty on the dog-fish ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I believe not. The Cape 'Ann News,' a few days ago, said in reference to the dog-fish pest on the coast of Maine :

From indications the fishing industry off the Maine coast will be seriously injured, if not practically ruined for a time at least. This is due to the dog-fish plague which is beginning to assume serious proportions. The dog-fish increase so rapidly and keep other fish so frightened that they threaten to seriously interfere with fishing for the whole season.

In conversation with the Rockland Star man, one of the oldest and best known fishermen in that section made the statement that unless some way was found to exterminate these pests the fishing interests would be practically ruined.

'Something has got to be done,' he said, 'and that right away. It is a matter that will not allow of delay, but the question is what shall be done ?'

Years ago we had the same kind of a plague with blue-fish. They are just as bad as the dog-fish when they congregate in large schools and can drive any fish except lobsters. The latter used to fight the blue-fish just the same as they do the dog-fish to-day. Now, however, you hear practically nothing about the destruction wrought by blue-fish because they do not destroy. The reason for this is that they are kept caught up so close that they do not have much of a chance to get together and make attacks on the other fish. The blue-fish has been discovered to be a fine food and there is a great demand for it and immense quantities of it are now sold during the season.

We have gotten rid of the blue-fish and now we have the dog-fish, something just as bad. The question is what shall we do to them to get rid of the pest ? It is known that their flesh is not poison and can be eaten, but on account of its stringy composition it is not popular so it is not very probable that the fish will ever become a great food. They have one feautre of value, however, and that is their skin. This makes one of the finest kinds of sandpaper imaginable. It is just like an emery stone and very smooth. It is possible that perhaps this part might be utilized to such an extent that there might be quite a demand for the fish, but this does not seem probable.

Then he goes on to suggest that a bounty is probably the best way of settling the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do we suffer from the blue-fish?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I believe not, at least I am not aware that we do. I suppose that probably the best solution if it can be arrived at is to make this fish marketable, to find, if we can, some commercial use for it. As private capital does not seem willing to undertake the task of doing that, I think some government assistance should be given. I have also been in correspondence with Mr. Whitman, who has been studying this question for a number of years, and he does not seem to be much in favour of a bounty. I will read an extract from the most recent letter I have had from him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He was in favour of it when he discussed it with me.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think he is in favour of it, but I think he feels that it might lead to a good deal of difficulty. In the first place, if you give a bounty for catching the fish you must also find some way of utilizing them. As the leader of the opposition has suggested, it would not do to throw them into the sea, it would not do to pollute the water with them. Consequently you must face this question. What are you going to do with them after you catch them ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There must be some inducement to bring them ashore.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Certainly, and I trust the government will be able to provide ample inducement to the fishermen to bring them ashore. Mr. Withman's letter says :

I am sure this is a difficult matter to deal with. May I offer a suggestion ? Let the department establish at some central point a reduction plant to test what commercial use can be made of these pests. If it is found that they can be profitably reduced to oil and fertilizer it will lead others to undertake the business. The government can by such an experiment prove whether a bounty is necessary or whether a high enough price can be paid for the fish to induce fishermen to catch them.

At this experimental plant some dog-fish can be prepared for lobster bait, some more for export to southern countries, where they are used for food, a few can be tinned and any other possible use for the fish tried.

A plant of the most approved process, The Edison Process, to treat 20 tons a day, can be installed for about $20,000 and would want a working capital of about the same amount to run it for a year.

Now that is valuable information. To erect one of these plants at some point on the coast would cost about $20,000, and for an expenditure of about $20,000 more it could be run for a year. He does not tell us what the profit would be. If we produced 20 tons a day of fertilizer in one of these factories, the chances are that it would be a profitable industry and that private capital would be induced to go into it and develop it, provided that the government first took it up and showed that it could be made profitable. I think that is one of the most practical suggestions that has been made. Of course there are many other ways proposed of disposing of these fish. It has been said that they could be used for lobster bait, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries very promptly tested that question. A ship was fitted out with lobster traps and sent along the coast to find out whether these dog-fish could be used for lobster bait, and a return has been made to the department which I have seen, and which shows

that the experiment has not been successful, that the lobsters do not take that bait as readily as they do other species of bait that have been used. These experiments of course are useful, but you will see, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty of the situation, and how important it is that all these experiments should be tried, and that all the information we can possibly obtain should be got before any step is taken. I have every confidence that we can safely leave this important matter in the hands of the government.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I do not often speak in this House, but when I do speak I generally make myself understood, and am not afraid to express my opinions very frankly and freely. I corresponded with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on this subject, and I objected to the personnel of this commission. I do not think that a gentleman learned in the law, busy at his profession, studying the decisions of eminent jurists both in Great Britain and the United States, is at all the most fit person to be placed on a commission of this kind. Neither do I think that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Tucker), who has had a military training and whose turn of thought may be in that direction, is eminently fitted to serve on that commission. Do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I aspire to be placed on the commission myself. I have a sufficient sense of my own ability to lead me to decline the offer if it were made to me. If the Minister of Railways and Canals wished to appoint a commission to deal with a difficult railway question he would appoint eminent engineers for that purpose.

Mr. COPP. Do I understand the hon. member to say that he wished to serve on that commission ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I said that I had sense enough of my own inability to fill that position, and that I would not accept it if it were offered to me ; and that, I think, would have been the proper course for my hon. friend to pursue. Now I read the report of Professor Prince, it is an exhaustive report, and he has dealt with the matter from a scientific point of view. He speaks from the experience of a practical fisherman ; and my idea of a commission would be one composed of men trained all their lifetime to the business of fishermen, selected from different parts of the province, and not confined to men from the Bay of Fundy, inasmuch as the difficulty extends over the whole coast of Nova Scotia to Prince Edward Island. I had letters on this subject the other day from fishermen in my own county who had taken their nets ashore. They are idle now from the scourge of the dog-fish that frequent the coast. The same nuisance exists at the entrance to the Bras d'Or. Now the main question is, what can be done to reduce this nuisance, for to exterminate them altogether is out of the question. There are three main ideas held on this subject. One is that they may be used for fertilizing purposes. Then there is the oil. A gallon of dog-fish oil is only worth about 15 cents, and if the government would raise the price of that oil to 25 or 30 cents, at most, the fishermen would catch dog-fish for the sake of the oil and confine themselves to that fishing alone.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). How could the government raise the price from 15 to 30 cents ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They might as well do that as give a bounty on the dog-fish caught. It is only a different way of expending the money.

Mr. KAULBACH. How does the hon. gentleman propose that the government should raise the price of oil ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I have been asked that question already. The government propose to spend a certain amount of money for the purpose of reducing the quantity of dog-fish. Might they not just as well take part of that money and give it to the fishermen, who would then spend their whole time catching dog-fish for the sake of the oil ? They won't do so now because the price is too low. Now the idea that dog-fish can be used for lobster bait is absurd. Lobsters are like ourselves, they have a taste of their own, and they select what will suit their taste and reject what does not. Only in the last resort will lobsters take dog-fish for bait, when they can get nothing else. The fish in the sea have their tastes, and prefer certain kinds of bait to others. The animals on land have their tastes also, and so do we in this House. Now there was an idea thrown out by Mr. Smith, I think, in the report that was read by the learned leader of the opposition, about the quantity of mackerel that would be caught from Lunenburg to Halifax. The dog-fish may frighten the mackerel off the shore so that they won't frequent their old haunts. But the quantity of mackerel that the dog-fish would eat would have no more effect on the great body of mackerel than the flour that the members of this House would eat compared with the quantity that is produced in Ontario or the great Northwest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He said that the dog-fish got between the shore and the school of mackerel and drove the mackerel off the shore so that the fishermen could not get at them.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I think there are two things that interfere with our success in catching mackerel as we used to do ; first, as has been stated, the dog-fish drive the mackerel into deep water, then in the second place the purse seines used by the

American fishermen in the spring of the year frighten the fish out into deep water, whereas in the old times they used to trim the shore. A question has been asked about the price of mackerel. Mackerel is divided into three classes. Spring mackerel, belong to class No. 3 because they are poor and thin. Mackerel that are caught in August are No. 2. They are getting fat and white. Mackerel caught in September, October and November are No.1. There are three classifications depending on the fatness of the fish and the size of them and there are three prices. I have sold mackerel at $22.50 a barrel and the year before last from $18 to $20 a barrel could be readily got for No. 1 mackerel in the market at Halifax. But last year the price was lower. Spring mackerel find a market in the southern states and West Indies and fat mackerel all over the United States. I understood from the reports that were made the papers that some of these commissioners had reported already and had recommended that the tail should be cut off the dog-fish as an evidence of their having been caught and destroyed. I know enough of the dog-fish to know that if you cut their tails off and let them go they will be as destructive as ever. I do not think any person possessing a sane mind would adopt that method of destroying the dog-fish.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend has misunderstood. The suggestion was that the horns should be preserved for the purpose of identification, not that the fish should be thrown away. Both letters that I have read express the very strong opinion that the fish should not be returned to the water. They mention it as a very great evil that they should be returned to the water.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). So it is. Dog-fish can be used for fertilizing purposes if the proper system is adopted. I would suggest to the government to have a thousand cans of dog-fish canned at some of our lobster canneries in Nova Scotia, that they put them up carefully and send them as an experiment to China, Japan, India, southern Europe and whatever other countries they think might take them for food. If they found a profitable market in these places or in any other places then the fishermen would begin to catch dog-fish, can them and sell them as they are now selling the lobster. These are my theories. Advance the price of oil, catch the dog-fish for fertilizing purposes, can a number of them and ship them as an experiment to different markets to see if they will be used for food.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. That is being done now.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). On a very small scale.

Mr. BELL. Where ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. By Mr. H. A. Baker, of Gabarus.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). We have the statement made by the hon. leader of the opposition that the methods of catching fish are the same to-day as they were fifty or sixty years ago. I do not know, so far as codfish, haddock, salmon and mackerel fishing is concerned that the present methods can be very much improved upon. I speak of the Island of Cape Breton, to which a certain number of Newfoundland fishermen have come and where they have settled among our fishermen. They have instructed them as to the proper means of curing and drying fish, and I think that the fish that come to the Halifax market from my own county and from Cape Breton generally are just as good as perhaps they can be made under any circumstances. I have watched the fish market in Halifax and I have watched the landing of fish. I have spent 26 years of my life among fishermen and I ought to know something about the subject. I may say that the fish cured in the western part of Nova Scotia, are not at all to be compared with those which are cured in eastern Nova Scotia and on the Island of Cape Breton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do they treat them by the same process as that applied to Scotch and Norwegian cured and pickled fish ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Their methods of putting them up are very different. For instance, our fat herring are split up and their bellies are salted inside before the fish are salted. Our barrels are poorer and perhaps some of the methods of curing fish are not equal to those employed in the old country. If you get a Norwegian barrel you can knock it about just the same as you could a stone. It will hold its pickle, but if you roll one of our barrels over a rough place it will become leaky, the pickle will be spoiled and immediately the pickle is spoiled the fish are useless for the market. What I have to urge is this : Advance the price of oil, encourage the use of dog-fish for fertilizing purposes, have a certain quantity of dog-fish canned and let an experiment be tried in the different markets of the world. No person from the province of Ontario has the least idea of the destruction to our fishermen and the fishing industry by this plague of dog-fish, and I think I may repeat what has been suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that it would be a good thing if the people of Ontario would adapt themselves to the use of more of our fresh and salt fish. If they did so their ideas would be very much enlarged. They would look better and they

would be a different class of people altogether from what they are now.

Mr. KAULBACH. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) to say that fish cured in the eastern part of Nova Scotia including Prince Edward Island——

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I did not include Prince Edward Island.

Mr. KAULBACH. Well, then the eastern part of Nova Scotia.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Yes.

Mr. KAULBACH—were of a superior character to those cured in the western part of Nova Scotia. Does he include pickled fish as well as dried fish ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I refer particularly to dried fish. I have been in the lofts in Lunenburg, and I have handled fish there and let me say with all due respect to those industrious fishermen in that country that they do not cure their fish—it is impossible for them to do so—as well as the fish that come from Newfoundland or from the northern part of my own county are cured.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. gentleman may have seen an inferior quality because I think our fishermen in the western part of Nova Scotia cure their fish fully as well as they do in the east. We have quantities of fish imported into our harbour from the east and I can see no difference at all.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I know that if a cargo of Cape Breton codfish were to be sent to Lunenburg they would bring a higher price than fish cured in the western part of Nova Scotia. But, our people are not in the habit of sending them there.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two words in regard to this very important question, important not only to the maritime provinces, but to the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and to the members of this House from every province of the Dominion. I think, from the remarks we have heard and from the information we already possess on this question, no very practical results can be obtained unless some arrangement can be come to internationally with the people of the United States to meet this great and growing pest and evil. If the people of the United States do not enter into a mutual international arrangement with us, it may be necessary for us to proceed ourselves ; and that being so, we should lose no time in taking energetic measures to get rid of this pest as far as possible. If this pest continues, it goes without saying that something will have to be done. I believe that the government is fully alive to the importance of this question, and that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will lose no time in doing whatever is possible and practicable in the matter. I cannot agree with some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Wm. Ross), although he is an old and highly respected member of this House. I am not a lawyer, and consequently I am not prejudiced in favour of that profession, which includes so many respectable members of the community, but still I think that on any commission a lawyer, or any man who is accustomed to collect and collate evidence, is a useful addition to such a body. The members of the commission are not giving their own private opinion ; they are simply meeting the fishermen and getting their opinions ; and any man who has had experience in preparing evidence can put that evidence in proper shape and report to the government. I have one word to say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to this commission. I understand that the members of the commission have given their services free.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Travelling expenses, et cetera, are paid them.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. If that commission is to go on taking evidence, I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that one of its members should come from the province of Prince Edward Island. The fisheries of that province are of great importance, and if the province had a representative on the commission he would be able to give very valuable assistance. In conclusion, I repeat that I believe that the department is seized with the very great importance of this question, and that no time will be lost, no time should be lost, in taking measures to exterminate this pest if at all possible.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). This subject came up a year ago, and in the interval the Department of Marine and Fisheries has appointed a commission to deal with the dog-fish pest and, amongst other things, to ascertain the best means of utilizing these fish when they are caught. I have had frequent conversations with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the subject, and he has impressed me with the great interest which he takes in it. He told me he was awaiting the report of the commission in order to arrive at a conclusion, but I would now remind the hon. gentleman that this is a case of extreme urgency. If we delay taking action, awaiting the report of that commission, and if we are to go into an elaborate investigation as to the utilization of the fish themselves when caught, very irreparable damage may be done to our fisheries. The fall mackerel will soon arrive on the coast of Nova Scotia, and the catching of fall mackerel, I need hardly say, is a very valuable industry. These fish are very capricious, and if they encounter dog-fish when they arrive on the coast they may strike out from our shores, the result of which would be that this very valuable fishery would be lost to the province of

Nova Scotia. Let me make this suggestion. In old times the Nova Scotia government gave a bounty of 50 cents a hundred for dog-fish ; a large number were caught, and the ravages of these fish were materially reduced in consequence. I would suggest that, pending the report of this commission, the government should establish two stations for the purchase of dog-fish ; one westward of Halifax, somewhere between Sambro and Halifax, to obtain the catch on the west coast of Nova Scotia ; and another east of Halifax, say in the county of Guysborough, to obtain the catch of the east coast. Officials of the department could be sent down there to take the dog-fish caught by the fishermen, and a bounty of half a cent apiece should be paid. I mention that amount, because it was the sum offered in former times by the Nova Scotia government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long ago is it since that bounty was given in Nova Scotia ?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I think it is more than fifty years ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did it produce good results ?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Yes ; it reduced the number of dog-fish on the coast very materially. There is some doubt as to whether a quarter of a cent per dog-fish would pay the fishermen an ordinary wage but fishermen and pilots with whom I have spoken tell me that a bounty of one-half cent each would induce the fishermen to get new gear and go into the business of exterminating dog-fish, partly because of the remuneration itself and partly because of the benefit which their extermination would be to our fisheries. I would like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take that into consideration, and while he is awaiting the report of the commission to consider the necessity of granting this bounty.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me that the dog-fish pest in Nova Scotia amounts to a calamity. The great fishing industry, which in all probability is the second industry in the maritime provinces, is valued at $14,000,000 or $15,000,000 yearly. I need not add to what has already been said on that score. With regard to the dog-fish pest, the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. William Ross) and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Matheson), tell me that about the year 1850, when they first engaged as young men in the fishing business, dog-fish were unknown. Other fishermen have told me that between 1840 and 1850 the whole maritime coast was beset with these voracious enemies of the fish and about this latter date they practically disappeared. About 1889 they reappeared along the coast of Nova Scotia, at first in small numbers ; but of late years they have increased to a degree that makes it necessary for us now to endeavour to do something to mitigate the pest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not since the period he names there has ever been a recurrence of them ? It might be interesting to know whether they come at regular periods or not, or whether anything can be accurately known in regard to that.

Mr. KENDALL. So far as my information goes, they almost entirely disappeared shortly before 1850, and they reappeared about 1888 or 1889. I remember distinctly when they returned to the coast of Cape Breton. Old fishermen whose recollection went back sixty or seventy years told me that they had not seen them before for about forty years. Since 1889 they have been on the coast every year in gradually increasing numbers. Various proposals have been made to the government for dealing with the pest. Among others it has been suggested that so much per tail should be paid for the dog-fish captured. My own idea, based largely on what I have observed as well as on statements which I have read, is that we should very seriously if not entirely deplete the treasury before we entirely exterminated the dog-fish in their season. However, it strikes me that something immediate must be done. The pest is probably temporary. The fishermen have for a number of years shown a great tendency to leave the maritime shores and go to the United States. What can best be done to tide over the present difficulty and keep them on the coast, ready for the period, perhaps one year off, perhaps five or ten years off, when the dog-fish shall disappear ? I think the measures suggested by Messrs. Whitman, of Canso, and Wilson, of Halifax, as read by the hon. leader of the opposition, are in the main the most promising measures that have been suggested. I may say that similar measures were placed before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries some months ago, and I am pleased to know that he proposes to deal with this matter in a comprehensive way. From the prices that fish guanos bring in the markets of the world, I think that if a large amount of money were placed at the disposal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the establishment of reduction plants, the country would in all probability sustain no serious loss on that account. It is not unlikely that even after these reduction plants for the purpose of making guano from dog-fish should no longer be called for, they would still be of use in reducing other fish offal, of which we must certainly have tens of thousands of tons on the shores of the maritime provinces.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For what purpose is the oil extracted from the livers of these fish used ?

Mr. KENDALL. Machine oil largely, and I am informed that if subjected to the proper process it may be utilized as cod liver oil now is, for medical purposes. However, I do not speak authoritatively on that subject. While we are on this matter, I wish to bring to the attention of the House—the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has already given it his attention—the importance of providing more refrigeration for the fisheries of the maritime provinces. During the last five or six years we have made some progress. I think some twenty-eight or twenty-nine small refrigerators have been established along the coasts, and there is a demand for more. We shall require in all probability forty or fifty more. But no matter how many are put up, these are only intended to meet the requirements of the shore fishermen. They will never meet the requirements of the great fishing fleet that goes to the banks and the gulf, and I must press on the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the necessity of making ample provision for this great fleet as soon as possible. I am quite sure that the measure will never be entirely satisfactory until we have three large refrigerators, one say in the Bay of Fundy, one about the Strait of Canso, and one in the gulf, say at the Magdalen Islands. With these we should also require at least two small steamers of the Scotch steam trawler type, fitted up with refrigerators, to convey bait from the points where it can be obtained to the large refrigerators, and from them to the different points where it cannot be obtained, and also to convey fresh fish caught off the coast to the Atlantic termini of the different railway systems. And here let me point out to the Minister of Railways that in my opinion, and in the opinion of many men connected with the fishing industry, it is essential that refrigerators be established at the Atlantic termini of the railways. We need not occupy our minds about refrigerators at the great markets, for there they are already provided. I wish also to point out to the House that the importance of this matter is seen in the fact that the Newfoundland government only last winter subsidized an American concern by guaranteeing five per cent interest on the bonds of the company to the extent of $500,000, under an arrangement by which the company provides bait for the Newfoundland shore fishermen and deep-sea fishermen, and purchases an enormous quantity of fish from the N wfoundland fishermen and transports it to the American market. I mention this to show that if we are to keep in the race we must take vigorous steps to place a first-class system of refrigeration in the hands of the fishermen of the maritime provinces. The magnitude of the industry will amply justify any such expenditure. However, I know that I do not have to press this necessity upon the attention of the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries with the slightest degree of apprehension as to the result ; because I am sure that every one in this House is thoroughly conversant with the fact that the hon. minister, since he took charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, has never turned down any measure of great importance that has been suggested to him. It is not long since he instituted in the St. Lawrence river a number of Marconi stations and established from the great lakes to the mouth of the St. Lawrence a chain of acetylene gas lights. And it is only a few weeks ago that he made arrangements to have a system of electric bells throughout the River St. Lawrence —a system which has proved very effective along the American coast. I have no doubt that he will also make provision for the extension of a like system to the maritime provinces and make ample provision to deal with the conditions that now threaten our fisheries. Of course there is always a great temptation to adopt proposals more or less popular in certain localities, but that is scarcely the way to deal with a question so important as this. For my part I have every confidence that the hon. minister is taking all necessary measures and dealing with this matter as its importance requires.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH. The shore and deep-sea fisheries of the maritime provinces is an important factor in the welfare and success of that portion of the Dominion, and representing as I do the largest fishing constituency in the Dominion is a sufficient apology for speaking on this subject at the present time. The great magnitude and increased importance of this industry, if cared for properly, is such that it demands and should receive the best consideration of the government, and as well the recognition and support of the representatives of both political parties in this House. It is a well known fact that the past few years the dog-fish have taken all but complete possession of our north Atlantic waters, and in the summer season the almost exclusive control. They have appeared the past few years in such myriads that other fish are driven from our shores, and are becoming so destructive to fishing property, such as lines, seines and nets, that fishermen fear to put their seines in the water, when the dog-fish infest these waters, lest they would lose them completely. Even when trawling in deep water they are found to eat the fish off the trawls leaving nothing in many instances but the head. The dog-fish is a menace to every description of fish, and what they can't destroy they drive away, hence during the season when the run of dog-fish exists all eatable fish are driven from our shores, the bait fish as well, hence the great scarcity of bait at this season.

The cod-fishing industry is the most valuable adjunct to the wealth of our maritime provinces, and should be protected in the best possible manner not only by a system of propagation, but by a careful consideration as to how all edible fish can be maintained and become a valuable commodity for export. Our forest wealth to a great extent is becoming exhausted or much curtailed. Our mines have their limit, although the limit may be far removed, but our fisheries may be preserved and made marvellously productive, and as lasting as the hills for all time to come. But we must seek a remedy to see this pest dog-fish removed. I know of no industry except farming, and its kindred branches in which this permanency can be claimed. If all other industries diminish, the sea will continue to yield her increase undiminished, if methods are employed to remove the dog-fish pest and we adopt the system to keep up the supply of edible fish.

I have advocated in this House bureaus of fishing for the advancement of the fisheries, from which valuable information can be gathered, equally as great as the benefits that are at present derived from bureaus of agriculture, and I cannot understand why a measure of this sort is not encouraged and adapted with a view to the improvement and greater development of our fisheries.

We have been suffering now for a number of years from what is known as the dog-fish pest. These fish are not indigenous to our waters, but come from the south and I agree with those who spoke previously that it may well be treated as one of international interest. In my opinion we should consult with the United States government and ascertain what suggestions they have to offer. As I understand, they have also taken the matter up and have suggested that a certain amount be paid to their fishermen for the capture of these fish. But that this proposition could be carried out satisfactorily, I have grave doubts. At the same time we can move independently of them to a certain extent. It would be better, however, if we could have their co-operation, especially as they are as much if not more interested in getting rid of this pest than we are. This pest is looked upon by our fishermen as most formidable—one that must be taken in hand and mastered as soon as possible. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whom I have interviewed on several occasions, seems desirous of doing what he can and willing to receive any suggestion that may be offered him to get rid of the evil. Whatever is done should be done promptly and we should insist on prompt action. Our forests are diminishing steadily owing to the demands of commerce and the anxiety of our lumbermen to realize on their limits as rapidly as possible. Our mines though considerable, will no doubt some day, happily far removed, become exhausted, but our fishing industry is one that will last for all time. But we require to employ every means to foster it and protect it as much as possible. The removal of this pest (the dog-fish) is one of those means. What we require is to ascertain what remedy would be effective. The giving of a bounty has been suggested. I have already suggested that a bounty of $5 per ton should be given instead of by actual count. The removal of the tail of the dog-fish and then letting it go would not kill the fish in my opinion. As I am informed by the fishermen, the fish would still continue to live, and if they should die in consequence of the removal of their tails, they would pollute the waters and the remedy would be worse than the disease. The reason why I suggested weight instead of number in giving the bounty is because when a fisherman comes in with a large quantity of fish, these fish are very difficult to handle because their fins and tails are like files and injure very quickly all those who handle them. But if the bounty were paid by measure, then the fishermen would get all they are entitled to and quick despatch. With regard to the suggestion thrown out by a previous speaker, that we should utilize the dog-fish as a fertilizer and have one fertilizing establishment that would not be practicable. Why? Because it would not be possible for those who catch the dog-fish to bring them to the factory to be converted into a fertilizer when far removed, but you would require to place factories at the points where the fishing is carried on to the greatest extent. Canso is an important point, but there are other points which would require those factories equally as much as Canso. In giving a bounty to the fishermen we are not only encouraging the fish industry, but we are benefiting that industry by the removal of this pest and in the course of time might be able to get rid of it entirely just as lobsters are less in number than ever before is due to the overcatch, and to the increase in price and the demand.

I therefore feel that the bounty, if given, should be paid by weight, at such a rate as the government could afford to give. I would also suggest that a bounty be given for the oil. The oil is an article of commerce that can be utilized for mechanical purposes and in other ways. I am informed by farmers that as a fertilizer the oil would not be as good as the body of the fish itself. Thus, according to my recommendation, the fishermen would have a bounty for the quantity of dog-fish caught, and also for the oil that would be obtained from the dog-fish. I would also suggest the establishment of fertilizing establishments at different points along the coast so that they might receive a bounty as well. By thus providing for the manufacture of fertilizers the farmer as well as the fishermen would receive that benefit to which he is

entitled from the bounty for the capture of dog-fish. At present we are compelled to send to the United States and purchase fertilizers. Some fertilizers are manufactured in Canada, but many persons having practical knowledge of the value of the fertilizers say that the fertilizers which they obtain from the United States, irrespective of the duty are better than those manufactured in Canada. Personally I have grave doubt with regard to that assertion; I think that cannot possibly be correct, but the analysts would be able to ascertain the comparative values of these fertilizers by the tests to which each class could be subjected. The dog-fish could thus be utilized in such a way as to benefit both classes of the community and I am free to state here that the dog-fish could be used as a feed as well. I know from past experience that dog-fish, prepared and dried as it can be with very little labour, can be employed as a feed for cattle—not for cows that are being milked, nor for cattle that are being fattened for beef, but for young cattle, young swine, and horses. If the fish can be prepared in that way I would suggest to the Minister of Fisheries that he also give a bounty of so much per ton for all fish so prepared in that way as an article of feed. We thus have three advantages from capture of these fish, the bounty for the oil, the bounty for the dog-fish as a fertilizer and the bounty for the manufacture of these fish into a good product. If this idea is favourably received by the Minister of Fisheries then I would say let him act upon it promptly so that the fishermen will be able to obtain immediate benefit. If the matter is left over for consideration they would not receive that immediate benefit. I am in receipt of numberless letters from parties who are interested in the fisheries, who urge very strongly that some action be taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These people will await the disposal of this subject with a great deal of interest.

I referred some days ago to the subject of the preservation of fish in cold storage. I would not now have brought this matter before the House but as our friend from Sydney (Mr. Kendall) referred to cold storage for fish and also to cold storage for bait purposes in Newfoundland for sea fishing, I may say that I feel that something should be done in this matter. There is no reason why we cannot have a more satisfactory service than is obtained under the process at present used at North Sydney. I referred when speaking previously on this subject to a system that is employed by Mr. Eaton, the patentor who has informed me that not only in theory but in practice his system has been found to give satisfactory results. Throughout the United States immense amounts of money have been employed in the industry of cold storage, and Mr. Eaton is now having one plant put up at Montreal, another he is arranging for at Toronto and another is about to be set up here in Ottawa. In order that the House may have a clear idea of the advantages of this system, I shall read to the House the prospectus of the Eaton Company:

Mr. WRIGHT. Are these plants being put up in Ottawa and Montreal by the government or by private individuals?

Mr. KAULBACH. Private individuals, capital subscribed. The prospectus is as follows:

THE EATON ICE PROCESS.

Ice of absolutely pure quality and free from bacteria, can be made in large quantities by the Eaton process for 10 cents per ton laid down in the icehouse.

Present cost of production.

Ice of much inferior quality, such as is obtained from the St. Lawrence or Back river, costs 75 cents per ton laid down, and is sold by the trade to large customers at $2 to $3 per ton, delivered at their place of business.

Comparative qualities.

While all river or lake ice, even the very finest, contains great numbers of germs and impurities dangerous to the health, Eaton ice is absolutely free from both, being made from water which has undergone careful scientific filteration. Nor does it contain air-bubbles, which in the ordinary article cause a loss of 40 per cent by melting, Eaton ice is hard as flint, so hard that it has a metallic ring, and it can neither rot nor become honeycombed. The absence of imbedded air prevents it from melting and from creating any moisture, it can only evaporate from the outside. Thus while dealers now are compelled to lay in a stock of 8,000 tons of ordinary ice for every 5,000 which they deliver during the season in order to effect a clear loss of 3,000 tons by melting, no loss of any consequence would occur with the Eaton ice, the loss by evaporation being merely nominal.

Absolute certainty of supply.

Ice famines are of no infrequent occurrence, owing to mild winters which do not permit the formation of cakes sufficiently thick to survive the storage period. The thinner the cakes of ice which are collected from the river, the greater will be the subsequent loss from melting in the icehouse during the summer.

The Eaton process obviates this danger in its entirety, while cold weather enables the process to be worked to the best advantage, there is no necessity for greater cold than that of the ordinary freezing weather which prevails in Canada for several months in the year. At a temperature 25, or 26 F or 30 or 40 C., one half inch of ice can be made per hour or 12 inches in 24 hours. With lower temperatures, it is made correspondingly faster. The horizontal dimensions of the ice cake are of course, limited only by the space available for the ice-bed and by the amount of the water supply. This would seem to prove that Canada is the country par excellence for working the Eaton process.

Comparative cost of production

	Good river ice	By Eaton process.
Sawing, per ton..	$0 14	None.
Carting..	0 50	.....
Packing..	0 06	.....
Melting..	0 25	.....

Cost of manufacture of Eaton ice in an 8,000 ton house. Two hundred gallons of water from city mains, at 20 cents per thousand gallons, making 4 cents for water used to make one ton of ice.

Cost of water for 8,000 tons of ice.. ..	$320 00
Labour, 6 men 30 days, at $1 50..	270 00
	$590 00

Actual cost of making ice in 8,000 ton house is therefor 7⅜ cents. To this must be added the interest charges on outlay for ground and plant. Larger plants will work cheaper still, because a considerable saving can be made in the cost of building and wages.

Plant and machinery.—The Eaton process works entirely without chemicals or machinery. Nature alone does the work of freezing. An expensive plant, therefore, is unnecessary; only houses to store the ice, with a water power attached to each for the treatment of the water, all built of the plainest materials. A 20,000 tons plant can be put up in this city for about $10,000, and larger plants proportionably cheaper

Size of Canadian market.—According to carefully collected statistics, there are consumed annually in the city of Montreal, at least 500,000 tons of ice, and in Toronto double that quantity, while the joint consumption of the lesser cities may be put down at another 500,000 tons, or at least 2,000,000 tons per annum, in Ontario, Quebec and the lower provinces. This is believed to be a very conservative estimate. Besides this local consumption, there is an unlimited field for export, for if the city of Portland, Maine, can export 5,000,000 tons of ordinary ice per season, ice which has to be brought 160 miles by rail, leaving 50 per cent of its substance in transit, there is manifestly no reason why St. John and Halifax could not build up a large business by shipping Eaton ice made at the wharfs and losing only a paltry percentage by evaporation. Ordinary good ice sold during the hot season, commands as much as $20 per ton at New Orleans, and $12 to $15 per ton at St. Louis; France and England, too, are ready to pay high prices for good ice.

Canadian company to work the Eaton process.—Mr. Eaton is the sole owner of the patents covering his process of making ice and handling water in Canada He has conveyed to the Union Ice Co., Canada, the sole right to use his process in the province of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island for the full term of the life of the patents. He has undertaken also to give to this company the free uses of any further improvements which he may make in his process, for the above territory.

The capital of the Union Ice Company is $500,000 in 100,000 shares of the par value of $5 each, fully paid and non-assessable. If a suitable property can be acquired, and a 20,000 ton plant erected, which can be done easily in three or four weeks, so as to be ready for the first cold weather in January, the house ought to be filled with ice before January 1st. When this has been done, the local ice trade can be given an opportunity to examine into the quality of the ice, the working of the process, the cost of production, and their own chances of competing with a system which works far cheaper and more certainly than the river. There being no desire to interfere with their trade, they can be offered all the ice they want at a figure considerably below what they are paying now; the stock necessary to fill their contracts can be carried for them in the company's houses until delivery time, and thus they will be saved the large outlay in cash for sawing, carting and packing, which they now must face every winter. If they decide to act thus as distributors of ice only, they will be able to get along without their icehouses and may realize upon their real estate and buildings. These inducements are thought to be so palpably plain that the trade will become at once the company's customers and all enmity and ill-feeling will be avoided.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for occupying the time of the House in reading this lengthy description of the system of ice production. I may say also that Mr. Eaton has described to me the virtue of the ice that is thus made. He says that the water goes through an electric process which deprives it of all the germs that water would naturally possess. The ice thus formed is therefore clear of all impurities of every description, and retains its congealed quality much longer that if it had not undergone this electric process. He further says in his prospectus that it removes all air globules from the ice, which in ordinary ice have a tendency to destroy the fish or meat when it is brought in contact with them. He further says, as I have remarked on a previous occasion in speaking on this subject, that the ice made by this process retains all the phosphoric properties contained in the fish or meat; whereas by the ordinary process of packing these articles in ice, those properties disappear much sooner. He also states that fish when deprived of its phosphoric properties is worthless, even as bait, and the fish will not take it. He goes on further to say that when ordinary bait is removed from the icehouse and taken on board a fishing craft, the bait will last but a very short time, whereas by his process it will last considerable longer. He also told me that he would think nothing of wrapping a pound of ice in a piece of thick paper, putting it into his satchel and travelling to Boston and back, and the ice would be in almost as perfect a condition as when he started. If that is the case it certainly offers many advantages over any other method of manufacturing ice that I have yet heard of. I have occupied a considerable time in givin expression to my views in regard to the question of dog-fish and

the remedy to be applied for the purpose of securing the removal of this pest with which the fishing industry of the maritime provinces has to contend. I sincerely hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will seriously take the matter into his consideration and act in a prompt manner in order that the fishermen of the maritime provinces may have the encouragement which they anticipate they will receive from the bounty which I suggest. I do not suggest a bounty of a merely nominal sum to the industry but a bounty sufficient to induce the fishermen to work actively to accomplish the end which is desirable, that is the removal of the dog-fish from our coast. It need not be a permanent thing. It need only be given a trial. If it is found that it does not work satisfactorily a change can be made and the hon. minister can adopt other methods.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, while the interest in this subject may be limited to a number of members in this House, I think its importance to the maritime provinces fully justifies the time and attention that have been given to it to-day. As the representative of a fishing constituency and as a minister from the maritime provinces, I naturally have the warmest interest in the subject. I have had much correspondence concerning it with people in the fishing business, including some of the gentlemen whose names have been mentioned in the discussion to-day and whose large experience entitles their opinions to the utmost consideration. I have repeatedly been in communication with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) on the subject, who at all times has manifested the warmest interest in the matter and the strongest desire to bring about some satisfactory solution. As he has indicated in the answers which he has given to questions which have been asked during the session, difficulties have been met with owing to the wide differences of opinion as to what is the best mode of dealing with the evil. That the evil exists, and that it is a great one, is fully realized, but the proper method of dealing with the matter is a question which necessarily requires time for consideration. I can only say that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has repeatedly assured me that it is his desire to co-operate with the maritime representatives in the matter, and when I came recently to prepare the supplementary estimates for the current year, which are not yet before the House, the hon. minister asked me to include a considerable sum to enable him to carry on some experiments along the line of what has been the general expression of opinion this afternoon ; that is, the establishment of reduction works for the treatment of dog-fish, both as to the preparation of the dog-fish as a food product and as to the production of oil and fertilizers. I can assure my hon. friends opposite, who have spoken on the subject, that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is entirely in sympathy with all that has been said, and has given the most substantial evidence of that fact by asking me to give him the necessary appropriation to carry out these proposed experiments.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if any attempt has been made to establish a cold storage service once a week between the maritime provinces and the province of Ontario. I allude now to the transportation of such fish as kippered herring and finnan haddies. I do not allude to those kinds that are in tin cans, but I refer to the kinds that are packed in boxes. We begin to receive them from the maritime provinces, St. John particularly, in November. They begin then to send them to us by express. The express companies have given us a very low rate on fish, but the difficulty is that we cannot get them at every season of the year. If the Lenten season is very late in the spring, we want a supply of fish, and to get this supply we must have a cold storage service from the maritime provinces to Ontario. If a car came up once a week, leaving St. John or some other maritime port every Wednesday or Thursday so that we could have the fish here by Friday, and we knew that a car was coming every week, it would be a great advantage to us. We are anxious to receive this fish in Ontario. We cannot get them unless we get them from the maritime provinces, and why can we not have fish the same as the people in the maritime provinces have ?

Mr. FIELDING. Something has been done along the lines suggested by my hon. friend, but there is ample room for expansion as he has suggested. The Intercolonial Railway, and I think the Canadian Pacific Railway, are providing some facilities for bringing fish in cold storage, but I believe that the opportunities for an expansion of this business in the upper provinces are very great indeed, and I am delighted to hear my hon. friend say that the people of Ontario are looking forward to obtaining supplies in that way. Something has been done, but there is ample room for improvement on the part of both of the railways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am told that an express car is run from Vancouver to Boston, attached to the Imperial Limited, which carries an enormous mass of halibut every day in the week, and surely if this can be carried all the way from British Columbia to Boston and sold at remunerative prices, the fish of the maritime provinces could be taken to Ontario, Quebec and even farther west.

Mr. F. B. WADE. Mr. Speaker, I think the discussion which has taken place to-day

must be productive of great good, because there seems to be but one opinion on both sides of the House, and that is that everything possible should be done for the benefit of this great industry. The fishing industry of the Dominion of Canada is worth about $23,000,000 annually. The fishing industry of the province of Nova Scotia is worth some $8,000,000 annually, and an industry of those proportions in a province of the size of Nova Scotia is one of very great importance indeed. I am sure that we are all anxious that it shall be fostered in every conceivable way, and I am glad to say that in all the communications I have had with the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) and his officials, they have always manifested the greatest interest in this industry and the desire and determination to do all they can to benefit it. In regard to the fishing industry as a whole, one of the great questions in connection with it is the transportation question. There is no doubt about that. If you have fish in the maritime provinces and you have consumers in Ontario, you must have means of transportation in order to get the fish from one place to the other. Unfortunately in Nova Scotia large sections of the fishing country have been deprived of transportation facilities, particularly from Halifax to Barrington and Yarmouth, and from Halifax east to the Strait of Canso. But it will only be a short time until we have a railway in operation along the southwest coast of Nova Scotia, and I trust that in the near future we will have a railway to the east from Halifax to the Strait of Canso. Then, with refrigerator cars, it will be possible to send large quantities of fresh fish to the markets of the west.

In regard to the methods that are being pursued at the present time, although the methods have been improved very considerably, I think it will be necessary in the near future for the fishermen of the maritime provinces to make very radical changes in the methods they have been pursuing because of the change in the market. They have to turn to the home markets more than in the past, because the West India markets, for reasons which I need not now stop to mention, are being lessened. Already this work has been begun, and firms are being established to prepare fish in the most attractive forms, and they are shipping as far west as Winnipeg and Regina. I agree that while the fisheries in Nova Scotia are worth $8,000,000 annually there is no reason why, with certain improvements, these fisheries could not be made to be worth at least $15,000,000 per annum in a very short time. That is a very great consideration. To illustrate that, I may say I know of a locality in my own county which is bordering on the Bay of Fundy. A few years ago I suppose the whole output from this one settlement was not more than $500 or $600 a year. But a pier has been erected at this place, which enables the fishermen to carry on their industry during the winter, which is the time for the haddock fishery, and as a result the output from that place is something like $20,000 a year.

The government is every year providing facilities to enable the fishermen to more profitably prosecute their calling. The result in the place I have mentioned is that we have received back in return more than $20,000 per year, and wherever that can be done the industry will be stimulated. I am glad that parliament is so alive to the great disadvantages our fishermen are labouring under because of the presence of these dog-fish. For some two or three years I have had my attention called to this matter very closely ; I have had communications with fishermen and with fish dealers, and with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the officers of his department. Everybody recognizes the evil, but the great question has been how it can be remedied. The government has been ready to do everything it can do, but the question remains what shall be done ? There has been a difference of opinion, and that is natural because people cannot very well decide how it is possible to provide a remedy. Many intelligent people tell me it is idle to think of exterminating the dog-fish ; others think they can be exterminated. There is a great deal of capital invested in the shore fisheries and a great many men are dependent on these fisheries for their livelihood. During the season this dog-fish scourge is on, these men are absolutely unable to earn a dollar. They go out in their boats and attempt to fish, but the lines are seized by the dog-fish and cut and the hook carried away, so that it is impossible for the fishermen to pursue their calling. If some means were adopted by which the fishermen during this season could catch dog-fish and make a small wage, even if it were only a dollar a day, it would save them from actual want which often results now. I have had extensive correspondence about this matter with people who are in a position to know, and I think the consensus of opinion among the best informed people is, that the government should do something in the way of aiding the erection of reduction works in certain localities along the coast. It would not be necessary for these reduction works to be so very close together, because the fish could be gathered up and delivered to them. The reason I think it would be necessary for the government to assist in this enterprise, is because of the uncertainty of a continuance of this dog-fish evil. They have been here before and have suddenly disappeared and that may happen again at any time ;—let us hope it will happen soon—but that uncertainty is sufficient to deter private capital from engaging in the establishment of reduction works. I therefore think that if the government would assist a private company in the erection of their plant,

requiring them in return to take all the dog-fish offered at a stipulated price, the most good could be accomplished. Then, whether the dog-fish were present or not, the fishermen would be enabled to earn a livelihood. I am satisfied that these reduction works could be made substantially self sustaining, but even suppose there was a considerable loss, the government is assisting other industries and it is but right that our great fishing industry should be assisted also. It is a matter for congratulation that there is on this question such a unanimity of opinion in this House; and that we are all actuated by the one desire to support the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in an earnest endeavour to exterminate this plague and to give courage to our fishermen who have been so tortured by it in the past.

Mr. O. TURGEON. I would not venture to occupy the time of the House were it not that my constituents are deeply interested in this question. I can heartily endorse the remarks of the leader of the opposition, and also the remarks made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in reference to the importance of our fisheries and the necessity of their preservation. I have the honour to represent a fishing constituency which represents one-third of the fishing industry of the province of New Brunswick; the total value of the fisheries of that province being about $4,000,000 of which $1,500,000 comes from the county of Gloucester. The fishermen of my county have suffered as well as the fishermen of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island from this dog-fish pest which has been engaging the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his department for the last year or two. In the waters frequented by the fishermen of my county on the Prince Edward Island banks as well as along the north shore of New Brunswick, these dog-fish have been in existence for over forty years, but until recently in such small numbers that the attention of the fishermen was not particularly attracted to them. Last year, after the first of August the fishing industry carried on in Gloucester county by over 220 fishing vessels virtually ceased, and evidence was given before the commission to show that the resultant loss amounted to over $50,000. The fishermen of my county have urged upon me the necessity of asking that the government shall come to their assistance. Last winter the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was kind enough to appoint what I might call a local commission, consisting of Professor Prince, and Mr. Pierre Morais, of Caraquet, to take the evidence of the fishermen in that district. When we realize that the products of the fisheries amount to $15,000,000 in the maritime provinces, and to $23,000,000 in the whole Dominion, it is easy to see what a great necessity there is for preserving this industry. I believe that with an earnest effort to develop our Canadian fishing industry it could be made to double in value within the course of a few years, so that New Brunswick would produce $8,000,000 or $10,000,000; Nova Scotia, $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, and the whole Dominion of Canada, $50,000,000, instead of $23,000,000 as at present. I am glad to say that the government is showing an interest in this matter and that their desire is to encourage the fishermen of the maritime provinces. For a number of years past we have had larger and more numerous appropriations for the construction of breakwaters and lighthouses, all calculated to facilitate the fishermen in the pursuit of their calling so that they may now get in and out of the harbour at night time as well as in the day, at low tide as at high tide. Instead of having to leave the banks on Friday night or early Saturday morning as was the case a few years ago, in order to get home for Sunday, the fishing fleet can now engage in fishing for a part of the day on Saturday, knowing that in view of the advantages that have been conferred upon them by the government, they can come into the harbour at night, and thus they have more time to prosecute their operations.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has certainly shown great interest in dealing with this calamity by appointing commissioners on the subject. While these commissioners have not yet reported, a number of suggestions have been made of more or less practicability. Some of them may be practicable along certain portions of the coasts of the maritime provinces while not practicable along other portions. Some suggestions have been made in this House and outside of this House, which may be practicable along the coast of Cape Breton, but not practicable for the fishing fleet of the county of Gloucester, which is isolated from the other fishing fleets of the maritime provinces. Every means which can be devised to diminish the dog-fish calamity should be taken as far as practicable. Among the suggestions which have been made is the establishment of fertilizers. I believe in the establishment of these fertilizers along our coasts, and I am surprised that the people of Canada have not sooner realized their necessity. At the same time, if we wait until these fertilizers are ready to do the good work they are likely to do, perhaps our fishermen will have lost patience and will have abandoned the fishing industry entirely. The men engaged in the fishing industry are laborious and active, and, as the hon. leader of the opposition said this morning, their valour and intelligence can be appreciated as well as the valour and intelligence of any other class of the Canadian people. They are willing to grapple with any difficulty and

help themselves out of the difficulty. It has also been suggested that a bounty should be paid to the fishermen, varying in amount. Such a bounty seems at first sight to be extravagant, and likely to bring Canada into a very large expenditure. It cannot be so, as our fishermen would only devote to dog-fish time that could not be otherwise utilized when at sea, on the fishing banks. Our deep-sea fishermen have no ambition to become fishers of dog-fish for the rest of their lives. They are anxious that the dog-fish pest shall be exterminated without their assistance, if possible. It has been suggested also that the government cruisers employed in protecting the coasts of the maritime provinces should be equipped in order that they may capture dog-fish in large quantities. They might be equipped with large seines of strong cord, similar to those which the Americans used in depleting our waters of mackerel and other fish at the time of the Washington treaty. If those men were able with their destructive engines, to destroy such fish as mackerel, we ought to be able to find means for destroying the dog-fish, which is threatening to destroy our shore fisheries. I would suggest co-operation between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the fishermen of the county of Gloucester and of the maritime provinces at large. I am sure the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has at his command men of ability, energy and tact, who would be willing to give their services and their best ability to the large interests of the country. men like Commander Spain and Commander Wakeham, placed at the head of such a fleet, would, I am sure, in the course of a few weeks show, to the advantage of Canada and the advantage of the fishing interests of the maritime provinces, that their efforts would be worth the small expenditure they would cost. I understood that the sum of $25,000 has been placed at the command of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for this emergency. The hon. minister has already assured us that he is ready to combat any emergency, and I believe he is as willing and ready to combat this emergency of the dog-fish calamity, in the interest of the fisheries of the maritime provinces, as he has been to equip the gulf and river St. Lawrence for navigation. For the destruction of the dog-fish pest prompt and vigorous action is required. Our fishermen cannot afford to wait for three or four years, for in that time, in their ambition, they will certainly leave the country and look for better employment; and once they leave they will not come back to that industry. We are exerting ourselves to promote the interests of our fishermen. The people of Montreal, Toronto and the west are asking for the fish of the maritime provinces. Let us show our fishermen that they will be encouraged as well as the men of any other industry. I believe that a large amount should be placed at the disposal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If he does not find the necessity of expending it, he need not expend it; but it should be there for the occasion. I believe that practical suggestions will be found only as the department engages in the work and looks for practical suggestions—it is only when you are at work that the best suggestions come to you; and I believe the suggestions will receive consideration, not only from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but from his hon. colleagues in the Council and from every member of this House.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN. Mr. Speaker, just one word with regard to this very important subject. No member of this House need apologize for calling attention to the importance of an industry which amounts to something like $22,000,000 or $23,000,000 annually to the Dominion of Canada. Representing, as I do, a very important constituency, containing as it does a seacoast of about 150 miles, containing also a very important salmon-fishing river, I do not feel that I should apologize for a moment for making a few observations in reference to this matter. With regard to this last commission that has been appointed, I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Wm. Ross) in objecting to the personnel of that commission. I think the personnel of the commission is all right, but it is important to take into account the local conditions in various parts of the country. When our fishing industry is scattered along 5,000 miles of coast, it is obvious that a commission picked from one locality would not be calculated to understand local conditions so readily as a commission picked from the various localities along the coast.

I find, on looking over the personnel of the commission then, that it is composed of gentlemen representing the Bay of Fundy constituencies and the Department of Marine and Fisheries. And if there is to be any change made in its personnel, my only suggestion would be that it should be composed of gentlemen taken from the various parts of the coast, leaving the selection to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his colleagues. I must say in passing that I can only add my mede of praise to the conduct of the hon. minister in connection with the duties pertaining to his office. I would call attention particularly to one feature in his administration and that is that he is always ready to get rid of 'red tape' and deal with a measure upon its merits. That certainly has been my experience, and that certainly is a feature of the hon. gentleman's administration well worthy of commendation. As this dog-fish pest has assumed such serious proportions as to become a menace to a most valuable industry, there is no need for me to say anything regarding the urgency of our doing something to extirpate it. What re-

quires to be done is for each gentleman from the maritime provinces to offer suggestions as to the means he considers best to get rid of the pest. It has been suggested that a reduction factory should be established for the purpose of enabling this fish to be utilized as a fertilizer, and according to the estimate of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that would cost something like $20,000 for the plant and $20,000 to run it. I am told that this is a very moderate estimate, and I observe in this connection that while the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Wm. Roche) agrees to this proposition, he couples his endorsation of it with the suggestion that the experiment should be tried on the Halifax coast. He leaves out of consideration the fact that we have a coast of something like 5,000 miles to deal with and that the dog-fish are not disposed to remain on the coast of Halifax any longer than anywhere else along our shores. It may then be urged that if the visits of these fish are of so transitory a character, why make so much ado about them. Well, one week of the dog-fish around our coast means perhaps two months destruction of our fisheries. Not only do these destroy the fishing lines, but also all the fishing nets and what is more it is well known by fishermen that the presence of this pest on the coast for one week will scare away all species of other fish for weeks at a time. Therefore do I say that the presence of this pest on our coast for one week might lead to the destruction of our fish for two months possibly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But they do stay much longer.

Mr. McLENNAN. Yes, unfortunately they do, but I am merely supposing a case. And I say that the transitory character of their visits would certainly tell very much against the establishment of a permanent institution such as a reduction plant. For the past thirty years I have lived among the fishermen and frequently have talked this subject over with them and the conclusion I have come to is that the best way to meet the evil would be to grant such inducements to destroy the fish—would be to give a bonus for every gallon of dog-fish oil sent to market or reduced or so much per head for every fish caught. That would be much more effective than a reduction plant, inasmuch as it would cover our whole coast. It might be said that an army of officials would be required to check the counting of these fish, which would certainly be an objection, but at the same time I am sure that the money we would spend in a month or so in this way would be much more than compensated for by the additional value given to our fisheries. I would therefore urge upon the minister and his colleagues the advisability of experimenting along this line and to pay a bounty either of so much per fish caught or so much a gallon for every gallon of oil. Two most important classes would in this way be benefited, because after the oil would be taken from the fish the residue would make a capital compost to be used on farm lands, and I venture to say that this compost would find a ready market, so that the only expense to which the government would be subjected would be the expense of furnishing the needed incentive in the shape of a bounty for every gallon of oil rendered or every fish caught. There is just one point to which I wish to call attention, and that is with regard to the lobster fishing industry, and I refer to this because the commission has not yet finished its work. I would call attention to it in particular to the operations along our coast. No doubt the investigations of the previous commission have been productive of the very greatest good, but there are certainly some defects in the conclusions at which they arrived. One of these defects is the great inequalities in the length of the season in different districts. I would therefore suggest that the commission pay particular attention to the equalizing of the lobster fishing season around the Island of Cape Breton. There is nearly a month's difference in the time within which fishermen can prosecute that industry in different parts of the coast around that island. I am sure the House will agree that a difference of three weeks in the open season in one locality is quite unreasonable.

With regard to the proposition to establish factories for the manufacture of oil and other valuable products from the dog-fish, I would again say that this would be a very costly way of disposing of the fish, although it might be profitable in some localities. The great obstacle would be the difficulty of applying such a system along 5,000 miles of coast. From the southern side of the Bay of Fundy to Labrador there is a fishing coast of that length and to establish these factories would involve an immense expense. What is more, the fish is of a migratory character and when a factory had been built at great expense perhaps in three weeks after its completion this pest would migrate to another shore. I would therefore press upon the government the choice of giving a bounty per head for every dog-fish taken or else of so much a gallon for every gallon of oil extracted. In this way the whole coast would be covered much better than by experimenting in any one locality.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend think the fish could be used for food to any extent ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I have never heard of it being used for food among our people.

Mr. WADE. I believe that some have been canned.

Mr. McLENNAN. Not that I have heard of. The oil is quite valuable, and as a fertilizer they are excellent. The farmers along out coast would lose no time I am sure in adopting them as a fertilizer and paying the fishermen for them. I make these observations on behalf of the fishermen along the 150 miles of coast in the county which I have the honour to represent. What holds true of that coast, no doubt holds true of several other constituencies in the province from which I come.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if the dog-fish has ever been analysed so that we might be able to tell whether it is fit for food or only for manure? Before we undertake to discuss the dog-fish, we should know its component parts, and what it is fit for. It has been discussed ever since we started this morning at 11 o'clock, but I have yet to learn what it is good for. It seems to be a great evil to the fishermen, and we should know what it is worth.

Mr. McLENNAN. Dog-fish have been analysed and are found good as food. I think 90 per cent of the fish is good for food, and the bi-products form excellent fertilizers.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY. I was glad to hear the hon. member for West Elgin ask this question, because I apprehend that this question should be discussed by the people of Ontario more than by the people of the maritime provinces. This is one of the vital questions of Canada. The fishery interests of the maritime provinces are the most vital in Canada. They are infinitely superior to the wheat interests, the mineral interests or the agricultural interests of Canada. This matter should be taken up in the most liberal spirit so that the government if necessary may spend not only $100,000, but $1,000,000 to exterminate this pest. This is a new menace to the fishing interests in the maritime provinces. What we want is a commission that will summon to its aid the most scientific knowledge in the country to determine where these dog-fish grow and then to ascertain the best and most effective means to secure their extermination, because exterminated they must be, otherwise they will destroy the fishing industries in Canada. They are the most important industries in the world. Down by the seas you have a maritime and a commercial people. Without a maritime and commercial population this country would be inland, and inland countries have ever been failures. You must have a mercantile country. The men who control the sea, who go abroad, are the ones who determine the character of a country. You train these men in the fisherise of the maritime provinces, and if you want a navy——

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am surprised at the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson). Is he so narrow as to be absolutely unaware of the enormous proportions of the fishing industries of the maritime provinces? The other matter is the commercial interest of this country, in which British Columbia ought to have some concern. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen should take so little interest in this matter. I suppose if it had been a question that offered some personal advantage to some one, they would have been on their feet. But apparently no subject that does not offer some personal reward to some members of this House appeals to their hearts or their statesmanship. I want the hon. gentleman to know that the fish industries of the maritime provinces are among the most important industries in this country. The only thing I regretted in the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson)—who is generally liberal to a fault and sometimes conservative to a fault—was his remark that this discussion commenced at 11 o'clock and it was time to finish it. Why, Sir, in the interests of Canada it should be continued for two months, if it were necessary. If it were some little vote of $2,000 for a wharf, then I suppose he would be willing to let it continue for a week. But when a vital interest is being discussed when the great fishing interests of this country are at stake, that is another thing.

Now I want to say that without great fishing interests you cannot have a commercial marine and you cannot have a navy. I want to see in a few years a navy, so that if my children desire to pursue a naval course they can do so on Canadian vessels instead of having to go abroad. I want to see a navy in this country. From what other source can you find men to man your navy unless from those who are engaged in the fishing industry? Can you man your navy with men from Ontario or from Manitoba? Why, Sir, a ship manned by Manitobans or Ontarians would sink in half an hour. You want the men down by the sea to man your ships. Maritime people alone can produce a successful navy. These are the sailors that fight on the ships that win victories, it does not depend on the number of the ships or the tonnage of the navy. Now if we want a navy in this country we must encourage the great fishing interests of the maritime provinces. I say that if need came we could furnish in the maritime provinces 20,000 or 50,000 of the finest sailors in the world. Give them three months training on board a ship, and they would fight the fleets of Japan and Russia combined, and sink them. I want to see questions of this kind appeal to the manhood of Canada, and relegate little questions to county councils. This is a vital question, and I ask the government to spare no pains in dealing with it. If it

takes $100,000, vote it; if it takes $1,000,000, vote it; vote all that is required to destroy the pest of the dog-fish. I have no technical knowledge of the fishing industries myself, I only know that with $1,000,000 you can get the technical information necessary to protect our fisheries. Therefore I would ask parliament to vote, if necessary, $1,000,000 to save the fishing interests of the maritime provinces, because they would serve for the foundation of a great commercial navy which I hope to see built up in this country.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON. I do not knew why the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gourley) singled me out for some of his jibes.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will tell you why. I noticed on one or two occasions while I was speaking—I do not know whether it is the training that British Columbia people receive or not, I am not familiar with their training—but I noticed that the hon. gentleman was acting in a very boisterous manner, what I would call an ill-bred manner, in attempting interruptions.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think I am in the judgment of every member of the House if my conduct since I have been here does not at least stand a fair comparison with that of the hon. gentleman. I do not think I have ever got up in this House and rambled all over God's green earth in making a speech. If the hon. gentleman is annoyed because, in conversation with a gentleman at my right, who said something to me which caused me to laugh while the hon. gentleman was speaking, I am prepared to apologize for my laugh, though to tell the truth I was not laughing at anything the hon. gentleman said, because most of what he said was not worth laughing at. Even if I did wish to laugh at him while he was speaking, there is no law in this country to forbid me. I think my breeding is quite as good as his, and I think my conduct in this House will compare favourably with his own. I would not have spoken on this dog-fish question if the hon. member had not unnecessarily brought my name into the discussion, but we in the west have some interest in this particular question. But we have not come to parliament like the hon. member for Colchester asking the government to contribute $1,000,000 towards exterminating the pest. We have dog-fish on our coasts and have had for years, but we deal with the pest ourselves, instead of asking the government to interfere on our behalf in the exercise of paternalism. I am a Canadian first, last, and all the time, and I believe that what is good for Nova Scotia is good for British Columbia. We in British Columbia have settled the dog-fish question some time ago. We have erected refineries there. We catch the fish and render them into oil and use the offal as a fertilizer. The result is that we have two companies there who are now making money out of it, and we do not come to the Dominion parliament asking for paternal assistance. I believe there is a little too much paternalism exercised by the government in behalf of people who expect government assistance for every little industry they start, or every little difficulty they get into. No doubt our people in British Columbia would be pleased if they could receive some benefit in the way of a bounty towards destroying the dog-fish pest. Our dog-fish are just as disastrous to other fish as they are down in the maritime provinces. The only difference is that our dog-fish do not go into the rivers in such large quantities, they stay in the open sea. Our salmon go into the fresh water, and when the dog-fish do not follow them into fresh water, but are caught in traps and by an apparatus made specially for the purpose, consisting of strong steel hooks which the fish cannot bite through.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are they put to any use in British Columbia?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes. The oil is largely used as a lubricant, they call it skidway oil. We use a lot of it in our country in lumbering operations. That may seem strange to people in the east. But we have no snow there to facilitate the getting out of logs, and the people use skidways which they grease with this oil. Dog-fish livers make an oil equal to cod liver oil, and a good many people use it medicinally. I am aware from personal knowledge that it makes as good an oil as cod liver oil. There is no better fertilizer than the residue from the refinery.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should talk of paternalism when we have aided British Columbia——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GOURLEY. I merely wanted to make an explanation and refer to the lead bounties which we granted British Columbia last year.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

SIR ELZEAR TASCHEREAU AND LORD DUNDONALD.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I wish to draw the attention of the government to a cablegram which appears in the evening papers—in the Evening 'Citizen' of to-day and in the Ottawa Evening 'Journal.' The cablegram is to the same effect. That in the 'Citizen' reads as follows:

London, July 19.—Sir Elzear Taschereau, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, says he is indignant at the political capital being made out of the Dundonald affair. He says the London 'Times' is being loaded up by Ottawa Tory

sources. There are few Scotchmen back of the whole agitation, and he cannot see how the British government, if alive to its own interests, can fail to recall Lord Dundonald before the end of the week.

In the 'Journal' of this evening the cable is as follows :

London, July 19.—Sir Elzear Taschereau says he is indignant that political capital is being made of the Dundonald affair. The 'Times' is loaded up by Ottawa Tory sources. Few Scotchmen back the whole agitation. He cannot see how British government, if alive to its own interests, can fail to recall Dundonald before the end of the week.

I can hardly believe it possible that these cables reflect accurately the views given in public by this distinguished jurist. His Lordship enjoys an enviable reputation as an impartial jurist, but if he desires to maintain that splendid position he must refrain from the public discussion of purely political matters. It is hardly in accord with the fitness of things that His Lordship —who is at present in London in attendance upon the sessions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Supreme Court of the empire—should make use of this language, or should give utterance to these views regarding a gallant British officer who is only defending himself against the unfair and unjustifiable attacks which have been made and are being made upon him. Lord Dundonald is no longer in the service of Canada. He no longer occupies the position of General Officer Commanding the Canadian militia, and if, as it is claimed by some hon. gentlemen, that, notwithstanding the fact that he occupies no official position in Canada or in connection with the Canadian government, although a distinguished officer of the British army, it is impolitic on his part to make public speeches or to discuss a matter of this kind in which he is so vitally interested, what shall be said of the course which is being pursued by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada in this connection ? I would like to ask the government if the statement I have read has been brought to its attention ; if this statement has been authorized ; if the government approves of it, and if it will make some definite announcement as to the position of the government, either now or at the sitting of the House to-morrow ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am afraid we cannot either now or to-morrow give my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) the precise answer he wants. We cannot deny that our attention has been called to the matter because my hon. friend has called our attention to it to-day, but this is the only way in which we have become acquainted with the statement and I think it would not be wise for us to assume anything to the disadvantage of the distinguished chief justice of Canada upon a mere cable report. I think that before forming any opinion as to any utterance of Sir Elzear Taschereau it would be wise for us to get fuller information. We have no information at the present time upon the matter to which the hon. gentleman has drawn attention.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that these cables have come by our own special Canadian cable service that is paid for by the people of Canada, and they are likely to be official on that account. That is the reason why I think we are entitled to have some definite statement from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman wishes to imply that these cables are in any way under the control of the government or that the government have anything to do with them he is certainly mistaken. We grant a sum of money to aid the Canadian Press Association in the dissemination of their news but they manage the matter entirely and I can assure my hon. friend that we have not really any more control over these cables than he himself. I do not wish to offer any opinion whatever concerning them.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister misapprehends what I meant to say. I meant to say that this cable service was supposed to devote most of its space to Canada. It was for that reason that the cable service was subsidized and for that reason I believe the service will be more likely to be official and accurate than an ordinary associated press cablegram might be expected to be.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS ON SURVEYS.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Yesterday the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) stated that he had received a communication from Mr. Griffith, secretary of the Amalgamated Engineers of Canada, to the effect that verbatim copies of the evidence being taken by His Honour Judge Winchester in connection with the alien labour inquiry now being conducted had been delivered to the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific. Yesterday I gave, as far as I was in a position to do so, as I could only speak from belief, a most unqualified denial to the statement, but I added that I would put myself in communication with the stenographer who accompanied the judge at once and ascertain the facts. I found that the stenographer was absent from Ottawa being in attendance on Judge Winchester in Montreal where he is still engaged on the inquiry. Accordingly I sent the following telegram to Judge Winchester :

Ottawa, July 18, 1904.

His Honour Judge Winchester,
Windsor Hotel, Montreal, Que.

(Rush.)

Have been asked in the House whether statement of Mr. Griffith is correct that Grand Trunk or Grand Trunk Pacific was furnished daily with verbatim copies of evidence taken by you in connection with present inquiry. What are the facts ?

(Sgd.) WM. MULOCK.

To which I received last evening the following reply :

Montreal, Que., 18, 04.

Hon. Sir William Mulock, K.C.,
Ottawa, Ont.

No evidence whatever has been furnished any one in connection with inquiry. I have myself only received certain portions of it on which to found my interim reports. Griffith's statement untrue.

(Sgd.) JOHN WINCHESTER.

RESIGNATION OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL GREGORY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I would like to direct the attention of the government and more especially that of the hon. Minister of of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to the fact that the correspondence brought down relating to the case of Lieutenant Colonel Gregory does not seem to include the correspondence between the district officer commanding No. 2 district and Colonel Gregory, which as I understand ought to be available. Perhaps that can be supplemented at an early date.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I understood that everything was brought down but I will make an inquiry.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Government of the Northwest Territories—registrars, &c., $39,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the cause of the increase ?

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). There has been a very large increase in the business done in the Northwest Territories ; the revenue has grown from $10,000, in 1896 to $74,800 last year. The increase of $7,000 is caused by the appointment of eight clerks at Regina at a salary of $600 each ; a clerk at Edmonton, $480 ; two additional clerks at Edmonton, $1,200 ; increases in salaries to the staff generally, $1,635 ; increase in contingencies, $485, total increase, $8,000. One clerk with a salary of $1,000 has resigned leaving the net increase, $7,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Government of the Northwest Territories—insane patients, $70,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand this money is paid under an arrangement with Manitoba. Has there been any change made in the manner in which the Northwest lunatics are looked after ?

Mr. SIFTON. No change. We provide for the maintenance of 148 patients at $1 a day, $54,200 ; transportation, $4,500 ; clothing, &c., $500 ; additional cases, $6,408. This expenditure is constantly increasing. In 1896 it was $33,500 and for the six months from the 1st of July to December 31, 1903 it was $30,431, so that I think $70,000 would be a conservative estimate. We simply pay according to a scale.

Government of the Northwest Territories—grant for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c., to be paid half yearly, $707,979.

Mr. SIFTON. This is a subsidy vote for the Northwest government and when the main estimates were made up several months ago we did not have any communication from the Northwest government as to their requirements, I simply inserted the total amount of last year's vote which would go on account of the amount that will be required for this year. It is intended to ask for the balance in the supplementary estimates. When we come to that vote, we will then know the exact amount, and I will put before the House a statement of what has been asked for by the Northwest government, so that it probably will be a more suitable time to discuss the matter.

Yukon—salaries and expenses in connection with administration of the territory, $235,540.

Mr. SIFTON. There will be a further estimate in connection with this amount. We pay out of this vote the salaries and what is called the living allowances of the officials of the Yukon Territory. They have been getting a living allowance of $1,800 a year each, in addition to their salaries, on account of the excessive cost of living in that territory. Last summer I formed the opinion that the time had come when this living allowance ought to be cut down and I directed the deputy to estimate for only $900 a year for each official instead of $1,800, I had in my mind at the time that it was not likely that the amount could be cut down to $900 and I desired to discuss the exact amount with the inspector, the member for the Yukon Territory (Mr. Ross) and the commissioner who have better information in regard to the Yukon than I have. This vote includes only $900 for living allowance and the additional amount will be put in the supplementary estimates, I desire to state that it is my intention to ask the committee to vote for the married men an allowance of $1,500, and the single men an allowance of $1,000. Instead of all the officials getting $1,800 a year living allowance, the married men will get $1,500

and the single men, $1,000, except in the case of some of the higher officials.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why doesn't the minister give them a salary, and let them provide for themselves ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is a difficult question. One or two of the other departments do that. It involves putting the salary up to such a figure that it would be difficult to make a comparison with the salaries paid in other places. It seemed to me to be much more satisfactory to pay about the same salary that we pay to a similar official in this part of the country and to add a living allowance suitable to the conditions of the country. When the conditions of the country change, we can reduce the living allowance. Otherwise the official might think whatever the conditions were that was his salary. He cannot say that now. When the conditions change, his living allowance ought to change too.

Grant to Yukon council for local purposes, $125,000.

Mr. SIFTON. This is in the nature of a subsidy.

Grant to Yukon council for maintenance and construction of roads and bridges, and maintenance of public buildings, $200,000.

Mr. SIFTON. This is also in the nature of a subsidy, but I desire to move for the reduction of this amount by $65,420, for the following reason : There has been some discussion as to whether the public buildings in the Yukon Territory should be administered as to their maintenance by the local council or by the Public Works Department. This estimate was made upon the basis of the local council carrying on that administration ; but the commissioner recommends that the method which formerly prevailed, of the Pubic Works Department administering the Dominion public buildings directly, is the more satisfactory, as it is the logical way. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is going to estimate for this amount in his estimates, which will be laid before the House in a few days.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think the minister has given us any good reason why these buildings should be administered from Ottawa instead of by the local authorities. It seems to me they could be much better administered by the men on the spot.

Mr. SIFTON. The Yukon council is in the nature of a local government. It has properties of its own to administer, a separate revenue and a separate budget. These are Dominion public buildings, and not buildings of the local government.

Mr. COCHRANE. For many years I have thought that it was better to give the Northwest Territories local autonomy and let them manage their own business. Why should they be kept in leading strings any longer, with all their monetary affairs directed from Ottawa ?

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend will reflect, he will see that there is no province in the Dominion where the provincial government administers Dominion public buildings.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not talking about Dominion public buildings. I am talking about the Northwest council taking care of its own affairs. In the province of Ontario we do not get subsidies to build our roads and bridges. We have to build them ourselves, and for that reason there is more economy practiced than there would be if they were built by officials appointed by the government at Ottawa. I think the time has arrived when the Northwest Territories should have the power to manage their own affairs in the way they consider best adapted to the country.

Mr. WILSON. I understand from what the minister has said that up to the present time these buildings have been administered by the local authorities, and he has not given us any particular reason for the change, except that they are Dominion buildings.

Mr. SIFTON. Last year a change was made by which some of the Dominion public buildings which had been built by the Department of Public Works were turned over to the local government to administer. They sent us an estimate of how much it would cost and we supplied the money. In that way we have not the same control over the expenditure, and the commissioner has written to the Minister of Public Works pointing out that to have some buildings owned by the Dominion administered by the local council and others administered by the Department of Public Works involves a confusion of accounts. They were all administered by the Dominion the year before last, and the commissioner recommends that we go back to the old system. The same men will handle the money and attend to the business. It is practically only a change in the method of book-keeping.

Motion agreed to, and item reduced by $65,420.

Surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, including $13,000 for Irrigation Surveys, &c.. ..	..$750,000
To provide for purchase of steel cases for Survey Records of the Department..	14,100
	..$764,100

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How much was surveyed last year ? The hon. gentleman told us last year that it was his intention to have 500 townships surveyed in the Northwest during this year. How many townships have been surveyed and where have the surveys been made ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have a statement of the work done last year but have not got it under my hand. I shall lay it on the table to-morrow. The work for this year is as follows :

1. Three parties under daily pay at $15,000 each—$45,000.

Three survey parties are to be kept at work for twelve months in the Peace River District, establishing base lines and block outlines, which are the governing lines of the system of survey of Dominion Lands. These lines have to be marked on the ground in order that subdivision surveys may be undertaken in the near future.

Each party is in charge of a Dominion Land Surveyor whose salary is $7.50 per day. The assistant is paid $3 per day ; the the cook and labourers are hired at the current rate of wages of this district. A party consists of fourteen men besides the surveyor and the assistant. The cost is about $45 per day.

2. Three parties under daily pay at $10,000 each—$30,000.

Three parties are to be employed during the coming season in surveying base lines and block outlines west of Edmonton and from Lesser Slave lake westwards along the 19th base line. These parties will be of the same strength as those sent to Peace river.

3. Five parties under daily pay at $7,500 each —$37,500.

For surveying the outlines of townships between the base lines before commencing the subdivision and for making subdivision and other surveys which cannot be executed under contract, it is proposed to have five parties. One is to work in Manitoba, one in Southern Alberta and three around Edmonton and at Athabaska Landing. An outline party consists of a surveyor in charge at $6.50 per day, an assistant at $3 per day, a cook and nine or ten labourers. The cook and labourers are engaged at the current rate of wages of the country in which they are working. The cost is from $30 to $35 per day.

4. One party under daily pay at $17,000.

The surveys made more than twenty years ago were marked by wooden posts and mounds. The posts have been destroyed by prairie or bush fires and the mounds being more or less obliterated, new settlers have great difficulty in finding the limits of their lands. The lines of these old surveys are being gradually renewed and marked with iron posts. By taking the townships in large blocks and employing a numerically strong party, the work can be done for five to six dollars per mile, which is less than half the cost of the original subdivision. It is proposed to renew the marks of survey in a block of fifty-one townships near Touchwood Hills, in eight townships at Willow Bunch in Southern Assiniboia and six townships near Prince Albert, or in sixty-five townships altogether. The work is to be done by one party consisting of a surveyor at $7.50 per day, four assistants at $3 each, twenty-nine labourers and a cook at current wages. The cost is estimated at $75 per day.

5. Three parties under daily pay at $7,500 each—$22,500.

For restoring the marks of obliterated surveys in Manitoba and near Edmonton, two parties are to be employed. Another party is to retrace the lines of townships in Manitoba which were badly surveyed. The lines will not be changed but plans will be made showing their directions and lengths and the actual contents of every quarter section. The parties will be of the same strength as those employed for the survey of township outlines.

6. Two parties under daily pay at $8,000 each —$16,000.

The surveys in the British Columbia Railway Belt are made by two parties, one attending to the eastern part of the belt and the other one to the western part. The parties are of the same strength as those employed for the survey of township outlines The cost per day is a little more than in the Northwest Territories on account of the higher wages of labourers.

7. One party under daily pay at $6,000.

Mr. A. O. Wheeler completed last year his survey of the Selkirk range in the vicinity of the Canadian Pacific Railway. His report and map are being published and will prove of great interest and value to the constantly increasing number of persons who are visiting the mountains every summer. He is now to commence the survey of the Rocky Mountains between the Gap and the Columbia river and to prepare a report descriptive of the country. His salary is $2,000 a year ; he has two assistants at $75 and $60 a month respectively and during the summer engages a few labourers for work on the ground. His office is at Calgary, Alta.

8. One party under daily pay at $5,000. It is proposed to have an exploration made of the Peace River District for the purpose of ascertaining where the best lands for settlement are situated. After these lands are located, steps will be taken for their subdivision at an early date. Incidentally, information will be collected to assist in selecting the 3,500,000 acres in the Peace River country which the province of British Columbia has agreed to convey to the Dominion. The party is to be in charge of Mr. Thos. Turnbull and will consist only of a few labourers. Mr. Turnbull's salary is $2,000 a year.

9. Four parties under daily pay at $6,000 each—$24,000.

The subdivision of townships into sections being executed under contract, it is necessary to have a thorough inspection made in order to make sure that the surveys have been properly and accurately executed and that the charges for doing the work are in accordance with the terms of the contract. Four Dominion Land Surveyors will be employed as inspectors ; each will have a party consisting of six labourers and a cook. The salary of the inspectors is $6.50 per day and the cost of each party is estimated at $25 per day.

10. Fifty subdivision survey contracts at $7,600 each—$380,000.

The Dominion Lands Act provides that except in special cases the township subdivision surveys of Dominion Lands shall be performed under contract at a certain rate per township, per mile, or per acre, fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council or by competitive tender. The present rate has been fixed by the Governor in Council and varies according to the difficulty of the work, from $7 per mile in bare prairie to $30 and $35 per mile in the woods. The subdivision of a township (not including the exterior boundaries laid out by surveyors under daily pay) requires the survey of forty-eight miles of section lines and of the lakes and rivers within the township. The cost varies from $350 in the bare prairie to $2,000 and over in the woods. A full township provides sixty-four free homesteads.

The surveys contemplated for the coming season comprise four hundred townships, the bulk of the work being situated west of the South Saskatchewan and south of Battleford, where a block of one hundred and eighty-three townships, mostly prairie, is to be subdivided The location of the townships is as follows :—

	Townships.
Southeastern Manitoba	8
East of Lake Dauphin	5
Near Fort Pelly	14
Southeast of Prince Albert	42
South of Battleford	183
North of Battleford	6
West of Fort Pitt	48
West of Fort Pitt near Battle river	35
On Red Deer river	9
West of 5th meridian, between Calgary and Edmonton	50
Total	400

These townships are to be divided into fifty contracts of about $7,600 each. The cost of the subdivision is estimated to average $950 per township.

11. Irrigation surveys, $13,000.

The irrigation surveys and the administration of the Irrigation Act are under the supervision of the Commissioner of Public Works of the Northwest Territories. The work includes the measurement of the discharge of streams and a topographical survey of the country suitable for irrigation, with a view to the best utilization of the quantity of water available. Two or three survey parties have been engaged on this work for several years and a number of observers are employed at various points on the streams. The work is to be continued as before at an established cost of $13,000

12. Yukon survey office, $40,000.

13. Employees at Ottawa, $90,000.

The greater part of the surveys staff consists of temporary clerks paid out of the appropriation for Dominion land surveys. There are at present ninety-seven persons thus employed. They have to examine, plot and prepare for publication, the surveys made by surveyors in the field and to attend to the miscellaneous work incidental to a large survey office.

The plans of townships subdivided and of other surveys are lithographed for departmental use, for distribution to agents and for sale to the public. The lithographic office, where the work is done, consists of nine employees and costs about $4,800.

In the photographic office, plans are copied, enlarged or reduced as needed and plates for photozinography prepared. The office consists of six employees and costs about $3,040.

14. 20,000 iron posts, $5,000.

The corners of townships and sections are marked with iron posts made of gas tubing. The price averages 25 cents each. 20,000 posts are needed for the coming season.

15. Miscellaneous, $19,000.

This item is to cover surveying instruments, printing and supplies of various kinds.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is any surveying being done at the present time in Manitoba under the auspices of the Dominion government?

Mr. SIFTON. There are, among others, five east of Lake Dauphin.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In what townships are these five being made?

Mr. SIFTON. I have not that information. My table does not give the exact townships, but I can obtain it for my hon. friend. I can give the committee a map of the country so as to show the townships that are being surveyed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The reason I ask is that in one township, township No. 19, range 19, which is in the permanent timber reserve there are many settlers who have petitioned the government to have it thrown open for settlement. There is practically no timber in the township and in view of the fact that land has been sold by the railway companies in that township, it seems to be the height of folly to retain it in the timber reserve. Either the settlers should be notified that it is to be kept as a timber reserve and no settlement permitted, or it should be thrown open for homesteading.

Mr. SIFTON. Are there a number of half-breeds in that township ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes, it is near Clearwater lake.

Among papers which were brought down in answer to a motion by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) I noticed some correspondence between the Dominion and provincial governments, showing that the provincial government sold some land in this township, but it had not been surveyed by the Dominion government and the attention of the Dominion government was drawn to this. Again some railway companies have their lands situated in that township, and have been selling some of their lands to settlers. The township is practically without timber and the half-breeds who have settled in it are anxious to know whether they are to be permitted to remain there. Some of them have waited on me and asked me to bring the matter to the minister's attention. I forwarded several petitions, which I received, to the department asking that these settlers be notified as soon as possible whether or not they are to be allowed to take up homesteads. I had a conversation with Crown Timber Inspector Stevenson, in Winnipeg last year and he said that legislation would be introduced this session in regard to that timber reserve. Is it the intention of the government to introduce such legislation or what decision has been come to in reference to this particular township.

Mr. SIFTON. I have had the facts brought before me and have given them some consideration. As to the people being notified not to take up homesteads, I think my hon. friend will admit that they were perfectly well aware that this land is on a timber reserve, but my hon. friend will no doubt

agree that it is sometimes necessary to do more than give notice in order to keep people off government lands. As to the colony in this particular township to which my hon. friend refers, some of the cases will be more or less difficult to deal with. It is not settled under the provision of the Dominion Lands Act at all. I have not been able to make up my mind positively as to how this township should be dealt with, but I think I have all the facts and only one point remains to be cleared up. I may say to my hon. friend that I think some land now in the reserve will have to be taken out of it before we make a final settlement of the question. One of the railway companies, I think it is the Canadian Northern Railway, have the right under the old Order in Council to select lands in that timber limit, but this railway was notified by the department some time ago that the department was willing to give them other lands in other places. The last communication which I saw on the subject was to the effect that their sales were not irrevocable and they were willing to carry out the suggestion as to the government acquiring these lands. We are considering the question now for the purpose of seeing what can be done. Of course the question of protecting a purchaser may arise. What I propose to do is to endeavour to effect an amicable and reasonable settlement all around so that I can introduce legislation which I would have introduced before this if this question about the land sold by the railway company had not been brought up. When that is out of the way I shall introduce legislation to finally define the bounds of these timber limits. As to the odd numbered sections, so far as the Canadian Northern is concerned, they have agreed to dispose to us of their sections in exchange for lands in other places and practically the only question which remains is whether there are any individual purchasers who have to be reckoned with. As to that we are now getting information.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Petitions have been sent to the government for several years past in reference to this, and the invariable reply has been that the department intended to send out an inspector and that as soon as his report was received the government would act on his report. I understand that one officer was sent out there last winter, made an investigation and reported. I think his name was Mr. Stewart.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend refers probably to Mr. Stewart, chief of the forestry branch.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes; he called and saw me after his inspection and told me he was going to report in favour of doing either one of two things, that the government should either close the township entirely, the government should buy up railway lands and give lands in exchange and have the township joined to the permanent timber reserve, or else that a certain reserve should be set apart for these half-breeds, giving them small limits inside of the township. This I understand is the nature of his report and having that report, I do not see what else the minister is waiting for, unless, as some of these half-breeds think—and there may be some foundation for their belief—that the government is hesitating until after the elections. These gentlemen have votes and it may be that the government do not like to turn them off the land before the elections, nor do they wish to allow them to take homesteads in these townships.

Mr. SIFTON. How long have they been there ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Some have been there twelve months, some have come more recently and some have been there a couple of years. Some of them had votes in the last provincial election—but perhaps I had better not give the minister too much information about them. At any rate the inspector reported as long ago as last January or February and having received that report, I do not see why there should be hesitation on the part of the minister to decide as to what he should do in regard to this particular township.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend knows well, of course, that these people had no business to go there in the last two years as this is a permanent timber reserve. My hon. friend and I both know perfectly well that it is sometimes difficult to keep people off government reserves, especially if there is any timber on them, or in their neighbourhood. But what I want to say is this: We want first of all to get the reserves into the hands of the government. The railway company has agreed to it, and practically the only difficulty we have now is to get exact information as to whether there are any persons on timber lands and where they are. Our whole object has been to ascertain and make the final boundaries of the reserves.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I can assure the minister that there have been some purchases by settlers from the railway company, and some of those purchasers are located on that land purchased from the Canadian Northern Railway. Has the minister received the report of Mr. Stewart who was sent up there last winter to investigate ?

Mr. SIFTON. No doubt we have a report from Mr. Stewart, but he was not sent up there for the purpose of reporting on the details of this matter. He went up there to look after this timber reserve.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like the minister to bring down Mr. Stewart's report. The minister knows there are many Galicians settled on those timber reserves,

and have been for the last five years. They are being allowed to develop their land, some of them are improving their land, and I understand that the Department of the Interior has not discouraged them to any great extent.

Mr. SIFTON. I venture to say that no officer of the department has directly or indirectly encouraged them to go on the timber reserves.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am not charging that. I am saying that the minister is not taking any steps to remove them, seeing that they are trespassers on this land. They are allowed to sell the timber, they set fires, in consequence of which a great deal of timber is destroyed.

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman knows what the law is about fires.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This very township 19, range 19, is not being thrown open to homestead entry because it is part of the timber reserve. There are hundreds of Galicians scattered throughout the Riding Mountains on government land; in some cases three or four Galicians are located on one quarter section. They have not been removed as trespassers, and they are allowed to cut down timber and sell it. I do not blame them for that because that is practically all they have to maintain them during the winter. They go out to labour in the summer time, and in the winter they cut and sell wood. Now, I would ask the minister if he would allow settlers from Ontario to go up there in shoals of hundreds and settle on those lands. I think they would not be allowed to remain there five years as trespassers, as these Galicians have been allowed to remain. The whole Riding Mountains are literally crowded with Galician settlers, and either this land ought to be thrown open for settlement, surveyed and properly divided into quarter sections, or these people should be removed by the government and the timber reserve should be permanently maintained.

Mr. OSLER. I would ask the Minister what amount was received by the government last year in repayment of land surveyed, from either the railway company or other sources?

Mr. SIFTON. No payments have yet been made by the company.

Mr. OSLER. Are the individuals charged?

Mr. SIFTON. No, there are different contracts with different companies. Some companies are liable to pay and others are not.

Mr. OSLER. I ask the question because I notice that you are charging the whole of this amount, $750,000, to capital. When the land is sold the proceeds are credited to revenue; but in the case of these surveys you are crediting revenue twice, that is to say, you are taking credit in the Interior Department, as I see on L—115, for $103,281, on revenue account.

Mr. SIFTON. The Interior Department are not responsible for the book-keeping of the Auditor General.

Mr. OSLER. That is the system that has been adopted and it ought to cease at once. You cannot imagine a more vicious principle of keeping accounts than to charge up to capital an advance for survey purposes, and then when that is repaid, to credit it to revenue. It is so palpably wrong that I hope, the attention of the minister having been called to it, the practice will cease.

Mr. SIFTON. I will call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. We charge the cost of surveys to capital account, that is the ordinary practice; but when the money is repaid, the 10 cents an acre, that is paid into the consolidated revenue account.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has there been any survey parties sent out to survey lands in the municipality of Rossburn, within the last couple of months?

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend has anything in his mind and will give me a few details perhaps I will be able to answer him.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understood a survey party was sent out under the auspices of the Canadian government to do some surveying.

Mr. SIFTON. As to dividing?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes.

Mr. SIFTON. Quite likely.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have this government built any colonization roads in Manitoba?

Mr. SIFTON. No, we have not built any colonization roads in Manitoba but we have cut some trails through wooded and swampy sections for which we had a special vote of $15,000 last year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has any of that been expended or is there any work being done for this purpose in the municipality of Rossburn.

Mr. SIFTON. This was in another part of the province between Lake Manitoba and Winnipeg.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is no work of that kind being carried on now in this municipality?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I suppose under this heading I could as conveniently ask some

questions in regard to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company's grant as under any other heading. I understand that during the past year a report has been handed in by Mr. Speers, the government agent, in regard to the work that has been done by the company in settling their territory. Under the contract entered into by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company with the government I believe they were to locate some twenty settlers on their homestead lands and twelve others on other quarter sections and that they were to receive all the other even numbered sections in the township. I believe that outside of the agreement those who have voluntarily gone in and settled on these homesteads have been counted as amongst those who were located by the company.

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What defence has the hon. gentleman for that? Why should any voluntary settler going in and locating in any of these townships be counted as amongst those located by the company?

Mr. SIFTON. Because there was not a single settler in that part of the territory when this arrangement was made with the company. It was not considered advisable to send settlers in there. The territory was considered to be barren. It had been examined and the conclusion arrived at was that it was totally unfit for settlement. It was settled simply because people went in and settled there. We never thought of advising settlers to go there. It was quite impossible for us to determine as to whether the settlers who were there went in as the result of the efforts of the company or as a result of our efforts.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. minister has therefore no means of telling how many of these settlers have gone in voluntarily?

Mr. SIFTON. We have the homestead entries.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. But they have entered voluntarily.

Mr. SIFTON. They all enter voluntarily.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. minister has no means of ascertaining how many have gone in voluntarily and not as the result of the exertions of the company?

Mr. SIFTON. What my hon. friend wants to know is as to whether we can distinguish between those who have gone in as the result of the efforts of the company and those who have gone in as a result of the efforts of the officers of the government, or voluntarily. We have no means of distinguishing except this, that we know that our officers never advised anybody to go in there. Our officers have never made any effort to send anybody there. At the time this arrangement was made we were not prepared to take the responsibility of advising the people to go there. These people came to us and said: We are prepared to put people there. We are quite satisfied that the people we send there will be able to handle that kind of land satisfactorily. We said: Very good, if you are, go ahead.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Mr. Speers reported last December and in persuing Mr. Speers' report one is struck with the fact that he does not say himself definitely that these settlers are really on the land. They have already secured 150,000 acres out of 250,000 acres which they are to get from the government on the strength of the number of homestead entries which they secure not on the strength of those who are absolutely on the land, because it has been charged through the public press that many of these are fictitious entries made by those who have no idea whatever of locating upon the land and I think it is a very poor criterion of actual settlement merely to take the recorded list of entries. But, already 150,000 acres of land have been handed over on the report of Mr. Speers, although that report does not say that these men are in actual occupation of the land. It simply goes on to say that so many homestead entries have been made and it is taken as evidence that the company have fulfilled that portion of their contract. I do not think that is fair or just. In support of the position which I take in regard to this matter I would read a letter that appeared last year in the Toronto 'Globe' from a gentleman who has himself voluntarily homesteaded in that country. It is as follows:

ABUSE OF HOMESTEAD REGULATIONS.

'Homesteader,' Regina, writes:—We noticed an article in the 'Globe' of July 10th referring to the abuse of homestead rights in northern Ontario in regard to the waste of timber. We have something going on here equally as bad. I have homesteaded on land seven miles from Regina and Prince Albert Railway. I made my entry in the last of September and went on my land in the beginning of May. I made my entry here direct in the Dominion land office without the intervention of any land company, but I am in the midst of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s territory and have seen some of the methods of settlements going on. They agreed with the government to find twenty homesteaders in each township, in the choosing of lands this company has been given the privilege, hitherto not accorded to any company, of choosing what lands they please for sale, whether odd or even numbered sections and leaving for homesteaders what lands they please, whether even or odd. As a consequence all or nearly all the homesteads are poor or almost worthless and the company has the best land for sale. As a result there is a great laxity in regard to homestead regulations. These poor homesteads are offered as an inducement by the company to intending purchasers and many buy on that understanding. Many of them never expect to live on them, but to hold the homestead for a while and then sell out with the homestead

thrown in as an inducement for purchasing. Those who have gone in on homesteads cannot tell what is homestead and what is sold and can get scant information, as the government land agents, at least the one I had to get my information from is a relative of the president, and consequently in sympathy with the said company and their purchasers. Where we are at present there are three of us who have started in actual residence of our homesteads, and for six miles around there are only three living on homesteads, yet there are many homesteads around us taken up as soon as ours and no one on them. We are almost alone and like Robinson Crusoe for loneliness, in the midst of a large tract of land held by land speculators. Nearly all has been sold or homesteaded around us, but now, more than nine months after entry, there is nothing doing and no one on these homesteads held by the speculators waiting for the rise in the price of land. We think the department at Ottawa did a very unwise thing in allowing this company to make odd numbered section homesteads. If there were a uniform system as to what was homestead and what land company land. we poor homesteaders could see that these absentee homesteaders had their claims cancelled, but we can not get any but scant information as to what is not homestead. An American can secure favours with this company that an native Canadian cannot enjoy. We know of cases where men had made excuses to the land agent and they do not intend to come on their homesteads until next spring. They just came in and promised to have five acres broken and then went away to Minnesota again. We think this is an unjust stretching of the rules and regulations in regard to homestead regulations and very unfair with those who are complying with them. We are of the opinion that the ways and methods of this land company need to be investigated, as the way in which homestead regulations are violated is the laughing-stock of those who are on homesteads and by none more than Americans who have taken homesteads. They think we must have a very strange government that will allow any company to do as has been done by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Co. I may say that what I am speaking of takes place a little over a hundred miles north-west of Regina.

Mr. SIFTON. What is the date of that letter ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is from the 'Globe of the 1st of August, 1903. Apparently this gentleman is not an opponent of the government; at any rate, he is a devoted reader of the Toronto 'Globe,' and he sent his communication to it. I happened to see this letter last fall, and I thought it only proper to bring it to the attention of the minister because if these charges are true they are very serious, and they show that my contention is strictly correct; that these gentlemen come in, take up homesteads, purchase a certain amount of land at as low a rate as possible from the company; wait until the price increases; sell it; pocket their profit, and throw their homestead in, which may be of inferior land.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the name of the writer of that letter ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I said he signed it 'Homesteader.'

Mr. DAVIS. Oh; it is an anonymous letter.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I presume the Toronto 'Globe' has the writer's name, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) desires to get it he will probably receive it from his friends of the 'Globe' much readier than I could.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SIFTON. I was asked before six o'clock as to the conditions of sale by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. It is evident that the person who wrote letter read by my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) was under a misapprehension with regard to some points. His statement with regard to the homesteading of odd numbered sections is made in entire misapprehension of the facts, because there has been no homesteading of the odd numbered sections in that tract at all. The odd numbered sections were reserved long years ago for the land grant to the Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, and the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company having purchased the land grant of that railway had the right to select the land from these odd numbered sections. We do not deal with the odd numbered sections at all; our dealing was altogether with the even numbered sections. As to the question of the settlement being bona fide or not, the settlers make their settlement in accordance with the ordinary rules. Every settler has to make his affidavit in the regular form, stating that he is bona fide taking up his land for his own benefit alone, and that he intends to reside and make his home upon it. Under the law he has six months to go upon it and reside, and an extension of time may be given. I do not remember whether there were any extensions of time in this particular tract or not, but the number of extensions is comparatively small, and the extensions have been given on what seemed to be reasonable excuses. That which is referred to by the correspondent as indicating bad faith is no indication of bad faith at all. He says a number of people went there and took up their homestead entries and went back to the States. Well, that is what a great many settlers from the United States do. They take up the lands and go back for their families, as most of them do not bring their families in until the next year. However, before they get the land they have to fulfil the settlement duties. So far as this particular tract is concerned, some time an order was given to the homestead inspector to make a thorough inspection of the whole tract. Patents were granted by officers of the department to the extent of

something like 150,000 acres. There was deposited $50,000 on account of the balance of the land, and we shall have the report of the homestead inspector as to the exact performance of the settlers' duties. I do not think there is any fear that the transactions will not be carried out.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The gravamen of the charges made in that letter, and what I intended to convey was that the government had disposed of 150,000 acres already on the strength of the homestead entries, and that there was no real proof that settlement had taken place. The minister does not attempt to contravene that statement. On the strength of Mr. Speers' report he has handed over 150,000 acres out of the 250,000 acres, and Mr. Speers does not attempt to prove that these settlers are actually on the land. That they have taken the homestead entries is an evidence of good faith that these settlers are on the land, but as a matter of fact they are not. Notwithstanding that after the homestead entry has been made, six months is given to them to go on the land, the gentleman who wrote this letter has distinctly stated that nine months have elapsed and practically none of them were on the land.

Mr. SIFTON. I hope my hon. friend will not assume that the statements in this letter are to be taken literally, because on the face of it the writer shows that he does not know the facts when he says the odd numbered sections are being homesteaded.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is a technical point which the minister takes advantage of. This gentleman may not be aware that they purchased the odd numbered sections from the Regina and Long Lake Railway Company, but in other respects the writer shows that he is well acquainted with local conditions. He tells us that in a radius of six miles there are only six settlers, and he shows that he understands what he is talking about. He gives evidence that homestead entries have not been followed up by actual settlement. What we complain of is that 150,000 acres of this land grant is practically handed over to the company without satisfactory evidence that the settlers have been secured to the country. This government has stated that they have reversed the policy of their predecessors and reserved the land for the settlers, but we charge that they have practically done nothing of the kind. The government has sold this land for $1 an acre ; the land may not have been worth very much when they sold it, but according to Mr. Speers' report some of the poorest of that land has been sold for $5 an acre by that company, and it sells up as high as $10 an acre. Another feature is that the government is taking scrip as well as cash in payment. In other words, instead of having $150,000 in cash for the 150,000 acres, Mr. Speers reports that they have scrip to the amount of $98,000 and cash to the amount of $52,000.

In my opinion scrip was never intended to be utilized for the payment of lands in blocks such as this contract called for ; and I do not think it is right or proper for the government to practically assist any band of speculators, who no doubt purchased this script at a very reduced figure, possibly at 50 cents on the dollar or less to make large profits by accepting it at par. I see that there is a stipulation in the contract that they can pay in scrip or in cash. That feature of the contract I condemn. I think the government, when disposing of the lands so cheaply, should have insisted on being paid in cash and not in scrip. I also desire to point out that in the agreement entered with these gentlemen, there are the names of two Canadians, Mr. Macdonnell and Mr. Adamson. Mr. Macdonnell, I understand, is the leader of the opposition in the territorial assembly. Mr. Adamson is the Liberal candidate in one of the constituencies for a seat in this House. I think it is not according to strict propriety that Mr. Adamson should be in that position and at the same time connected with such a large land speculation. The hon. minister can see how he could use his position in many ways to bring pressure to bear on settlers who have taken up land, in order to secure their support. I think strict propriety should induce the government to advise Mr. Adamson either to retire from the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company or from his candidature for the Dominion House. I think the hon. minister himself will scarcely defend Mr. Adamson's position. I desire to ask the minister also, is it or is it not a fact that Mr. Turiff has some connection with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company ? I have heard not only from his political opponents, but from many of his political supporters that Mr. Turiff is secretly connected with that company. In fact, they have intimated to me that he was compelled, through fear of his connection with it being disclosed, to resign his position of Dominion Land Commissioner. He also is a Liberal candidate for the representation of Eastern Assiniboia in this House, and he can use his position to influence the electors in the same was as Mr. Adamson. The minister will know whether that statement in regard to Mr. Turiff is true or not. If it is, he should not be allowed to occupy the position he does in connection with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and at the same time be a Liberal candidate for this House.

Mr. SIFTON. With regard to the contract, I may say that the number of settlers in the district was given in the report of the land agent last December, and upon that the officers of the department acted. The only question can be whether the settlers will remain on the land. Instructions have been issued to an inspector to go there for the purpose of verifying the fact. I

have not the slightest fear that the conditions regarding settlement will not be carried out. As to the price paid for the lands, all I can say is that these lands would have been homestead lands if we had not disposed of them in this way. Had settlers gone upon them, they would have returned no funds to the government. By the sale the lands returned to the government $1 an acre, so that, so far as money is concerned, the government is $250,000 ahead. The lands were surveyed sixteen or seventeen years ago, but settlers had passed through them and had gone to various other parts of the country. My information is that there were only three or four homestead entries in good standing in the department at the time the lands were disposed of. At the present time we have the prospect of a well-settled territory as a result of the arrangement made. As to the payment of scrip, it makes no difference in the world to the government whether the land is paid for in money or in scrip. Scrip is receivable in payment for Dominion lands, and sooner or later the government has to redeem it. As to Mr. Adamson's connection with the company, all I have to say is this, that we do not exercise any control over the electors of Humboldt. They have a right to nominate any one they like for a seat in this House, and they nominated Mr. Adamson. As to Mr. Turiff being connected with this contract. I never heard any rumour to that effect until something was said about it in one of the committees of the House. I believe Mr. Turiff was asked if he had any connection with the company, and he said he had not. That is all I know about it. When the rumour came to my knowledge, I asked him if he had any connection with the company, and he said he had not. It had nothing to do with his resignation of the position of Commissioner of Dominion Lands. Mr. Turiff had nothing whatever to do with the contract. It was made with the president of the company, Colonel Davidson, who discussed the matter with the deputy minister. My deputy informs me that various members of the company were here, and that he discussed the matter with them. I never discussed it with them or saw any of them in connection with it. The question was submitted to me by the deputy minister, and I approved of it. So far as Mr. Turiff is concerned, he had nothing to do with and gave no advice in connnection with this matter, and I am informed that it was never brought before him. As to the general features of the transaction, the operations of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, resulting from the acquisition of this tract of land, have been of immense benefit to the Northwest. If we had given the land to it for nothing, we would have received benefits ten times over in return. This company has been exceedingly efficient as a colonization agent. It has placed a lot of valuable settlers not only on this tract but on the remainder of its tracts. I can recall no feature of our colonization policy in the Northwest which has been attended with greater success than the efforts of this company. Every one familiar with the district will bear me out in what I say, that on this land, which was tenantless for many years, we have at the present time a very large and thriving settlement, which bids fair to grow not only in numbers, but in wealth. I think the transaction is in every way advantageous to the country and one which will promote good settlement.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister has stated that settlers would not go into that country in years gone by, which is very true. Many years ago the land in that particular district was not looked upon as being very superior land and was not taken up as there were hundreds of thousands of acres of much better land available. But, as occurs in many countries, land is now being settled upon and purchased in Canada that would not have been taken up a few years ago. The minister states that an inspection of those lands will be made and that actual settlers will have to be provided for before the balance of the land will be handed over to the company. That is all very well after 150,000 acres out of the 250,000 have been handed over to them upon the mere strength of the homestead entries. I think it is a distinct admission by the minister that he has been rather remiss in this matter, and has been late in taking the stand he now proposes.

Mr. SIFTON. If the matter had been brought to my attention when the report was brought in, I would have given instructions that a special report should be made. As soon as it was brought to my attention I gave instructions for a special report.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister was rather tardy in giving instructions, because it is well known that 150,000 of the 250,000 acres have come into possession of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company without sufficient proof being furnished for members of this House to see that the conditions of their contract have been complied with. In fact, I think when the discussion was up last session the minister himself remarked that they were not likely to fulfil their conditions, that is the condition that they were to have two-fifths of their settlers in these townships inside of two years. The minister then said :

> The two years are not yet up, but will be in a few months. It is very doubtful if they will be in a position to get anything.

That was in July last, but 150,000 acres of these lands have been handed over on the ground that the company have complied with the conditions, that is that thirty-two settlers have been provided for each town-

ship. As a matter of fact, they have taken the report of Mr. Speers of the number of entries as proof in that regard. I wish to draw attention to this fact, that in order to arrive at that conclusion they had to group the townships. I ask the minister if that was the intention in the first place ? Had they not to take the townships separately, and did not this condition apply to each individual township rather than to a group of townships, for which an average would be struck ? I understand, according to the report of Mr. Speers, that the latter procedure has been followed ; whereas, as a matter of fact, the agreement and the intention of the agreement was that they were to secure thirty-two settlers in each individual township.

Mr. SIFTON. As to the last question which my hon. friend has raised, I may say that where they take any land they will have to take the whole township, and will have to have an average of so many for the whole township. They cannot scatter their settlement.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that no one in this House is as well acquainted with this tract of country as I am, because ever since the railway was built through that section I have been travelling up and down it, that is for the last thirteen or fourteen years. To my mind, the bargain that has been discussed this evening is a first-class bargain for the people of this country. For thirteen years there was not a settler in that district, not a homestead was taken except three or four, where some section foremen made some homestead entries. No one would go in, and I may say that if the whole tract had been offered to me previous to this arrangement with the government, simply on condition that I should pay the taxes, I would not have felt justified in taking it. What are the facts of the case ? This company has spent a lot of money. All is not gold that glitters. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) talks about their getting the land so cheap. He forgets to take into consideration the vast amount of money that they have spent in advertising, not only that tract of country, but the whole Northwest. If we could trace it up, I fancy that a great deal of the immigration we are now getting should be attributed to the advertisements of these people in the United States. I have been in some of the large cities of the United States and have seen what this company have been doing. They took up a special train of ten or fifteen pullmans loaded with people from the western states, senators, &c., to show them what that country was like, and that train must have cost them a great deal of money. They took that land when there was no one upon it, and now the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) tries to make out that this land has been granted to them on homestead entries, but that the people are not there. The people must be there, for there are large towns all along that line, which have sprung up since that company undertook the work of filling that country. There are large towns, large lumber yards and machine factories, dozens of stores, &c. If there was not some one back in the country these people would not be doing business, and if my hon. friend would take the trouble to go up the line of the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Company, he would find that a large number of people have gone in there. Even the gentleman who wrote that letter would not have been there if it had not been for the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. He was in the west for thirteen years and never thought of going into that district until the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company began operations there. Then he went there and thought they had a good thing. Like many other people, he thought that all was gold that glittered. He, too, neglected to consider that this company have spent an enormous sum of money in advertising that country and advertising the whole Dominion. When the whole transaction is threshed out, I venture to say that the company will make very little money out of it. My hon. friend alluded to the fact that Mr. Adamson was a member of that company when it was formed some three or four years ago and the purchase was made, and he seemed to think that for that reason Mr. Adamson had no right to be a candidate. I have never before heard such a doctrine as that. Because a gentleman four or five years ago happened to have transactions with the government it is contended that he cannot now become a candidate if the people want him to run. The people of this country have not shut out Canadian Pacific Railway directors, for instance. If that rule had been enforced, many of those who occupied seats on this side of the House previous to 1896 could not have been members, because if you traced up their records you would find that a majority of them had acquired timber limits or had some such dealings with the government of the day. It is ridiculous to talk about such a doctrine. This gentleman went in there two years ago, and if the people of Humboldt want him—as they have shown by their large vote in his favour at the convention that they do want him—they will elect him by a large majority, and I think they have a perfect right to do so. The bargain, taking it all around, is one of the best bargains ever made for this country. It has already done a great deal for the western country, not only by the filling up of the regions which were always in the past looked upon as useless, but by filling up other sections of the country, because this company has spent thousands and thousands of dollars in advertising this country. This company have carried on their operations in a very businesslike way. The first thing they did on the prairie was to survey a town. Then they built large hotels with their own money, built livery barns and ap-

pointed men to show settlers over the country in order that they might select lands. They ran the hotels free. People came in under these circumstances, and now my hon. friend asks : Is it certain that the people on the land were brought in by that company ? Considering that the land lay there for thirteen years without any person going on it, we must assume that any one who is on the land there must have gone on it, directly or indirectly, through the efforts of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has made just such a defence as one would expect. He tells us this is a good bargain. I do not know whether he is interested, but no one would be astonished if he furnished a portion of the scrip.

Mr. DAVIS. This has gone so far that not only from speakers on the other side but also from the Conservative press in this country comes the charge that I am a scrip speculator. That was stated in an article in the 'Mail and Empire' the other day ; and although I do not take much stock in what appears in that paper, yet as this charge is repeated so often, I wish to state now that out of the thousands and thousands of scrip issued in the Northwest Territories at the time, I did not buy more than fifteen in all, and I bought that to put on some lands of my own.

Mr. CLANCY. Of course I must accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but his defence is not quite what it was on the last occasion. On the last occasion his defence was that he had paid just as much as other people did for the scrip. Now it appears to be that he only bought a very limited quantity. However that is unimportant one way or the other. One thing perfectly clear is that the contract has been utterly disregarded in every feature. We have the declaration of the hon. minister himself, copied in the report of Mr. Speers, that there is nothing more to show than that entries were made there, without a particle of proof that there was a single settler. I do not say that there are no settlers. Perhaps there are, but there are no pretense that the company fulfilled the contract, and that is the difficulty. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that his attention was called to that after the grant of 150,000 acres had been made. I would like to ask him if he was aware at the time the 150,000 acres were granted this company that he only was in possession of a report stating that so many entries had been made and not stating what settlers were upon the land.

Mr. SIFTON. No, I was not aware until after the grant was patented. When it was brought to my attention I gave instructions that an actual inspection should be made. My hon. friend must understand that a matter of that kind might go a certain distance without being brought to my attention. As soon as it was brought to my attention, I gave instructions to have an actual inspection made and also calling attention to the provisions of the contract.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite understand that small transactions might slip through, but am unable to understand how the officers of his department could take upon themselves to grant 150,000 acres of land without the authority to do so. Who took upon themselves to carry out a large transaction of the kind upon the report then given ? Who was the guilty party ?

Mr. SIFTON. My deputy in the patent branch issued the patent. When the thing came to his knowledge he brought it to my attention. We discussed the terms of the contract and I gave my instructions.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister knows that the contract was before his officers. It provides as follows :

> It is agreed that the purchasers shall place twenty settlers on each free homestead land in each township and twelve on lands which may be sold by the purchasers, before they shall be entitled to the remaining even numbered sections. In other words, there shall be in each township twenty quarter-sections to be settled on by homesteaders and twelve on the company's sections which the settler may purchase.

That contract was in the minister's department, and some person in the department must have taken upon himself great responsibility. Surely the hon. gentleman has no officer in his department who would attempt to issue a patent for 150,000 acres of land upon the report of Mr. Speers which disclosed nothing that entitled the company to the lands. He cannot pass that over by saying that some one unknown to him had committed an act of that kind. Was it done on the recommendation of his deputy.

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. CLANCY. If the deputy did not recommend it, who did ?

Mr. SIFTON. We will make a careful search and find out exactly how the transaction took place. My hon. friend must understand that there have been placed on these lands an average of twenty-one settlers in each township where the company are operating.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not disclosed in the report.

Mr. SIFTON. As to whether the settlers have actually remained there or not, we have sent out our inspectors to find out. As the fulfilment of the remainder of the conditions, we have the deposit of $50,000 and the remainder of the 100,000 acres which the company will not willingly give up without trying to earn it. True the land has increased in value, but it is through the efforts of the company, and I have not the

the slightest doubt that, under present conditions, they will go on and earn that land. A year ago I had doubts, because at that time they had not been successful, but at present I have not the slightest doubt, and no doubt the report will show that all those settlers are there. The government has perfect security.

Mr. CLANCY. I have not talked about security. That is another branch which we may discuss later on. I have not stated what security the government has for the carrying out of the contract. I am calling attention particularly to the gross irregularity, I may say the criminal conduct of an official in his department, with a contract of that description before his eyes, when it is disowned by the minister himself, denied by his deputy, and still neither of these gentlemen knows who is the guilty party. It is the most extraordinary statement I ever heard made in the House of Commons—that 150,000 acres of land is handed over to this company. Why, Sir, what conclusion will the country draw from that circumstances? Either that the officers in his own department must be concerned in it, or they would never have taken upon themselves to be guilty of a transaction of that kind. Yet we are told by the minister that there is no impropriety in Mr. Adamson becoming a candidate—a candidate in support of the hon. gentleman himself, a candidate in his interest, a candidate that has been a participant in that transaction, a candidate to whom 150,000 acres of land was handed over. Will any person say there is no impropriety in that? It is a transaction that seems perfectly plain to be a conspiracy against the interest of the people. It is idle for the hon. gentleman to talk about the security. If there is any security it is not because he carried out the conditions of the contract, or that he was careful that his officers observed their duties. If he has security, it has been given in utter disregard of that sort of thing. Now I leave the hon. gentleman to stand convicted of a transaction in his department that shows the loosest kind of administration of the business of the people of this country. The department must have fixed designs upon the people of this country to have evaded the instructions and to hand these lands over to these persons who were not entitled, according to any information in the department, to a single acre. The hon. gentleman, only two or three months before, declared that so far as he knew then he did not think they were entitled to an acre of that land. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in a very enviable position. He had better hunt up the culprit in his department and dismiss him.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. minister and the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) have spoken about this land as having become valuable simply because it passed into the possesison of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. For thirteen years nobody would settle on it, the hon. member himself would not have taken it for the taxes. Settlers passed by it and went into a more productive portion of the country because this was worthless. But as soon as the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company got possession of it, does he mean to say that the quality of the land improved so much simply because it changed owners? It is true that these gentlemen advertised extensively, and how did they advertise? In a manner that commends itself to the minister? I do not think so. The minister rather repudiated them last year. If it is true that these were worthless lands that nobody would settle on for thirteen years, they were no use, what did the Saskatchewan Land Company do? They issued a prospectus lauding those lands to the skies as being amongst the most productive in the Northwest Territories. This was brought to the attention of the minister last session by the leader of the opposition:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that the company has issued a prospectus in which these lands were described in very glowing terms.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not responsible for the advertisements of land companies.

The minister was quite unwilling that the land company should advertise these as being among the most productive lands in the Northwest Territories, because it would induce settlers to come in under false pretenses. If they are as good as described by the member for Saskatchewan, I do not think the members of this company need to be commiserated because of their bargain with this government. Take the 150,000 acres of which they have already secured possession, and which they have got at $1 an acre. In reality they have not paid $1 an acre, they paid $98,000 altogether in script, which they may have purchased for fifty cents on the dollar. But assuming that they paid in cash $1 an acre, or $150,000 they have sold that land, putting it at a low average, for $5 an acre. Mr. Speers in his report states that most of the land has been selling at $5 an acre. As a matter of fact it has sold from $5 to $10. But putting it at the lower figure, $5 an acre, they received $750,000. Deducting all expenses in connection with the transaction I think you will find that they have made $600,000 profit.

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman tries to make the point that the lands were sold at an undervaluation. There was a tract of 3,500,000 acres of land set apart from which the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company might select about 800,000 acres. That arrangement was made

many years ago before I took office. Matters progressed until I had been in office for a year or two, and the company alleged that they were unable to earn 800,000 acres of land in the 3,500,000. This 3,500,000 was examined and reported upon by officers of the railway company and by officers of the government, and by far the greater portion of it was classified by them as being actually worthless, unfit for settlement, of such a character that the company could not recoup themselves out of it. So bad was it that this railway company brought an action in the Exchequer Court of Canada for the purpose of compelling the government to make good the contract, and to give them the equivalent of the 800,000 acres. We gave them 3,500,000 to select from, and they brought action in the Court of Exchequer for the purpose of proving that there was not 800,000 acres in that whole tract fairly fit for settlement. This particular tract that we are talking about is the worst of the 3,500,000 acres. It was considered absolutely hopeless in every possible way. Within a year before this transaction took place, the solicitor of that railway company came to my office and asked me if I would favour securing from the government of Canada authority to pay them $1.25 an acre instead of giving them the 800,000 acres they were entitled to. That is to say, although they had 3,500,000 acres to select from, they wished me to make an offer, which they would accept, to settle with the company by paying them at the rate of $1.25 an acre for the whole 800,000 acres. This 250,000 acres was in the worst district and sold at $1 an acre a few months afterwards to these people with the settlement conditions to which I have referred and which are set out in the contract. Let me point out further that in the next season this land presented a little more favourable appearance. I am not alluding particularly to this tract, but to the whole 3,500,000 acres. The same people who bought the 250,000 acres went to the people who owned the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan land grant of 800,000 acres, and bought their entire land grant which they could select from this 3,500,000 without any settlement conditions. They bought the whole 800,000 acres from shrewd speculators like the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) who I believe was interested in the transaction; they bought the whole 800,000 acres I think for $1.75 an acre, with the privilege of selecting it from the 3,500,000 without any conditons whatever. There could be no more absolutely conclusive evidence of the fact that the dollar an acre we got was the full value of the land without any settlement conditions whatever. If we had sold it for a dollar an acre without any settlement conditions we should have made a very good bargain.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In referring to the hon. gentleman's remarks last year as to the number of settlers sent in by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, I find that the hon. gentleman said:

> Of course they have sent in a considerable number. I recollect now they applied to get some patents, and they filed some information with regard to settlers. But the evidence which they filed did not prove that they had complied with the conditions and consequently we did not give them the land.

Will the hon. minister explain what evidence the land company filed with the government in order to claim the patents for their land? Was it homestead entries?

Mr. SIFTON. I presume they referred to homestead entries as sufficient evidence. I was not willing to act upon that, but subsequently the officers issued the patents on Mr. McCannel's report.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is the ground upon which we are condemning the hon. gentleman. It seems that last year the company had made application on the strength of homestead entries to get their land. The hon. minister refused and notwithstanding that refusal the land has been handed over to them on the strength of that evidence.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say that the explanation in regard to the land seems rather strange in view of the fact that when you look over the surveyors' field-notes you find that land is graded No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4. Quite a portion of this land is graded No. 2 and No. 3. Under those circumstances it could not have been such very bad land, because No. 2 and No. 3 would be fairly average good land.

Mr. SIFTON. This land is in the worst tract of the whole lot.

Mr. SPROULE. These are your own surveyors' field-notes as to quality.

Mr. SIFTON. It has been examined by expert land examiners on behalf of the railway companies and on behalf of our department and so far as this particular tract of land is concerned we have their statement that it was no good, that it was absolutely worthless.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the examination of your surveyors of no value? It has always been regarded as of value. For the last twenty years or more we have been getting that information and settlers have accepted it as evidence of the quality of land. If land is graded as No. 1 it is regarded as the best land, if No. 2 it is fairly good land, and if No. 3 it is fairly good land, and if No. 4 it is regarded as not being very good land. The value which was attached to it twenty years ago has

been accepted. Whatever means the surveyors took of satisfying themselves of the quality of the land, I presume that the land is the same as it was before.

Mr. SIFTON. That is not the statement of the expert examiners.

Mr. SPROULE. The expert examiner is not likely to go over it as carefully as the surveyor did, because the surveyor has to run up both sides of each section and he makes his report upon it. The land examiners are not likely to go over the lots as carefully as the surveyor is required to do.

Mr. SIFTON. That is what they were sent there for.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the inspectors go over every foot of land when they go into a locality to ascertain what is the general quality of the land.

Mr. SIFTON. This matter was a sore subject with the department, a subject of dispute, a subject that became so acute that the railway company finally sued us for damages in the Court of Exchequer. They claimed that they should select the land farther north. They did not claim that they ought to have taken this land.

Mr. SPROULE. What portion is good land and what portion is bad land, because what I saw of it did not lead me to the impression that it was bad land? There is another thing which seems to strengthen me in the impression that it is not bad land and it is the fact that it has been sold to farmers who have gone and examined it for themselves and who ought to be good judges. It has been sold to them for $5, $7 and $8 an acre. That does seem to be conclusive evidence that the land could not be so very bad.

Mr. SIFTON. I hope it will turn out better than we expected.

Mr. SCOTT. Before this arrangement was made you could not get any person to look at the land at all. A very strong corporation, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company were using every means even going so far as to go to the courts to prove that the whole district was absolutely worthless and for years every effort proved entirely unavailing to get any person to get off the train and examine the land.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. They have read the speeches of some of your friends.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman if he knows anything, knows that one reason was because there were a few dry years in that country it led to the impression that the land was in the dry belt and was of practically no value for farming purposes. The result was that a good many people who had settled on that land during the dry years got up and left it because of the feeling which they had that they could not carry on agricultural pursuits successfully. But this same district to-day seems to be as fine as any other district in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SCOTT. Very likely this district will prove so, but what I have stated is the absolute fact that no person could be got to get off the train to look at this territory. For a hundred miles through this territory where there had been a railway in operation since 1890 only three homestead entries had been recorded. Between Lumsden, twenty miles north of Regina, and Saskatoon, on the south branch of the Saskatchewan river, a distance of over 100 miles, except one little ranching community at Dundurn, although a railway had been running through that country for twelve or thirteen years, there was not a single farmer, not one single settler, and people could not even be prevailed upon to look at the land partly as a result of the action of the railway company which had gone to the length of going to the courts to prove that the district was absolutely worthless.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is in possession of the facts, or whether he has ever been there or not. But, we have to accept his statement that there is only one farmer in that district. My information is a little different, but we have to accept his statement and take it for granted that he knows. I would only remind him that the Calgary and Edmonton Railway runs through a section of the country that is regarded to-day as one of the most valuable in the Northwest Territories and that a few years ago you could go northward for 100 miles from Calgary and find very little land settled. Up to the last few years you could go to many of these stations and right up to the railway you would find no land settled. That railway was in existence for settlers and running all right. The real cause was that there was plenty of other land available for settlement and that a few dry seasons frightened the people out of that country. I know many who left that district believing it was not likely to be fit for agriculture, but I take it that the reports of the surveyors are as good evidence as we can have of the quality of the land, and they grade it into two or three classes.

Mr. SCOTT. The very same people compose the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company and the Calgary and Edmonton Land Company, as are interested in these lands, and they made no objection against accepting the lands along the line of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway. The conditions along that line were quite different.

The southern portion of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway is through range country where until recent years there were not many homestead entries made.

Mr. SPROULE. Why were there no homestead entries made when there was a railway there ?

Mr. SCOTT. North of Calgary for a distance of perhaps fifty miles, similar conditions prevail to those prevailing south of Calgary to the American boundary line. It is range country and until recent years there were ranches and ranching towns every few miles along the line, but there were not many homesteads. On the Prince Albert Branch Railway north of Regina, when you got north of the town of Lumsden you ran for more than a hundred miles without seeing a single individual except a few section men in summer and even they were not there in the winter time. Let me say to the House that if it had not been for this arrangement made with these American land speculators, these enterprising people, I venture to say the railway of the hon. gentleman's friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) would be out of commission to-day, and they would not be running trains over it. On the 11th of February last year, I was on a train on that line which wandered off upon the prairie. I do not think it was running at a greater speed than ten miles per hour, but the ties were so rotten that even with the aid of the winter frost they were unable to hold the rails to keep the train upon the right of way. Until this arrangement was made two years ago, there was so little business along that line of railway, that the Canadian Pacific Railway which has been operating it for the owning company headed by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) could not find any encouragement to make betterments upon the road, and it got into such a condition that it was almost dangerous to travel upon it. I say it again, and I say it advisedly, that had not that arrangement been made the railway would be at this moment out of commission. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the attitude they have taken to-night, are quite consistent with their previous political history. It reminds me that some years ago when Sir Wilfrid Laurier spoke at the board of trade banquet in Toronto after the Conservative Minister of Finance who had read long pages of statistics to prove that Canada was prosperous, Sir Wilfrid remarked that if he were at the head of the government and wished to prove that prosperity prevailed, he would ask the people to put their hands in their pockets to find whether prosperity existed. Our friends on the other side of the House still prefer to quote statistics and to hunt up departmental records, but for my part I prefer to go into the country and see the existence of prosperity along that line of railway, where only three or four years ago there was nothing but desolation. To-day you can see thriving towns with hundreds of people doing a prosperous business. It is only four years ago this fall that my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Ross) and myself took a trip along that railway to that little ranching district of Dundurn. There was a building called Dundurn station, but no agent and no operator, and we had to wait on the railway line from ten o'clock in the morning till well after dark before we could get a train. There was no agent and no operator to give information, and we dare not leave the railway track for fear the train might come along at any moment. I was up there again a year ago last winter after this arrangement had been made with the Saskatchewan Land Company, and there was an agent at Dundurn station and I suppose a dozen large buildings, where a few months before there was nothing to indicatae business or prosperity. This Saskatchewan Valley Land Company arrangement, taken by itself, has proved perhaps the most effective and successful of all the measures of the Minister of the Interior towards North-west progress.

Mr. SPROULE. The argument of the hon. member (Mr. Scott) is rather amusing, because it is not so long ago that we heard him declare in this House, that this railway line was so inefficient that it prevented settlers from going into the country. To-night he says that but for this land deal that railway would not be a paying concern. He now contrasts the policy of the present government with the policy of the late government, and he says that because of the policy of this government there were thriving and prosperous towns and fertile country districts settled by farmers. If the land there was bad, it would not be settled with prosperous farmers ; you would not find settlers take up their homesteads on land of such inferior quality as he described this land to be.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not said that the land is bad ; I do not think it is. It is perhaps not as good as in some other sections of the country. There may be certain sections of it not particularly good, but I do not wish to be understood as saying that the land is bad. I believe that a very large portion of the land in that district may be found to be very good indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. Why, five minutes ago the hon. gentleman said that the land was so bad, that the railway company went into the Exchequer Court to try to get out of taking it.

Mr. SCOTT. They said it was bad ; I did not say so.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that these shrewd railway men after send-

ing their agents to inspect the land, actually refused to take it because it was so bad.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not say so; they did.

Mr. SPROULE. And yet a few minutes afterwards the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) gets up and says that owing to the salutory policy of the government, there are rich and prosperous farmers settled on this land. It is quite plain that there is a nigger on the fence, and that any argument the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) may present to the House in regard to that section of the country must be taken at a discount. He has a peculiar kind of hydrophobia, which, whenever the member for Toronto or that railway company is mentioned, causes him to jump up in his seat as if he were worked by a spring, to denounce that hon. gentleman and the railway company with which he is connected. He places at his service any argument that accidentally comes into his mind on the impulse of the moment, regardless of whether it is logical or not, or whether it is in accord with the argument he presented a few moments before. He has given an example of that to-night. In my judgment the argument which he gives on one side and then on another makes his testimony of very little value to the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. From what I have heard of the operations of this company in this House and in another place, there does seem to be something very remarkable about it. The minister tells us that out of 3,500,000 acres of land, those who constructed the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, now operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, had the opportunity of selecting 800,000 acres. After the selection of that quantity, there would still be 2,700,000 acres. I understand that the Saskatchewan Land Company purchased from the government 250,000 acres at the miserably low price of one dollar an acre, and that they did not get the poorest land, but had the privilege of selecting the 250,000 acres out of half a million acres. Is it likely that these shrewd American speculators, who went up there and pulled the wool over the minister's eyes and got such a bargain, were going to take the poorest land, when the fact is that they were getting selected land? It has not yet been explained to me why the government would allow an American company to go into a tract of land of 500,000 acres and pick out 250,000 acres of the best land they could get, and then hand it over to them for a dollar an acre, and receive payment in scrip, which, as the hon. gentleman for Marquette says, possibly did not cost them more than fifty cents on the dollar. It looks to me like a huge job. In the first place, I do not think the Minister of the Interior should have the power to sell the lands of that western country to any company at a dollar an acre. In my ignorance I thought it was the policy of the Liberal party to keep the land for the settler. We heard that years ago; but when these gentlemen get into power, it is the land for the speculator, and at the miserably low price of a dollar an acre, while the settler has to pay $5, $6 and $7 an acre for it. Well, this is not the first time that the Liberals have abandoned the policy they preached all over the country. It is only a sample case, but to my mind it is one of the dirtiest samples ever exposed in this House.

Mr. SIFTON. I want to correct a remark I made a moment ago. When speaking of the sale of lands to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, I said that the price was $1.75 an acre. It was $1.53 an acre.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Now that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has indulged his monomaniac propensity to have his periodical fling at the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), that being evidently the object for which he rose to his feet, I would like to ask the minister if Mr. Pierce is still inspector of surveys?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have any surveys been conducted in the Peace River country in the past year?

Mr. SIFTON. There have been some block outline surveys, and one small tract has been subdivided.

Dominion lands, chargeable to income—commissioner's salary, $3,200.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is an increase there.

Mr. SIFTON. There has been a general increase in the salaries of the civil servants, and this is not as large proportionately as the increases of other officials.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is a new official.

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, J. W. Greenway, formerly inspector of school lands.

Dominion lands—superintendent of mines, $3,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What are the duties of the superintendent of mines

Mr. SIFTON. The superintendent of mines during the last year has been engaged largely in the development of the system of examining ore deposits by the Swedish method. He published a work on that subject last year in order that mining institutes might post themselves on the matter. The hon. gentleman knows that there are vast deposits of iron in Canada. The work has been very highly commended by scientific mining bodies all over the world. Latterly

I appointed him to go to Europe at the head of a commission for the purpose of investigating the process of melting by electricity, and his report on that subject will be issued in the course of a week.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the Department of the Superintendent of Mines established by statute ?

Mr. SIFTON. The office was created by statute many years ago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice in last year's 'Hansard' that the Prime Minister said, in reference to the superintendent of mining :

> There is no doubt that with this amount of money voted by parliament the government has perfect authority to create such a work, but it will last only one year. Unless it is provided next year it will lapse, ipso facto ; it cannot be continued from year to year as it could if it were established by statute.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend is referring to a special vote for the superintendent of mines. The office was established years ago by statute. In the actual organization, we have not got the accommodation for the work he is carrying on, which is very largely laboratory work and requires scientific apparatus.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many men has he under him ?

Mr. SIFTON. He brings in specialists from time to time. We had to secure an electrical expert from Peterborough and a metallurgical expert from England to assist the investigations in Europe.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is not the position of superintendent of mines a provisional position, or has the Dominion mines of its own which require a superintendent ?

Mr. SIFTON. We have the direct supervision of the mining territory upon Dominion lands, but the office he holds is for the purpose of carrying on investigations of a general character.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask how it comes that Dr. Bell has not been gazetted as the head of the geological survey ? He has filled the position now four years and deserves every consideration, and I think some explanation should be given why he has not been permanently appointed. He is only receiving a salary of $2,400.

Mr. SIFTON. I am responsible for making the appointment and am not prepared to recommend Dr. Bell. I have personally very kindly feelings towards him. He is the senior officer of the survey, and I appointed him the acting head in the hope that I would be able to make his position permanent but have not been able to do so. I prefer not to make any statement further than this, and my hon. friend will know that the question of the qualifications of scientific men is a very difficult one for anybody who is not an expert himself.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If Dr. Bell is not fitted for the position, how comes it he has been kept in it for four years ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have had the reorganization of the department in contemplation for the past two or three years, and next year hope to be able to complete it, but so far have not been in a position to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the superintendent of mines ?

Mr. SIFTON. Dr. Haanel.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the result of his trip to Germany about the use of electricity in smelting ore ?

Mr. SIFTON. The report will be ready for the printer in a couple of weeks, and I shall have much pleasure in sending a copy to each member of the House. I could not state satisfactorily in a few words the results of his report. If I entered into very full details, I might say something which might be misleading. The reason of the delay in getting out the report is because we only received the report of the metallurgical expert from England, who was appointed to examine into and make an analysis of the different processes of manufacture of steel, a short time ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. minister not say in a general way whether the process is a success or a failure ?

Mr. SIFTON. Speaking generally, it may be said that the report is encouraging and will demonstrate that given satisfactory qualities of ore and reasonably cheap power, electric smelting can be carried on successfully in some parts of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. There is not much enlightenment in that. Given fairly good quality of ore and plenty of heat, you can smelt the ore. That follows as a matter of course. What experience has Dr. Haanel had to justify his being regarded as an expert in that line ?

Mr. SIFTON. He has the experience of a practical chemist and practical electrician.

Mr. SPROULE. Where did he gain his experience ?

Mr. SIFTON. In a German university.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that his only experience has been gained in study at the university. It is one thing to study and another to apply the theories you have learned at a university. It requires years of practical experience to make an expert.

Mr. SIFTON. Of course, the government cannot have experts in every line. All the government can look for is a man who has

more or less general attainments, and when any special questions come up, he engages specialists from time to time. We have had an expert electrician from the Canadian General Electric Works at Peterborough, and a metallurgist from England recommended by competent authorities there. No government could keep in its employ men who were specialists in the different branches, with regard to which inquiry from time to time may have to be made. All we can do is engage specialists as they are required. At present we are contemplating making an inquiry into zinc in British Columbia, and we shall have to engage a man who is a zinc expert. What we want for a superintendent is not a man who is in the ordinary sense a specialist in any particular branch, but, a man of general scientific education, who will be able to direct particular inquiries.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not regard such a man as an expert at all. An expert is a man who has acquired special knowledge of a subject by the experience of a long time, and who puts that knowledge into practice. I am informed that Dr. Haanel is only a very commonplace man in his line, and was regarded in every line of life as rather a failure. But he is trotted out as an expert and is given a salary as an expert, being placed over the heads of other men in his line. I am informed that among other occupations he was in the ministerial line, but whether he was a success or not in that line I do not know. I do not think that this man will impress the intelligent people of the world.

Mr. SIFTON. When he was appointed he was professor of physics in Cornell University at Syracuse.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to say a few words on behalf of Dr. Bell. I certainly am surprised to hear that he is not likely to receive the appointment of the Director of the Geological Survey. For forty-eight years Dr. Bell has been travelling throughout this country gaining information, and certainly he is a fountain of information with reference to the mines and topographical work of this country. He undoubtedly deserves the greatest credit from the people of this country. I have read his reports for years, and when we consider the efforts he has put forth on behalf of the people of this country in developing their mines, their woodlands and their agricultural lands, I am sure there is not a man in the House but will feel sore when he realizes that Dr. Bell is to accept a position secondary to any man in this country. He has crept up step by step until he is one of the most eminent geologists in the world, I may say, to-day. It seems that a geeat injustice must have been done him, when we realize that he has been dragged along, year after year filling the position of Director of the Geological Survey of this country ably and well. If he had not filled it properly, why was the position not filled by some one who was capable of doing so? Now, at his time of life, after the efforts and labours he has put forth on behalf of this country, I say it is a shame and a disgrace that a man holding the position that he does in the scientific world, possessing his ability, should have to accept a secondary position.

Mr. SIFTON. Does my hon. friend know that when his friends were in office Dr. Bell had been in the Geological Survey for over thirty years, and yet his friends appointed a young man over his head as Director of the Survey, a young man who had been only comparatively a few years in the service? My hon. friend must know that while we all respect age and experience, something else besides age and experience is required. My hon. friend must remember when he comes to pass judgment in matters of this kind, that I have had better opportunities of understanding the situation than he has had. My hon. friend has had no experience in the administration of the department, but he must realize that after administering the department for several years and being brought into daily contact with the details of its operation, I am in a fairly good position to express an opinion in regard to such a matter, and that I could not possibly be animated by any other motive than a desire to do what would be fair to Dr. Bell. Nothing would be more pleasant to me than to appoint Dr. Bell, but the most pleasant thing is not always the most satisfactory thing. If I felt I could appoint Dr. Bell I would do so. My hon. friend must give me credit for believing that the conclusion at which I have arrived is based on the facts that have been brought to my attention.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might it not be fair to Dr. Bell to suggest what there is lacking in the man that he is not capable of carrying on the work of the department? I feel the position keenly, because I have known Dr. Bell, through his work, for many, many years, and realize that he has been a most valuable man to this country.

Mr. SPROULE. What position does Dr. Bell occupy in the department, and what is his salary?

Mr. SIFTON. He is acting Director. He has filled that position since Dr. Dawson died about three years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. How long has he been in the department?

Mr. SIFTON. He has been forty years in the Geological Survey.

Mr. SPROULE. What salary does he get now?

Mr. SIFTON. $3,200, I think.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think it is only $2,300 now, and that he has not even had the statutory increases the last two years.

Mr. SPROULE. Has he reached the maximum of his class, and what class is he in ?

Mr. SIFTON. Officers of the Geological Survey are called technical officers, and their salaries are especially voted every year. At the time Dr. Bell was appointed acting Director he was getting $2,400 ; I am not sure whether he is now getting $3,200 or not, but I think so. Of course, we are not now passing Geological Survey items, and I have not the papers under my hand. When we come to the items of the Geological Survey, I will be able to tell my hon. friend.

Mr. GOURLEY. What salary was Dr. Dawson getting at the time of his death ?

Mr. SIFTON. $3,200.

Mr. GOURLEY. Has Dr. Bell been getting that salary while performing the duties since Dr. Dawson's death ?

Mr. SIFTON. During the first two years he did not receive the full salary, and I remember that the reason why he did not was that the question had come up upon various occasions as to whether officers of the government filling higher positions temporarily should receive the salaries of the officers for whom they were acting. I sent it before the council for the purpose of being discussed, and that was the decision that was arrived at.

Mr. SPROULE. What class is Dr. Bell in at the present time? The minister's statement is very indefinite regarding the salary. He says he thinks he gets $3,200.

Mr. SIFTON. He is not in any class. The officers of the Geological Survey are not classified as are the officers of the civil service. They are rated as technical officials and their salaries are specially voted.

Mr. SPROULE. In the Auditor General's Report he appears to get $2,400.

Mr. SIFTON. I said the salary of the director was $3,200. The question whether Dr. Bell was to get the salary of a director was up on one occasion and it was decided that he should not. I do not remember whether he has been getting it this last year.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite clear that he has not. By the Auditor General's Report he has been getting $2,400. It would be interesting to know why he has not been getting more. Ever since his predecessor died I suppose he has been getting the same salary. The statutory increase, I presume, would not apply to him, if he does not come under the Civil Service Act, though as a technical officer, he would be eligible for the statutory increase there as well. It would be interesting to know when his salary was increased, and to what extent, during the past few years. I have heard it said that he gets a much smaller salary in proportion than others who are doing equally valuable work, and that in addition he is not a permanent appointment, that some one else might be put over his head at any time. I assume from what the minister says that he is not likely to appoint him. It appears that he has been in the service for 48 years.

Mr. GOURLEY. I must say that a salary of $2,400 for an officer who has been 48 years in the service of the government, affords little encouragement to men of talent and scientific ability to engage in the service of the government.

Mr. SIFTON. I am not responsible for the scale of salaries in the Geological Survey. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to ask me, in the case of a gentleman who has occupied the position of a scientific man in that department for the last 40 years, why I do not think he is a desirable man to put at the head of that department. I think he is a very respectable gentleman, and performs valuable public service, but if I remain in office and endeavour to put the Geological Survey on a much more useful basis, I do not think he is a good man for the position and would not recommend him.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to infer in his answer to the hon. member for Lambton that he was not a suitable man for the position. Then we have the fact that the minister brings in a new man who has had no experience at all, and gives him $3,000 a year, Dr. Haanel, without any experience, and no other qualification as disclosed to us except that he was a schoolmate of the minister when they were at college. Now it does seem to me that this is the old story that kissing goes by favour. The minister puts a friend of his in a high position, without any knowledge upon which to base his judgment; he puts him into this position, and gives him a salary over and above a man who has rendered faithful service for 48 years, and whose education so far as we know has been all that a man should require to make him an expert. In addition to that, he has had training and experience for that length of time, yet a new man is brought in without any experience at all, and put over him and given a larger salary.

Mr. SIFTON. No new man is put over him at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Because Dr. Haanel is given a higher salary, therefore he must have a higher position.

Mr. SIFTON. Dr. Haanel has nothing to do with the Geological Survey at all. His duties are connected solely with metallurgy.

Salaries of inspectors, Dominion lands and Crown timber agents, sub-agents and clerks in the outside service, $121,700.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister said a while ago that he was going to advance the salaries of the officials all round. Take for instance, my own town of Minnedosa, the agent of the Dominion Lands Office there, has been in receipt of $100 a month for many years past. I refer to Mr. Flesher. I notice that the clerk, Mr. Hogarth, has been in receipt, until the past year, of a salary of $65 a month, while this year his salary has been advanced to $100 a month. The head of the office remains at the old salary. I would like some explanation.

Mr. SIFTON. I was speaking of a general increase in salaries under the amended Civil Service Act. We have made some increases for officials who were not affected by that amended Act, not as a result of or by the action of that amendment, but because of the fact that the salaries ought to be somewhat increased. A certain scale of increase was provided for those who were affected by the Act. But I had no reference to officials of the class my hon. friend refers to in the outside service. I have an impression that the gentleman my hon. friend refers to is a very old man.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. He is old, but he is very active.

Mr. SIFTON. My impression was that he is an old man, and that the clerk did most of the work. If my hon. friend thinks he is deserving I am quite prepared to consider it. He has had the same salary for a long time.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The clerk's salary was increased from $780 to $1,000, but the head of the office, Mr. Flesher, remains at the same salary. Mr. Flesher is a very active man. He is up in years but he never misses a day from his office. He does the greater portion of the work notwithstanding that the clerk is much younger. I am not complaining that the salary of the clerk was increased but I consider that if his salary was increased Mr. Flesher is entitled to have his increased as well.

Mr. SIFTON. I will look into it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In view of the fact that before another session we will be in the throes of an election campaign, I think the hon. minister will be aggrieved to hear that some of his officials, inspectors, &c., have been taking a very active part politically.

Mr. SIFTON. When ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. They are doing it at the present time.

Mr. SIFTON Will the hon. gentleman specify ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes. A year ago a question in regard to civil servants taking part in elections in Manitoba came up for discussion in this House when the hon. minister was not present. I brought to the attention of the House the specific case of Mr. Thos. Young, homestead inspector at Dauphin. His case was one which the right hon. Prime Minister stated came within the rule which he had laid down. The right hon. gentleman stated that if he accepted the nomination of the Liberal party for the Manitoba legislature he would cease to be an employee of the Dominion government. Mr. Thos. Young at that time did accept the nomination on behalf of the Liberal party. I pointed out to the House that I felt confident what was going to be the result, that Mr. Young was being allowed to retire temporarily during the campaign and that when the campaign was over and the elections consigned him to private life again he would be appointed to his position. I tried to get some specific declaration from the acting minister as to whether that procedure would be followed or not. The reason I was so sceptical in regard to the action that the government would take was that the same thing happened in my own constituency where my opponent in the last election who had been homestead inspector was allowed to resign to take part in the contest and who, after being defeated, was reappointed to his position. I instanced that as an illustration that most likely that procedure would be followed in the case of Mr. Young. On the 6th of April in this House I asked the hon. minister the following question ?

1. Did Mr. Thos. Young, homestead inspector, Manitoba, resign his position during the year 1903 ?

The reply was :

Yes.

The second question was :

If so, what was the date of his resignation ?

The answer was :

12th July, 1903.

I may say that that was the very day upon which I was personally present at a political meeting where Mr. Thos. Young had spoken from the same platform as I myself had been speaking from. Yet, he resigned on the 12th July. The third question was :

Was Mr. Young a candidate at the provincial elections in Manitoba last July ?

This is the very innocent answer which the hon. gentleman gave :

The department has no information on this point. He was reported in the press as being a candidate.

I think the hon. minister is not nearly so innocent as he would imply by that answer, because I read Mr. Thos. Young's acceptance of the nomination last year. That

ought to be official enough. So official was it that the right hon. Prime Minister recognized this case as coming within the rule laid down and as constituting an infringement of a civil servant's proper duties and declared that he should be asked to retire. The fourth question was :

Is Mr. Young now in the employ of the government ? If so, in what capacity ; what is the date of his appointment, and the amount of his salary ?

The answer was :

Yes, Mr. Young is now employed as forest ranger for northwestern Manitoba. He was appointed on the 9th November, 1903, at $125 per month.

So that, the very thing that I predicted would happen, did come to pass. Not only was Mr. Thos. Young reappointed, but he was reappointed at an increased salary to soothe his wounded feelings for having been defeated in the previous contest. He had been prior to the time he resigned in receipt of a salary of $100 a month and he was reappointed at the rate of $125 a month no doubt to recompense him for the loss of time consequent upon the campaign.

Mr. SCOTT. He had had more experience.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes, he was a sadder and a wiser man. This same Mr. Thos. Young to-day is a most active politician and no person in that part of the country be he Liberal or Conservative, will say anything to the contrary. But, Mr. Thos. Young is not the only one. There is a gentleman named Yeo, a land agent in the Emerson district whose particular duty seems to be to look after the Galicians. Mr. Yeo was the party who was put in charge of bringing the Galicians out last year to register. They were not then qualified to register. He brought them out a month ago to register.

Mr. SIFTON. He is a sub-land agent. The men who are appointed as sub-land agents are given small salaries, are not supposed to devote their whole time to the service and are not therefore in the ordinary sense government agents.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It appears that the hon. gentleman discriminates according to the amount of salary his officers get.

Mr. SIFTON. He only gets $25 a month.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is another official, Mr Harvey. I think he is supposed to be an interpreter. Would the hon. gentleman inform us what Mr. Harvey's duties are supposed to be ?

Mr. SIFTON. My deputy informs me he is an interpreter at Winnipeg.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is his particular duty ?

Mr SIFTON. He is in the immigration service.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What does he do ? Does he accompany parties of foreigners around and interpret ?

Mr. SIFTON. The interpreters are there for the purpose of being in communication with foreign settlers when they come in. He interprets for the foreign settlers when they come in and he is also sent out with settlers to assist them in making locations.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. He accompanies foreigners to their new locations. I wish to direct the hon. minister's attention to the fact that Mr. Harvey has been during the past two or three months devoting his time and attention to my humble self.

Mr. SIFTON. What has he been doing?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. He is acting as interpreter for the Liberal candidate in his canvass. I do not know whether it comes within the scope of his duties or not but it is a notorious fact that Mr. Harvey has accompanied from house to house Mr. S. L. Head, the Liberal candidate for Marquette interpreting for the Galicians. I do not think it is the duty of this gentleman to accompany any candidate, Grit or Tory because he is paid by Conservative money as well as Liberal money and I do not think the hon. Minister of the Interior will defend any such action on his part. I have not the slightest doubt that when I draw the attention of the hon. minister to his conduct he will have this gentleman summarily dismissed, because we know that other officials have been dismissed upon the representations made by hon. members of this House. I can assure him that what I am telling him is a fact because if it were not a fact I would be the last one to say so. The fact is that he has been accompanying the Liberal candidate from House to House, in the Galician settlement acting as interpreter and one old Galician in his quaint way, describing his actions and manners afterwards, said that he put him in mind of a man spreading butter very thickly on bread. I wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to this fact and I am sure that he will have this gentleman's conduct inquired into. I do not ask that this gentleman shall be decapitated without being given an opportunity to present his defence.

Mr. SIFTON. I will not undertake to dispute what my hon. friend says. It certainly is not the business of an official of the immigration department to travel around with any candidate or to act as an interpreter for him. I cannot say that I have in my mind the names of all the officials of the service and I was not aware that a man by the name of Harvey was there. My deputy informs me that he is an interpreter. This is the first I have heard of the matter to which my hon. friend refers and I will

give instructions to have the matter investigated. The instructions will be not only to him but to other officials in the service.

Mr. SPROULE. It would hardly be expected that the minister would remember the names because their names are legion.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I may point out that all the Conservative members in Manitoba would appear to have had their own experience with regard to this state of things. There was a Liberal convention in my riding last fall when the election was expected, and several aspiring Liberal candidates appeared on the scene. It is said, that at the convention, a government official who was one of the scrutineers worked the thing in such a way, that he turned the wheel in favour of the candidate who did not have a majority of the votes.

Mr. GOURLEY. He switched.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I may say that two of the aspiring Liberal candidates were government officials. One was an old official who has been in and out of the local legislature, and who when out of the legislature is a regular official of the government, and when in the legislature is paid by the day. This official had his name on the list of candidates presented at the convention, but the wheel of fortune was turned over to an official of the Public Works Department, and who is now supposed to be the Liberal candidate. Candidate No. 1 was dissatisfied and complained that he had been robbed of the convention, and so the fortunate candidate had to come down to Ottawa to complain that his brother official was interfering with his chances of election. The unlucky candidate was called down to Ottawa and the Deputy Minister of the Interior made him an offer to go to France on an immigration mission, so that he might be away during election time and not hamper his Liberal friend. This official did go to France but no election took place, and the other candidate has had to resume his work in the Public Works Department. The aspiring candidate who had been robbed of the convention had to come back from France and he had to cable and cable for money to enable him to do so. The government it would appear did not want to see him again, but at all events after very considerable delay he managed to get enough money to take him to his home. He has now resumed his duties in the Dominion Lands Department in Winnipeg as an inspector of something, and we are awaiting the election. I might say that at that convention held by the Liberals of St. Boniface—as a matter of fact there were three conventions but I refer to the last—there were no less than twenty officials of the Dominion government attending the convention to select a candidate to oppose me and to try to defeat me at the coming election.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. CLARKE. They have a big contract on hand.

Mr. BOYD. The Minister of the Interior and some of his supporters seem to look upon this as rather amusing, judging from their smiles, but if they had been here from 1893 to 1896 and had listened to the castigation handed out to the Conservative government if an official interfered remotely in an election (not to speak of the flagrant interference of the present officials of the Interior Department), these hon. members would have a different smile upon their faces from what we see to-night. We all remember that last session we brought to the attention of the government the fact that a number of the officials of the Interior Department were taking a very active part in the local elections, that they were in fact Liberal candidates, and we predicted that after their defeat they would resume their positions. That prediction has been verified. As the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) has forcibly drawn to the attention of the minister, his officials are again taking a prominent part in the political struggle. It is most unfair to permit these officials who receive their pay from the country as a whole, to participate in political contests. I am surprised that the Minister of Interior, who when he is at home gets the credit of going into the fight fairly and fearlessly, should allow such underhand conduct as this. It has been said that he could not get Liberal candidates unless he looked for them in the ranks of his officials, but I venture to think that if he paused and thought about it a little, he would put an end to this indecent state of things. It is now said that three or four of the Liberal candidates in the field are identified with the Saskatchewan Land Company, beginning with Mr. MacKenzie up in Alberta and going along to Mr. Dawson and Mr. Turriff and right down pretty nearly along the whole line, that is the rumour; the minister may not hear it but it is talked about and even written about in the newspapers. If the minister did his duty, or had any desire to see fair play he would put a stop to these officials interfering in politics.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Before this item passes, there is a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of the Interior in reference to a dispute between certain sections of the Galician people in township 18 range 3. I will state the circumstances so that the minister may take them into consideration. It appears that three years ago Father Philas, head of the Order of Basilians in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, made application for a homestead entry of legal subdivision 16 of section 27, township 18, range 3 east. The application was made for the Greek Catholic church and $10 entry fee was paid. A receipt was given for the entry fee and the entry was made in the books of the

Dominion Lands Office. The Greek Catholics then proceeded to build a church on the property which cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $500, and at a meeting of the Greek Catholics of that district five trustees were elected to look after the property on behalf of the congregation. Everything went along all right until about a year ago, when some priests of the Independent Greek Church—another branch of the Greek Church—went into the district and succeeded in getting two of the trustees to leave the Greek Catholic Church and come over to the Independent Church. They then formed a congregation known as the Greek Independent Church and took forcible possession of the church which the Greek Catholics had erected. When the Greek Catholics found that two of their trustees had deserted and gone over to the enemy, they held another meeting and elected two other trustees to fill their places. The five trustees of the Greek Catholic Church then caused the church to be locked, but the Independent Greek Church Congregation or some one acting on their behalf, forced the lock and took possession. Matters have been going on in this way ever since, and Father Philas went to the Dominion Lands Office and made a complaint against the action of the Independent Greek Church, and he was promised that matters would be investigated. He called at the land office in Winnipeg a few days ago, and was informed that a Mr. Foley, one of the homestead inspectors had been sent out to the district to investigate, and had sent in a report on the basis of which the department had decided to issue a patent to the Independent Greek Church trustees.

The Greek Catholic trustees were not notified that Mr. Foley was going out into that district, and they were therefore not consulted by him while he was out there. If the state of affairs is as represented to me —and I have every reason to believe it is, for I have been informed by Father Filas himself—it seems to have been a very high-handed proceeding on the part of the government to act on the report of one of their officials who only consulted one side of the arrangement, and did not consult those who contributed their money to build the church. I would ask the minister to investigate the case at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SIFTON. I do not know the circumstances of the case, but it is of sufficient importance to warrant us in finding out what both parties have to say, and I will have it investigated.

Salaries of extra clerks at head office and advertising, including $5,000 for extra service in connection with Dominion lands, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $38,500.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does this advertising include the advertising of land regulations and mining regulations ?

Mr. SIFTON. Not altogether.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the increase of $11,000 for ?

Mr. SIFTON. The details of the increase are as follows : In connection with the Dominion Lands Branch there have been eighteen additional appointments of the writer class, whose salaries altogether amount to $10,175 ; there are statutory increases for two clerks, amounting to $105 ; there have been increases in the salaries of clerks and messengers under the provisions of the amendment of the Civil Service Act of last year, amounting altogether to $3,860 ; and there is an increase in the amount for advertising and printing of $3,100 making a total of $17,000 odd. There have been decreases by the appointment of four clerks of the temporary staff, paid out of this vote, to the permanent staff as junior second-class clerks. Two temporary clerks have been made permanent. Four clerks have been transferred from this to another branch. One has resigned from the service, which makes a saving of about $6,000 or a net increase of $11,000 in the vote.

Dominion Lands—protection of timber lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and tree culture in the Northwest Territories, $40,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What are the regulations regarding portable saw-mills ? I understand that, as they are enforced in the Dominion reserves at Dauphin, farmers are not permitted to have portable saw-mills set up within the reserve, and must haul their logs some miles to have them sawn. They object to that seriously.

Mr. SIFTON. The farmers are not supposed to have portable saw-mills. My hon. friend knows the practice better than I do. The practice followed is this. People set up portable saw-mills for the farmers who get permission to take out logs for their houses. I have a fairly good idea that what is being done is perhaps not altogether within the spirit of the regulations, but the net result is that the new settlers are getting their timber for building purposes the cheapest way they can, and I do not think that public policy requires the practice to be interfered with. As a matter of fact, the regulations do not contemplate the farmers setting up portable saw-mills. They are supposed to take out a certain number of logs for the purpose of building their houses and not more.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are they not permitted to saw logs to build a frame house ?

Mr. SIFTON. A man would not likely set up a portable saw-mill just to cut up logs for one house. A number of people club together and a portable saw-mill is set up.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Suppose a number of people club together and have one port-

able saw-mill set up by one of the farmers who saws for all the rest, what is the objection ? The hon. gentleman has his officials to see that they do not cut up the logs for sale. Is it not a fact that some of those timber reserve lands were surveyed a few years ago ? Have none of the timber reserves been sub-divided ?

Mr. SIFTON. Not so far as I know.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been done with regard to tree culture ? Who is doing that work ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is being done on the plan I explained to the House during the last two or three years, under the supervision of Mr. Stewart. The free distribution of trees in Manitoba is not being carried on to as great an extent as heretofore. Private individuals are now going into the business of furnishing seedlings, and in a short time the free distribution may cease. In the Territories, however, it is necessary to continue it on a large scale. If my hon. friend would take the trouble to look up the report of the chief of the forestry branch, he will see what is being done. For the year 1904, in the province of Manitoba, 1,200,000 young trees were furnished, and in the Territories 500,000, so that for this year 1,700,000 have been furnished.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought these were furnished by the experimental farms.

Mr. SIFTON. We raised some of them on the experimental farms. At Indian Head we have purchased a small plot of ground upon which we intend to raise seedlings.

Mr. SPROULE. Where did you get the million of trees planted out ?

Mr. SIFTON. We raised them from the seed.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the work was being done by the experimental farm. We have money voted for the purposes of that farm, why put an item in here to duplicate the same work ?

Mr. SIFTON. We raise the seedlings on the experimental farms.

Mr. SPROULE. Where have you plantations outside the experimental farm ?

Mr. SIFTON. We have 160 acres at Indian Head, which are not upon the experimental farm, but a particular place set apart for the purpose of raising seedlings.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the only place ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, outside the farm.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of this money is intended for that work ?

Mr. SIFTON. This is the total vote for the whole service. The expenses in connection with the shrubbery are set down in the superintendent's estimate as $3,405, paid out of this vote.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. SPROULE. I have never understood that there was any tree culture outside of the experimental farm, and that the seed sown there was given out to the farmers generally. I cannot understand why you have an item here for that purpose. I cannot understand why we would require an item here for that purpose when we vote money enough to carry on the work of the farm.

Mr. SIFTON. This is a special branch. The work might have been carried on by the Department of Agriculture as a part of its work, but it was determined to do it in my department. The cost is the same ; if the Minister of Agriculture were doing it he would have to ask so much more money than he does. There is a small plot of land at the experimental farm of which our men are making use.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another instance of that duplicating which is done and it would seem that sometimes the object of it is to provide work for some one.

Mr. SIFTON. The farm is not doing this work at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Then what are they spending the money for ?

Mr. SIFTON. This is not an appropriation for the experimental farm ; it is an appropriation for the forestry branch ; the officers of the forestry branch make use of a small amount of land on the farms to do this work.

Mr. SPROULE. You employ a Mr. Stewart as timber inspector or something of that kind and now Mr. Stewart is starting to scratch up little patches on the experimental farm and sow seeds. At the same time we have a staff at the experimental farm who are doing that work. The same thing prevails in other lines, as for example, in the case of the chicken fattening stations, some of which are apparently started simply to give a little patronage to friends, but there are very little returns from them. If we want to go into the cultivation of trees in connection with the farm or not, do it at one place in the Territories.

Mr. SIFTON. That is exactly what we are doing. We started this work at the farm because that was the most convenient way of doing it and we wanted to get on with the work, and as the result of our experience we have established a small place in the neighbourhood of Indian Head where we intend to carry on the work exclusively.

Mr. SPROULE. This item is so worked that we are not able to judge of the different purposes for which it is intended. Where is Mr. Stewart located permanently?

Mr. SIFTON. Here.

Mr. SPROULE. If Mr. Stewart has his headquarters here is he more likely to be successful in carrying on tree planting at Indian Head, than a man in charge of the farm there who has been doing the work for years ? How much of this vote is used for fire protection and how much for tree planting ?

Mr. SIFTON. The items are as follows :

Salaries, officers and assistants :—	
Superintendent	$2,500
Assistant superintendent	1,200
Inspector	1,000
Clerk	520
Manager Indian Head nursery	900
Supervisor	1,000
A. P. Stevenson, supervisor of tree planting in Manitoba, ten months with team at $100 per month	1,000
Four additional agents during summer months for inspection work	2,000
Foreman of Brandon nursery, 6 months.	380
Freight and express charges on plant material, including cost of deivery of trees and seeds to applicants in all parts of the country	1,000
Cost of growing and purchasing plant material. This includes wages of men employed in the nurseries and in gathering seed and also cost of trees purchased outside	4,500
Travelling expenses for all officers of branch. This includes expenses of superintendent, assistant superintendent, inspector and four additional agents for tree planting and about twenty fire rangers	5,000
Printing and stationery, including fire notices on parchment paper, copies of fire Acts, instructions to tree planters, forestry circulars and bulletins, &c.	4,000
Building fire guards	1,500
For purchase of books for use in office; subscriptions to periodicals on forestry, &c.	500
Proposed report from Dr. C. A. Schenck, (the eminent expert on forestry, an amount which may or may not be expended)	500
For purchase of implements, &c., for new forest nursery station	500
For inspection and assistance in tree planting in older provinces	1,000
Pay of forest fire rangers and inspection of timber lands :	
In Railway belt British Columba	5,000
" North Saskatchewan district	2,000
" Riding Duck and Porcupine Mountains	2,000
" Foothills of the Rocky Mountains	1,000
" Moose Mountain timber reserve	500
" Turtle Mountain timber reserve	500
" Eastern Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg district	1,000

Altogether $40,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not give any information ; this item refers only to Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SIFTON. It should include British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. In addition to that the minister has it all mixed up, part of it for fire protection, part of it for tree culture, part of it for farms and part of it for other lines, so that we are as much in the dark as ever. We should not have them all put together so that we cannot ascertain what is being spent on these different items in order that we may judge whether the criticism is what it should be or not. If we had the work that took place on the farm and the number of officers employed, we would be in a better position to judge intelligently of this expenditure, but it is all jumbled up, two or three things together and we cannot separate it so that it can be properly analysed. I think that ought to be done for the benefit of the House.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend will note that I gave the figures of the $12,000 for the payment of four fire rangers in respect of Dominion lands.

Mr. SPROULE. Is all the rest of that for tree culture ?

Mr. SIFTON. Substantially, yes. It includes the salaries of officers who take charge of this fire protection.

Miscellaneous—maintenance, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs Reservation near Banff Station, Northwest Territories, $27,020.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything in the report of the Interior Department showing what is being done from year to year at Banff ?

Mr. SIFTON. There is a report every year to the head of the department which shows what has been done, it is printed in the departmental report. This vote is required for payment of salaries, caretakers, repairs for roads, bridge over the river, purchase of animals, new roads, clearing land. The report of the superintendent is found on page 25 of last year's departmental report.

Mr. SPROULE. Under whose supervision is this work done, or is it done by day labour ?

Mr. SIFTON. Most of it is done by day work under the supervision of the superintendent. The museum that was put up a year ago was of course built by contract, but nearly all the work of building bridges and repairing roads is done by day labour. That is found to be the cheaper and more satisfactory way of doing it. If my hon. friend has had the pleasure of visiting the park he has found that some of the best road-making done in Canada has been done in that part. The superintendent has done marvellously good work for the amount of money at his disposal.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of animals do you intend to buy ?

Mr. SIFTON. We have bought goats, bulls, four or five elks. The superintendent has been endeavouring to get specimens of the mountain sheep. He has been trying to get a couple of buffalos from the far north within the past two or three years, but he has not succeeded yet, and I have practically given up further attempts. The report shows that at the present time we have forty buffalos, eight elk, four deer, fourteen angora goats, besides moose and some other animals. Three buffalos were presented by Mr. T. G. Blackstock, of Toronto, and fifteen or sixteen were presented to the government by Lord Strathcona. The others have been bought from time to time within the last five or six years.

Mr. SPROULE. We are voting an item to be used the present year, and I think we voted the same item last year.

Mr. SIFTON. We take this estimate so that the superintendent may have the money in case he desires to use it.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of that vote last year was spent for the purpose of buying animals ?

Mr. SIFTON. The Auditor General's Report of last year only shows an expenditure of $79.50.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it for the purpose of supplying this park that the hon. gentleman got his hon. friend the Minister of Finance to put goats on the free list ?

Mr. DAVIS. They are going to Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. They need not send goats to the Northwest. I ask the hon. minister where he got the goats ?

Mr. SIFTON. They are a rather rare breed of goats.

Miscellaneous—construction of roads, bridle paths and other necessary works in connection with the Yoho park reserve and immediate vicinity, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this park ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yoho Park is a continuation of the Banff park. The Banff park runs up to the British Columbia line and in the railway belt, beyond the British Columbia line, we have set apart a park contiguous to the Rocky Mountain park. Yoho park contains magnificent natural scenery and some glaciers which are declared to be equal to the Alpine glaciers. The Canadian Pacific Railway have spent a considerable amount of money in sending in experts for the purpose of definitely locating the glaciers and we are building bridle paths so as to make them accessible to tourists. They are a very great attraction to tourists going through to the coast. The Canadian Pacific Railway have taken a great interest in developing the tourist business. We have done what we could to make the park attractive and accessible. This particular vote is for the construction of a road from Field to Takakaw Falls including two bridges across the Yoho river, $9,000 repairs to tote road, Field to Hector, $300 ; repairs from Field to Ottertail, $500 ; trail from Emerald lake to Burgess Pass, $400 ; trail from Emerald lake to Glacier, $150 ; extension natural bridge to Canyon, $100 ; a total of $10,450. We are asking for $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How is that work being done ? Have you another staff of men there and if so, how many of them ?

Mr. SIFTON. No, there is no staff there. This is part of the other park. The difference is only in the name.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think it would be better to put the whole of it under one vote ? What object is there in dividing it up ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is across the British Columbia line ; that is all. What is known as the Rocky Mountain park is taken out of the Northwest Territories and is under the legislative jurisdiction of this Federal parliament. In British Columbia we own the park only as a private individual might own land. We own that much land there so there is a difference in the legal position in which we are placed. There would be no objection to calling it Banff park but at the time the park was established Yoho was suggested and it was given that name.

Mr. SPROULE. When you own the property, as a private individual would own it, why do you require to divide it up and have one item of $10,000 for this park and another item of $27,000 for the other park ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is exactly the same as if we had it under one name.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps if you had one item it would be a larger vote than if you divided it up into two smaller items.

Mr. SIFTON. The roads would cost the same.

Mr. SPROULE. The roads would cost the same but when we take up the Auditor General's Report to ascertain what expenditure has taken place to embellish this park you have to look under two different names to find it. Persons not familiar with the circumstances, not having heard the explanation of the minister, would not be likely to find out what the expenditure had been. They would look for Banff park and they would see the expenditure that had taken place there but they would not know that there is another park which is an addition to this same park.

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon friend will bring in a Bill to put it under one name I will vote for it.

Mr. SPROULE. If I am assigned the duty I might be inclined to do that. I would not be so much disposed as the hon. Minister of the Interior is to hide away items in half a dozen different places that should be put under one vote.

Miscellaneous—cost of investigations and demarcations and other astronomical work of the Department of the Interior, including cost of instruments. Salaries of temporary officers and clerks may be paid out of this sum at rates exceeding $500 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $63,000.

Mr. SIFTON. Of this vote of $63,000, $43,000 is required, for the operations on the 49th parallel west of the Rocky Mountains, including salaries of surveyors and assistants engaged thereon. This work is being carried on under the agreement between the British and United States governments. It will consist of running the line and cutting out a vista throughout, cutting the necessary trails, making a triangulation to measure the distances, making a topographic survey of the adjacent country, taking necessary astronomical and other observations, and the purchase and placing of monuments to replace the existing mounds of loose stones. The estimated running expenses of the parties are $24,000, the salaries of surveyors and their professional assistants $11,000, and the cost of monuments, $8,000. In connection with the astronomical work the salaries amount to $12,580, and in connection with field astronomical work the estimate is $3,500. This last amount is to cover the expenses of observers engaged in the determination of latitudes and longitudes in the eastern provinces. Then, there are travelling expenses amounting to $900, and books, stationery, &c., $3,020, making a total of $63,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is for the boundary between our country and Alaska ?

Mr. SIFTON. No, there is nothing here for that. We will have a supplementary vote for that.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this work being done ?

Mr. SIFTON. This is for the actual surveying of the boundary, on the 49th parellel of British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. Between British Columbia and the United States ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is very expensive because of the fact that it is in a mountainous country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the position of the work at the present time ?

Mr. SIFTON. I will be able to answer that to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was spent of last year's vote ?

Mr. SIFTON. I think I am safe in saying it was all spent.

Mr. SPROULE. That is no information at all. I asked also how much of this work was done, and when it would be completed, and the minister could not answer that question either.

Mr. SIFTON. I will have a statement prepared for my hon. friend to-morrow.

Miscellaneous—cost of litigation, $11,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. At page L—57 of the Auditor General's Report I see an amount of $1,368.98 paid to Howell, Mathers & Howell, which I believe is in connection with the litigation which took place on behalf of the municipalities of Argyle and Springdale regarding the school taxes. Would the minister explain what position that matter is now in ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is in the Department of Justice, and I would prefer to let the Minister of Justice do that. I think he read a statement in the House last session showing what the legal result was. I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter, and ask him to make a statement.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are these lands paying the school taxes ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have no doubt the school taxes are being levied against them in pursuance of that decision. If they are not paid I suppose the local government would sell them for taxes.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the government should allow lands set apart for schools to be sold for taxes.

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not perhaps understand. A suit was instituted for the purpose of determining whether the Canadian Pacific Railway was liable to taxation by the local municipal authorities. One suit was taken with respect to Manitoba and another with respect to the Northwest Territories, because the conditions were supposed to be different. I do not want to be held responsible for the exact legal correctness of what I say, but I understand it was held that in the Territories the land was liable for school taxes, and in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) I said that under the local ordinances I presumed the school taxes were being levied, and if the taxes were not paid the lands could be sold.

Miscellaneous—maintenance of assay office, Vancouver, $13,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you doing less work there, to account for this decrease ?

Mr. SIFTON. The office was very much over-worked last year ; the work is not so great this year, and the expenses are less.

Mr. SPROULE. What staff have you, and their salaries ?

Mr. SIFTON. The manager, $2,500 ; the assayer, $1,500 ; assistant assayer, $1,300 ; melter, $1,400 ; janitor, $950 ; and various other expenditures for supplies, &c.

Miscellaneous—engraving, lithographing and printing maps of Dominion and Northwest Territories, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you issue any new maps last year ?

Mr. SIFTON. A new map of the Northwest Territories was issued four or five months ago, and I will send my hon. friend half a dozen copies if he wishes.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to see them. Are you sending out any more new maps this year ?

Mr. SIFTON. I make it a practice to send all these publications to the members, and I did not think about that one, or I would have issued instructions to send it out.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister intend to get out any new maps this season, and if so, of what districts ?

Mr. SIFTON. We are carrying on the work of issuing new sheets of different portions of the Dominion constantly, with new information. The particular vote for which I am asking is for four different sheets—one for the southwestern portion of Ontario, one for Quebec, one for New Brunswick, and one for southern British Columbia. This is in addition to reprinting some of the maps which we have with additional information up to date.

Mr. SPROULE. What are these maps intended to show—the geological deposits ?

Mr. SIFTON. They are not geological maps. They are maps of Canada. I have no doubt my hon. friend got a copy of the map of Canada which we issued a short time ago.

Mr. SPROULE. It was a mere outline map. Maps which would be valuable would be maps showing the railways, the land sold and the land unsold, the land settled and the land unsettled. So far as I know, there is no map of that kind.

Mr. SIFTON. The new map issued a year or so ago contained all the information which it was possible to put on a map. There was so much information on it that it had to be engraved on copper. A map showing where the land offices are and information of a similar kind would have to be published as a special map. It could not be put on a large map of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. But you are not getting out a large map of the Dominion of Canada. You are only getting out sectional maps.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend will understand that the officers are perfecting the geography of Canada, and are getting out a portion at a time.

Mr. SPROULE. The information does not go far enough. I asked whether it was a railway map, a land map or a geological map, or whether it contained all this information ? We sometimes have inquiries for maps of this kind. Where, for instance, can I get a railway map of the Northwest or British Columbia ?

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend can get a railway map by looking at the map of the Dominion of Canada which was issued last year.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What work will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of the Interior will continue his estimates, to be followed by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. What line will the Minister of the Interior take up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Immigration.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman cannot take up immigration until the report is down and we have some little time to consider it. We have not got it yet.

Mr. SIFTON. There is nothing in the report except the evidence taken before the committee, and the hon. gentleman has had that. There is no use of holding up the estimates until the evidence is sent down by the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. We are in this awkward dilemma, that the report is not before us, and we cannot discuss it until it is.

Mr. MACLEAN. Can the Minister of Finance tell us whether the Minister of Justice intends to go on with his Railway Bill to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR. As the Minister of Agriculture is not here, I give notice to the Minister of Finance that on the motion to go into Supply, I shall have something to say with reference to the report of the Department of Agriculture.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 20, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

PORT PHYSICIAN—FRASERVILLE, QUE.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Taylor—asked

Has Doctor Gilbert of Fraserville, Quebec, been appointed port physician at that port ? If so, at what date was such appointment made, and at what salary ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There is no doctor employed at Fraserville on a salary for the treatment of sick seamen.

POSTMASTERSHIP AT CHESLEY, ONT.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. Has the postmaster at Chesley, Ontario, been appointed ?
2. Who received the appointment ?
3. Is the position permanent ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). No appointment has been made to the postmastership, at Chesley, as yet.

SPEED OF MAIL STEAMERS.

Mr. McCOOL asked :

What is the average speed per hour being made during the present year, 1904, by steamships carrying British and Canadian mails from Moville to Rimouski, and from Rimouski to Moville, respectively ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The average speed per hour made during the year 1904 to the present date, by steamships carrying British and Canadian mails from Moville to Rimouski and from Rimouski to Moville, is as follows :—

Moville to Rimouski, average 11·8 knots per hour.

Rimouski to Moville average 13·1 knots per hour.

SCHOOL OF MUSKETRY.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say a few words. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) furnished the House with a statement from the Officer Commanding the School of Musketry to which I wish briefly to direct the attention of the House. A few days ago it was my privilege to make certain statements——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) allow me to interrupt him ? I would suggest that the motion for supply, which is the next order to be taken up, should be moved, and then he can make the remarks he desires to make.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But there may be another motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understood there was to be none. But even if there is one, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) can make his remarks, unless he himself desires to conclude with a motion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And speak on the other motion also ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, certainly.

SUPPLY—INTER-IMPERIAL PREFERENTIAL TRADE—DISMISSAL OF LORD DUNDONALD.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to bring to the attention of the government certain remarks of the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) as reported in the press despatches. The Solicitor General seems to have undertaken to give information to the British public with regard to more than one matter. The first subject is the attitude of this country respecting preferential trade. The history of that movement in this country and in Great Britain is pretty well known. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) adopted it as part of his platform in 1896. He declared himself as much in favour of inter-Imperial preferential trade as was Sir Charles Tupper, and promised to do everything he could to obtain it. In 1897, a preference was granted as a measure of free trade and as a compromise between the warring factions of the government. The right hon. Prime Minister went to Great Britain and told the people there that Canada wanted no preference in return for the preference we had granted, that our action was in return for the splendid freedom which Great Britain had given us. And he further said that he did not want Great Britain cursed with the protection which has wrought so much evil in Canada. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) repeated the same observations in 1901 on at least two occasions. At the Colonial Conference in 1902, this government practically threatened the government of Great Britain with the withdrawal of the preference unless some preference was given in return. No meaning could be placed on the language except that. It was not language used casually, but was contained in a carefully-prepared memorandum. So, it became apparent that the views that the right hon. gentleman had expressed in 1897, and that had been repeated by the Minister of Agriculture in 1901, had ceased to occupy the minds of this government, and that their intentions pointed in the very opposite direction. In 1903 and during the present year there has been a movement led by

Mr. Chamberlain in Great Britain. That movement has attracted great attention not only in the mother country but throughout the empire. It has been asserted against Mr. Chamberlain, that Canada was taking no interest in that movement, and it has been pointed out that, while only one or two provinces of the Dominion and certain boards of trade had adopted resolutions favouring Mr. Chamberlain's policy, the parliament of Canada had given no sign—had expressed no opinion whatever, upon the advantages or disadvantages of his policy.

The excuse, the reason for this, put forward in government organs—and I believe it is no secret that the right hon. gentleman shared that opinion—was that this being a matter of political controversy in the United Kingdom between those who favoured Mr. Chamberlain's policy and those who were opposed to it, it would be unbecoming and in bad taste for this parliament to express any opinion upon the subject. That view was voiced by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his speech upon the budget last year, when he said in so many words that it would be unbecoming for parliament to take any part in the movement by signifying the willingness or unwillingness of Canada to adopt a policy such as that which Mr. Chamberlain was advocating; although it is a policy, so far as its essential features and its principle are concerned, which had been adopted by both parties in this country in the election campaign of 1896. Well, if that were a good reason why the parliament of Canada should refrain from expressing any opinion upon the subject, it seems to me that it is a much stronger reason why a member of this government, visiting the United Kingdom on official business of this country, should not attend partisan meetings in the mother country and express himself as either opposed to or in favour of Mr. Chamberlain's policy. That hon. gentleman's remarks are thus reported in a cable from London, under date July 18:

> Surprise is expressed at the speech delivered by Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, the Solicitor-General for Canada, at a Liberal demonstration at Dollis Hill House on Saturday. After remarking that Canadians were following the fiscal discussion very closely, Mr. Lemieux said they should apply to the present position between the Colonies and the Empire, the old axiom, 'Let well alone.' He added that Canadians were loyal, happy and satisfied to live under the British flag, but if they wished to tighten the tie, they would break it.
>
> The anti-Chamberlainite papers are making use of this statement, the inference made being that a section of the Canadian Cabinet is opposed to the preferential policy despite Mr. Fielding's declaration in the budget speech. This is regarded specially unfortunate on the eve of the publication of the report of the tariff commission, which is expected to base the whole Chamberlainite policy emphatically upon closer Anglo-Colonial trade relations.

I may say that I do not regard the language of Mr. Lemieux in dealing with the tie which binds the mother country to the colonies as especially happy. The suggestion that a very slight movement might break the tie between the mother country and the colonies is one which I think will not be appreciated by the majority of the people of Canada, and is one as to which I do not think Mr. Lemieux speaks for the majority of the people of Canada, if he desired to suggest any such condition of public opinion as existing in Canada at the present time. We have another report, under date July 19. But I may say before coming to that that the language of the Solicitor General to-day is in marked contrast to that of the Prime Minister himself when in Great Britain some years ago, because on that occasion, if I remember rightly—I do not presume to quote his exact words—he said that whenever the beacon fires were lighted on the hill-tops, Canadians would rally to the support of the empire, or words to that effect. The report under date July 19 is as follows:

> Fuller reports of the political demonstration, at which Hon. R. Lemieux spoke on Saturday, show its bitterly partisan character. One speaker spoke of the downward path that had led Mr. Chamberlain to his present condition of the most reactionary figure in politics. Another declared it would take the whole time of the next Radical Parliament to undo the misdeeds of the Balfour Ministry.
>
> Mr. Lemieux declared that Canada asked nothing in return for the preference, and was ready to continue it without asking anything in return, because Canadians were not going to put their loyalty up for sale. He added that they should apply to the present position between the Colonies and the Empire the old maxim, 'let well alone.'

Mr. Lemieux was perfectly correct in that part of his remarks wherein he states that Canadians are not going to put their loyalty up for sale, but it is to be borne in mind that we have always been told by the present administration that in dealing with commercial matters, with trade relations between the mother country and the colonies, the mother country was absolutely devoid of sentiment and would deal with us purely on business principles. We do not propose in Canada to put our loyalty up for sale, but we do profess, or at least some of us have professed to believe, that a policy by which mutual preferences would be granted by the mother country on the one hand and the colonies on the other hand would be of great importance indeed, not only commercially, but as a means of solidifying and uniting the empire.

I would also like to call attention to Mr. Lemieux's remarks on another occasion, to a cable despatch in which he is reported to have said:

> Unless the British government recalls Lord Dundonald immediately the bitterest feelings

will be aroused in Canada against the imperial military authorities.

Well, I doubt very much if the hon. Solicitor General has any mandate from the people of Canada to express that opinion. He on this occasion also said :

The 'Times' is always against the Laurier government. It gives Lord Dundonald's version of the case completely ignoring the government side. There is no doubt but that Lord Dundonald is now playing into the hands of the Canadian opposition in view of the coming elections. The meeting held in Toronto was nothing else but a pretext to arouse the feelings of Ontario against Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but rest assured there is enough common sense in Canada to understand the true position.

Mr. COWAN. He told the truth then.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend thinks that is the truth. I think it was the Postmaster General who made that remark.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not make the remark, but I will endorse it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad to have the endorsation of that remark by the Postmaster General. Another gentleman, I think, in the British House of Commons said that the opposition were endeavouring to exploit Lord Dundonald.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend the Postmaster General endorses that remark also ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I have to say is that if there is any reason for making that statement I am not aware of it. Perhaps the Postmaster General, if he comes to address the House, will be good enough to state the facts upon which he grounds that expression of opinion for which he, as a cabinet minister of this country, ought to be held responsible. I say that the Conservative party has not endeavoured to exploit Lord Dundonald, and has not——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And has not had anything to do, so far as I am aware, with any reception which has been tendered to him on any occasion. I say that, speaking upon my responsibility as leader in this House of the Conservative party, and as knowing something of that party's affairs. I say further, that the opposition in this House have a perfect right to criticise the action of the government in connection with the administration of the militia, and, therefore, in connection with the circumstances which led up to the dismissal of Lord Dundonald. If that is exploiting Lord Dundonald, they have a perfect right to exploit him. If by the expression 'exploiting Lord Dundonald' anything more than that is meant, then I say that those who make that charge, and especially the Postmaster General, who has not been afraid to endorse it, as he calls it, in this House, ought to state the facts on which they rely when making any such statement. Lord Dundonald has been exploited, has he ? When the circumstances of his dismissal were brought up in this House, was it not in order for the opposition to call attention to and discuss the facts connected with the administration of the militia which had been stated in his speech in Montreal, and which were practically admitted by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), as well as by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) ? Were their mouths to be shut, and are they to be precluded in any way from discussing various matters connected with the Militia Department, of which Lord Dundonald has spoken since his dismissal ? For what is an opposition in parliament, if not to discuss matters of this kind ? I do not understand the suggestion of the hon. Postmaster General.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are not here to make incendiary speeches.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is not ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is referring to himself or not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I refer to any one who makes incendiary speeches in this House or out of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman's observations are of a remarkably general and vague nature. Until he comes down to the particular I will not deal further with his remarks.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is just soliloquizing over his own misconduct in days gone by.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Be good now.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as Lord Dundonald is concerned I am not here to defend him. He is absolutely able to defend himself but when public men in this House and in this country, such as the hon. Postmaster General, are apparently of the opinion that Lord Dundonald, since his dismissal from the position of General Officer Commanding, is bound to sit silent under the most venomous, and if his statement is to be believed, the most untruthful attacks, and not

say one word in his own defence, I say that is a position which I do not acquiesce in for one moment. The position of the hon. Postmaster General seems to be that Lord Dundonald is to be gagged and that he is to be subjected to every possible charge that can be made against him in this parliament and in this country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My observations had no reference whatever to Lord Dundonald himself. My observations had reference to those gentlemen who are exploiting Lord Dundonald for their own political advantage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I think the hon. Postmaster General's observations must particularly have reference to himself and no doubt an uneasy conscience is that which prompts such observations. If there has been any exploiting in this incident I would be able to show, if it were desirable or necessary to do so, where the exploiting has been. I will give you one illustration and more can be given. Those who enter these grounds may read the inscription which has been many months near the entrance gates :

'Lisez le Canada,' organe du Sir Wilfri Laurier.

In that paper only of yesterday's date there is a long extract, not an editorial, but a long extract from another journal published for the obvious purpose of convincing the people of Quebec that Lord Dundonald unjustly discriminated against them. I would call that exploiting this incident for political purposes. I would call that exploiting this incident for unworthy purposes more than anything that I have heard of in connections with the whole question. A great many other illustrations of the same kind could be given. But so far as I am concerned in regard to Lord Dundonald I have taken the opportunity in this House of speaking upon the incidents which led up to his dismissal. I have not justified his remarks at Montreal as not being a breach of discipline. Lord Dundonald himself has said that he knew perfectly well what he was doing when he made these remarks and that he did it with an obvious purpose, but that did not preclude me from criticising the government in connection with the facts which led up to Lord Dundonald's dismissal and it does not in the least vary the original condition of affairs which in the judgment of Lord Dundonald made it necessary for him to speak out on that occasion. Whether he was wise or unwise, whether he was guilty of a breach of discipline or otherwise is a subject I have not discussed in this House beyond pointing out that so far as the military regulations which were invoked by the right hon. leader of the government were concerned, they could have no application to that particular incident ; otherwise, dozens of military officers throughout the country who had spoken in commendation of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence and of the administration of the militia would be equally liable with Lord Dundonald to dismissal because the regulation that was cited by the right hon. Prime Minister applied not only to terms of reprobation but applied equally to terms of commendation of a superior officer.

I think it is to be regretted that the hon. Solicitor General has taken part in a bitterly partisan gathering in the mother country and has seen fit at that gathering to discuss a subject which is a matter of political controversy in the mother country, which is so much a matter of political controversy in the mother country that the right hon. Prime Minister and his government have thought that we should not discuss it or deal with it by resolution in this House during the past two years.

I think it is also to be regretted that he spoke in the tone in which he did of the loyalty of Canadians, because, as far as I am concerned, I believe that the loyalty of Canadians in the province of Quebec, in the province of Ontario, and in the other provinces of Canada is made of more substantial stuff than that which would be gathered from the remarks of the hon. Solicitor General.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the occasion of the speech which we have just listened to from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is the publication of certain remarks which are attributed to my hon. friend the Solicitor General now in England upon official duties. Upon these remarks the hon. leader of the opposition has made some comments which I think are hardly justified by the occasion. I do not believe that my hon. friend or any other member of this House would consent to be tried and judged upon telegraphic extracts from reports of what he may have said in any part of the world or even in Canada. I do not believe that it would be fair to my hon. friend the Solicitor General to come to any conclusion upon the remarks which have been attributed to him and which he is said to have made in a meeting of the Liberal party in Great Britain. I have only to call the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has quoted two versions of the remarks which have been said to have been made by Mr. Lemieux on that occasion and that these remarks do not bear at all the same construction. One of these versions could not only be accepted without comment and without criticism but could be accepted as fairly expressing the views of

anybody. If Mr. Lemieux attended any meeting at all I do not think that of set purpose he went to any political gathering in Great Britain and until such time as we have received from Mr. Lemieux himself an authoritative version of what he said, I decline for my part to discuss the statements of Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is my right hon. friend under the impression that this was not a political partisan gathering ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not say that. Mr. Lemieux may have found himself in a political gathering—I do not know that ; but I remember on one occasion I was myself accused of having attended a certain meeting—it was the occasion of Mr. Redmond's lecture in Ottawa—when I had been there merely as a spectator and had paid for my ticket like everybody else. I did not think I had done anything to which exception could be taken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend did not speak.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not speak, and when we know what Mr. Lemieux really said it may be that no objection can be offered to it at all. It is the fate of all of us that certain language may be attributed to us which has not been reported properly ; and, moreover, if Mr. Lemieux made a speech there it must have been a speech which would occupy some time in its delivery, but as we have it cabled it is condensed into one or two sentences, so that it would not be fair to hold Mr. Lemieux accountable on the basis of what must be a very incomplete report. The only thing which Mr. Lemieux is alleged to have said, and which has caused comment in this country, is a reference to the loyalty of Canadians. Well, Mr. Speaker, for my part I have only this to say once for all : I do not think we are called upon to defend our loyalty on any occasion. It is very much to be regretted that any Canadian should find himself called upon from time to time to defend his loyalty ; but it is unfortunate that we have to take that stand sometimes, and Mr. Lemieux may have found it advisable to defend himself and his own countrymen. We find our loyalty attacked —I will not say on the floor of this House—we find our loyalty attacked, if not openly, by way of insinuation. The newspaper press of a certain party has time and again stated that we are influenced by secret motives when we pursue a certain line of policy as a political party. Not only that, but if one of us by a slip of the tongue utters a word which he immediately corrects, even that is supposed to betray the secret feelings of the heart. Under such circumstances, and as we are all human, allowance must be made if a man reflecting upon these facts thinks it advisable to utter certain language in defence of the loyalty of his countrymen of his own blood, which under other conditions there should be no necessity for uttering. For my part, I should not attempt to defend Mr. Lemieux or anybody else. Our history is there to speak for itself. I agree with Mr. Lemieux that our loyalty is not for sale, and that whatever may be the attitude taken on the question of the preference it should not weigh one iota in the loyalty which we have for, and which we owe to Great Britain. I have said on previous occasions, and I have not been contradicted—I think the leader of the opposition endorsed the views I expressed a moment ago—I have said on many occasions that our commercial relations with Great Britain should be above all things based on considerations of mutual interest. When we gave the preference we gave it without any return on the part of Great Britain. We thought we were serving the interests of Canada on that occasion, and if we have to discuss the question later on, we should again decide on our course in a manner which will serve the best interests of Canada. That is all I have to say with regard to the alleged remarks attributed to Mr. Lemieux.

As to the observations Mr. Lemieux is stated to have made in an interview, even for these remarks I would not hold Mr. Lemieux accountable until he has had an opportunity of stating whether the views put in his mouth are true or not. I hold it to be a sacred principle in political and public life, not only between party and party, but between individual and individual, that a man is not to be judged upon what he is reported to have said unless he has had an opportunity of saying : these are my words or these are not my words. If Mr. Lemieux said yesterday that Lord Dundonald ought to be recalled, I imagine he simply reflected not so much his own opinion as the opinion of the British government, expressed not later than yesterday in the British House of Commons. As to the action of Lord Dundonald, I have not a word to say. He has chosen his own course ; his course is before the public ; it is for the public to decide. As to that incident, I have said everything I want to say on the floor of this House, and unless perhaps our attitude is again challenged. I may perhaps make this remark, that whilst it is said in the Conservative press that the dismissal of Lord Dundonald has been unjust and tyrannical, the hon. the leader of the opposition is himself bound to admit that in this House he will not challenge the dismissal of Lord Dundonald. More than this I will not say upon the present occasion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In his concluding remarks the prime minister referred to the action of the British government yesterday as reported in the press, but a moment before the right hon. gentleman condemned the leader of the opposition for basing his remarks on a newspaper report of the speech

of the Solicitor General, which he thinks may not be correct. On what authority does the Prime Minister justify the British government for its expression of opinion yesterday ? On what authority did Mr. Arnold Foster address the House of Commons yesterday, and state in these words as reported.

Mr. Arnold Foster (Secretary of State for War) welcomed Mr. Churchill as the spokesman of the opposition in this debate which was not calculated to contribute to the public advantage. One question was that of war office discipline, of which he was in charge, and the other was the advisability of this debate. He saw that no advantage could arise from this debate except to make bad blood between two great branches of the empire. Did Mr. Lloyd George, he asked, speak as the representative of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

I might here remark that it is a strange coincidence that the right hon. the first minister finds himself endorsed by the disloyal men of the empire ; by Mr. Lloyd George, a pro-Boer.

An hon. MEMBER. And Winston Churchill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will deal with Winston Churchill later. Mr. Lloyd George is a gentleman who is hooted in every part of the United Kingdom if he addresses a public audience.

Mr. FIELDING. What about Campbell Bannerman ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We have not come to him yet.

Mr. Foster continued :

No. representation, he continued, has been made to the imperial authorities by the government of Canada which is well able to take care of itself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The government of Canada took care that the people of this country were taxed to send cable messages to the old land to parade the views of the Canadian government before the British public. Why were not both sides of the case cabled over by the Minister of Finance ? Why did he dare to take the money of the people of Canada to cable over his Order in Council, and not let the whole case be presented to the people of England ? More than that, the Solicitor General is very conveniently in England to impress the British public with the views of the government, and to hold threats before them of this kind :

Unless the British government recalls Lord Dundonald immediately, the bitterest feeling would be aroused in Canada against the imperial military authorities.

I want to tell the First Minister that Mr. Lemieux does not represent the loyalty of this country ; let that be distinctly understood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He does.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who does ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sam. Hughes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Is he not loyal ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, he is not loyal. Any man who has been proven in this House to have gone to the province of Quebec in the campaign of 1896 and paraded treason and disloyalty to the empire——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Put him out.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is certainly taking great liberties with the freedom of debate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Very well, I shall endeavour to confine myself within the rules. I will tell you what Mr. Lemieux did, and let you judge. He demanded that his fellow-electors in the province of Quebec should vote to turn out the Tupper government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT. And they responded.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. To turn out the Tupper government because they were spending $3,000,000 to buy rifles for the defence of Canada. Declarations of gentlemen were quoted again and again in this House to show that Mr. Lemieux was guilty of saying to his people : 'You don't want to return such a government as that to power ; vote for Laurier, who will see that no Canadian is sent to fight as a British soldier in any part of the empire.' These were the appeals of this gentleman ; and Mr. McIntosh, the gentleman on whom the First Minister passed such a eulogy the other day, pointed his finger at Mr. Lemieux in this House and said. 'It is behind the bars of the penitentiary you should be for treason instead of preaching loyalty in this House.' Hon. gentlemen will not be permitted to take one line in certain parts of this country, and then, when they are hobnobbing around other centres, to preach along other lines. It is our intention to see that they pursue the same line on both occasions. I repudiate the idea that Mr. Lemieux has any commission from any loyal man in Canada to use the language he does on the other side of the Atlantic. Mr. Arnold Foster goes on :

Did Mr. Lloyd George, he asked, speak as the representative of Sir Wilfrid Laurier ? No representation, he continued, had been made to the imperial authorities by the government of Canada, which is well able to take care of itself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. So long as it has the people's money to pay for its cablegrams. He went on :

The discussion, he said, will not tend to establish good feeling between Canada and the motherland. Lord Dundonald, continued the Secretary of War, went to Canada as an officer of the Canadian government and no one had imputed any misconduct to him, other than want of judgment. Not being in agreement with the Canadian government, the latter dismissed him at once, when he became a British officer on half pay. Lord Dundonald could stand as a member of the Canadian Commons and could not be deprived of right to take an active part in public life. Mr. Arnold Foster believed it, however, to be undesirabe for any officer to take part in public controversies, and the War Office had informed Lord Dundonald that his conduct was undesirable, and requested him to return to England to be heard in his own defence. He had therefore instructed Lord Dundonald to return home and not take any further part in political controversies.

Gentlemen have played their little game. They have read history, and they remember that when the imperial authorities, many years ago, planted a British colony in South Africa, and were inclined to build that colony up on loyal lines, the protests from the disloyal element in South Africa resulted in stopping the planting of British colonies in that country. They know that the imperial government is cowardly in relation——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They know that the imperial government in its dealings with its colonies has always bowed to the disloyal cries rather than bring on a ruction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. Treason.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, and I want to tell you that had Great Britain continued to plant her colonies in South Africa from 1820 onward, in place of bowing to the disloyal cries of the Boers, there would have been no war in South Africa ; and the desolation of thousands of homes would not have taken place had the government of fifty years ago showed backbone. Then there is a speech by Mr. Churchill, the gentleman who is noted for his escape from a Boer prison, and who goes around telling people what a terrific time he had in escaping, when the fact is that the Boer sentry who was with him waited three-quarters of an hour and wasted three boxes of matches pretending to light his pipe in order that the gentleman might escape.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Did he stay captured after he was captured ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Winston Churchill was taken prisoner, and the arrangements for his escape were made. I may say that if my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience, and if the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) will possess his soul in patience, accounts will be squared with them, and with the Minister of Justice too, before the close of the session. Let them make no mistake about that. The Minister of Agriculture may expand a broad grin over his countenance. All I have to tell these gentlemen is that they will have an opportunity of having accounts squared before the end of this session. Let them make no mistake about that. Mr. Winston Churchill said :

Although Lord Dundonald considers himself right in making the protest, he could have done so in a less harmful way.

How ? By having it filed away in a pigeon hole, just as similar protests from loyal governors in South Africa and other British colonies have been filed away for generations. If the gentlemen in South Africa who recommended that certain loyal lines should be followed in that country had been heeded long ago, there would have been no war ; and if those gentlemen had pursued the course that Lord Dundonald has pursued, of cutting the painter, the history of South Africa from 1899 to 1902 would not have been written as it has been ; but that country would have been loyal from the start. I want to say from where I stand that Mr. Arnold Foster has no mandate under the law or the constitution of the British empire to use the language towards Lord Dundonald that he has. I do not know what Lord Dundonald's views are ; I have not seem him ; I have only returned to the city this morning ; but if he is the man I take him to be, he will tell Mr. Arnold Foster in plain language that he has no more right to utter such words as he has uttered than the smallest page in the House of Commons. Lord Dundonald is as free as the air we breathe, Sir.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Lord Dundonald is neither directly nor indirectly under the control of Mr. Arnold Foster, and I am surprised that any government in Great Britain could be found to bow to the influence of any colonial government, and take the course the present government has taken in relation to Lord Dundonald. I trust, Sir, that Lord Dundonald will see his way clear to teach Mr. Arnold Foster and the loyal elements in Great Britain as well as the disloyal elements, that the free men of the empire, some of them, yet live. Mr. Winston Churchill says further :

No one could deny that Lord Dundonald was being exploited by the opposition party in Canada for party purposes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Lord Dundonald has been charged in this House, and he has been charged by the organs of the govern-

ment with a desire to impose militarism on the people of Canada. That has been discussed before, Sir. It has been shown, on the contrary, that Lord Dundonald has not either directly or indirectly attempted to impose the spirit of militarism upon this country, but he has charged the Minister of Militia with having attempted to impose militarism upon this country with relation to the Col. Ponton matter and other matters. We have also the incident of the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons, in connection with which the Minister of Agriculture has been caught red-handed in all sorts of dealings in his attempt to impose militarism on the people. He has been charged with a desire to impose fortifications along the border which will cost some $50,000,000. This charge he has exposed to be a campaign falsehood of the Liberal party. He has been charged with attempting to overthrow responsible government when it has now been clearly proven that not he but the Minister of Agriculture and the government are the ones who departed from that principle. Lord Dundonald followed strictly and religiously all the lines of responsible government until he found that patience had ceased to be a virtue. When he found himself subjected to the petty, contemptible annoyances of the Minister of Agriculture, he did what any man of spirit in Canada would have done and resented that mischievous meddling. And when the right hon. the First Minister soars into one of his eloquent periods and boasts of his loyalty to the mother country and decries the introduction of race issues, let him begin at home. Let him be honest enough to tell his followers: gentlemen, you are unjust to Lord Dundonald, you are untrue to the best interests of Canada in keeping up these race cries. Sir, there is not one tittle of evidence to show that Lord Dundonald has been guilty of injustice or unfairness to any French Canadian. Let the Prime Minister reprove his own followers. Let him write an article or send a telegram—and the country will pay for it—to his own organs, telling them that their iniquitous crusade and their attempts to array the French Canadians against the English speaking people of this country must cease. Then and not until then will we have some faith in his professions of loyalty. But until he stands up and repudiates the disloyal utterances of his own organs, we will not have faith in the sincerity of his professions. Sir, the people of Canada will not bow down to these gentlemen and allow Lord Dundonald to be dragooned and blacklisted in every corner of the Dominion. Because free citizens of this country dare stand up and defend a fellow-citizen of the British Empire, we are charged with exploiting Lord Dundonald for political purposes. I want to tell these gentlemen that the spirit of liberty is not quite dead in Canada yet, and before this matter is over they will find out that the people take the same view of it as we do. It looks very much as though the game of these hon. gentlemen had succeeded and as though the British government had been weak enough to yield to their importunities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. Do not be disloyal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It looks as though they have been weak enough to yield to the demands of hon. gentlemen opposite. All I have to say is that I am very much disappointed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. No doubt.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have never had the knack of standing before an audience in one part of Canada and preaching one doctrine and then going into another part and preaching disloyalty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am unable to do otherwise than stand up and express the honest sentiments of my heart on all occasions, and I have no hesitation in saying that I am surprised that Arnold Foster dared used the language he did last night in the Imperial House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COWAN. Another good man gone wrong.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to tell this House and country that Lord Dundonald is not the man I take him to be if he will bow for one second to any illegal, unjust mandate of any official to return to his own country sooner than it suits his own convenience. Mr. Arnold Foster will find that the spirit of liberty is not dead in the colonies altogether yet, if it is in the old land.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, treason.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, I mean every word of what I say, and I want to tell these gentlemen that before they are done with this issue they will find that they are reckoning without their host. I made some statements the other day with reference to the school of musketry. I stand here to reiterate every statement I then made and claim that every one of them was proven absolutely by the statement of the officer commanding the corps itself. Inasmuch as I do not require to bask in the sunshine of the shadow even of such great men as the First Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I owe them no obligation. They cannot override me and force me to bow down before them. They cannot demand of me: did you or did you not do so and so? When I read the statement the other day in the papers, I was ashamed to think that thirty-five or forty young men,

taken from any part of the Dominion, could be found so subservient, especially when wearing the uniform of His Majesty, as to let any man, be he the commissioner of any school of instruction or the officer of high rank in the militia or even the minister himself, to line him up and ask him, did you or did you not do so and so ? Every man attending the school was lined up the other day and asked the question : did you do so and so ? In place of telling the commander to go to a warmer clime——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—and mind his business, these men seemed to bow to the little tyrant pro tem. More than that, in reading up the correspondence in relation to the Ponton matter, I was sorry to see that although Col. Ponton had the manhood to resist the mandate of the minister, yet he so far bowed down as to give the explanation demanded of him. That man is not a proper citizen of Canada who will obey an illegal order. He is not a loyal citizen who will bow down to an unjust or tyrannical command. I maintain that every officer and man in that school of instruction who would allow Col. Cartwright to ask him such a question shows that he does not realize the first duty of a citizen of this country. The statement I made here that the men were taxed for the maintenance of the club was perfectly correct. Every officer has to pay $3 club subscription in addition to his mess charges, and he has to pay 85 cents a day which does not include the 25 cents a day for government rations. That is simply for board, because these officers and men lodge in the tents furnished by the government, and for what they pay, they could board in the King Edward Hotel of Toronto or the Russell House in Ottawa.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Grand Union ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The rates there are a little higher.

Mr. COWAN. Is that a special rate in the King Edward—25 cents a day ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They have a place there set apart for bootblacks and gentlemen of that character which might suit my hon. friend, but I never look for it.

Mr. COWAN. I never boarded that cheap.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Privates are compelled to act as servants to officers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are no privates attending the schools.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hon. gentleman opposite laugh. It is an easy thing for ignoramuses to laugh, but all I have to say is that the minister read a statement in the House the other morning which deliberately contradicts his statement now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister says that there are no privates taken for the course of military instruction, but there are a dozen privates of the permanent corps sent down to Rockcliffe for fatigue purposes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes, of the permanent corps.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And the minister knows that long ago I brought up the question of the permanent corps doing fatigue work.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was this :

I am also informed that privates are called upon to act as servants to officers, and that these young men who are brought from the farms to learn musketry are subjected to prison discipline.

I say there is not one word of truth in that statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to tell the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that he is making a statement to this House that is not true.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say there are no privates there who are called upon to perform such duties as the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There are men of the permanent corps who are called upon to perform those menial services, and the Minister of Militia knows it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) wishes to be fair in this matter. These young men who are from the farms—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Militia will kindly take his seat until I am done with him. My statement was this :

I am also informed that privates are called upon to act as servants to officers.

There is my statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 'Young men who are brought from the farms to learn musketry.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What I said was this :

These young men who are brought from the farms to learn musketry are subjected to prison discipline.

The point that I make to-day, that I have made before, and shall go on making and urging until this thing is righted, is plain : It is hard enough to keep our permanent corps together as it is. Desertions occur every day. If you turn up the

reports you will see that nearly as many men desert every year as enter the force. Why ? When we send a young man to join one of the permanent corps, what duties is he assigned to ? Is he taught how to defend his country or how to become an instructor for the militia ? No. He is set to blacking boots and doing menial work for—

An hon. MEMBER. For snobs.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—to dancing attendance upon those who seek to pose as an aristocracy. I object to this and shall continue to object. These young men who are sent to join the permanent corps should be used as means of instructing our militia, and not as servants. And what I want the Minister of Militia to say is that these men of the permanent corps who are down at that school doing fatigue duty, simply doing the dirty work around that camp, shall be sent back to the permanent corps to attend to the duties that properly belong to them.

Mr. COWAN. Where was Turpin ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Turpin was never called upon, Sir, to perform such duties as these. I want to impress upon the Minister of Militia the importance of this matter of treating properly the men of the permanent corps. We do not engage these men to do menial work. Why, the reports show that our permanent force is so reduced that it cannot perform the duties assigned to it. Years ago I brought this matter up, and pointed out that the law of the country provides that these men are to be trained to become instructors and to help in the education in military matters of the officers of the militia. If these gentlemen in camp want servants, let them get them elsewhere. And, if the Minister wants fatigue parties for the dirty work about the camp, he can get them at less expense, not by setting young men of ambition at such duties, but by engaging men who are content to remain in that class. So, my statement that these men are called upon to act as servants to the officers is borne out by this memorandum of the commandant of the school of musketry. My next statement was in relation to the young fellows from the farms being subject to prison discipline, which has already been read. I demand that these young men shall not be subject to inquisitorial rules regarding coming in at a certain hour and so on. These young men are as capable of taking care of themselves as is Colonel Cartwright or any officer in Canada, and they should be as free to come and go as the officers themselves. That is the ground I take, I cannot be driven from it. One other statement I made was as regards extra clothing and bedding, the statement of Colonel Cartwright frankly admits the truth of what I alleged. He says :

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Owing to the fact that at a previous camp officers were allowed sheets and pillow-cases there may have been some disappointment on this score, but all the officers to whom I have spoken on the subject consider that sheets and pillow-cases are unnecessary for camp life.

Therefore, the statement I made that the same rule did not prevail as in other years and that there was dissatisfaction, is borne out by the statement of Col. Cartwright himself. These are all the statements I made, and every one of them is admitted. Col. Cartwright says, further :

I do not bear Col. Sam. Hughes the least animosity in regard to the statements he has made, because it is clear that he has been misinformed by some malicious person.

I do not want any controversy with Col. Cartwright. I may say that Sir Adolphe Caron, formerly Minister of Militia, who is now within the precincts of the House, will, I am sure, bear me out when I say it was more through the action of your humble servant than through that of any other man that Col. Cartwright was given a position when—however, I do not need to discuss that, further than to say that it was desired on his part to be appointed an officer in the permanent corps. I have endeavoured, so far as I could, to be a friend of Col. Cartwright ever since. But the sunshine of his favour is not absolutely necessary to my life. Therefore, perhaps, I may seem not to be sufficiently impressed by his statement that he does not bear me any ill will. Now, at page 7209 of 'Hansard' I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that Col. Cartwright seems to have paraded these men before him and to have demanded of each of them a confession much the same as a school teacher might do with the children in a little country school.

Mr. BENNETT. Were the prisoners warned ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have not the order before me. But I want to tell the minister that this kind of thing is not in harmony with the democratic spirit of the country or with the military regulations. And, so far as I am concerned, it shall not be permitted in this country. No officer has a right, and no officer should dare, to bring his men before him and ask any such questions as seem to have been asked of these men. I want the minister to endeavour to have the militia carried on in accordance with the principles of individual liberty and of self-respect on the part of the men. If he does not do it, we will endeavour to give him such instruction as we can in the principle of liberty. I want him to understand that the militiaman loses none of his rights as a citizen when he dons His Majesty's uniform, unless he contravenes the militia regulations. If the minister allows that lib-

erty to be curtailed, we will try to bring to bear upon him the influence of the public opinion of this enlightened and democratic country. I want him to try to cultivate in the members of the militia the spirit of independence that should be in the heart of every man. I trust that the minister will give this matter his attention and that, in the first place he will inquire of Col. Cartwright by what authority he dared to bring these men before him and ask each one to answer his question in relation to certain matters reported in 'Hansard' and in the press of this country. And, after he has taken that matter up, he may hear from me about it on another occasion. And I would ask the minister also, when we may expect the fulfilment of an order that, I understand has been issued, demanding the name and the post office address of every officer and man in the militia regiments throughout the Dominion of Canada ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). In view of the statements the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has made that every one of the allegations made by him in this House the other day has been absolutely and literally proved by the papers I laid on the table yesterday, and a portion of which I read to the House, I think hon. members generally will agree with me that it would be an impossibility to convince that hon. gentleman that any statement made by him is incorrect or unfounded. And I may say at once that I do not propose to enter upon so hopeless a task. But I will make one or two observations and only one or two. First, I may say that I am informed, upon what I believe to be very excellent authority, that only one officer of the school now convened at Rockcliffe had any communication, direct or indirect, with the hon. gentleman and that that one officer absolutely denies that he stated to that hon. gentleman anything upon which he could found the charge which he has made.

One single word with reference to private soldiers. The hon. gentleman made a statement and endeavoured to appeal to the sympathy of the House and of the country with regard to the improper use that was being made of private soldiers brought from different parts of the country to be taught musketry. His statement was this:

I am informed that privates are called upon to act as servants to officers and that these young men——

What young men ? These privates.

These young men who are brought from th farm to learn musketry are subjected to prison discipline.

The answer to this is to be found in the official document which I laid on the table of this House.

Private soldiers.—There are no privates taking the course at the Canadian School of Musketry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Everybody knew it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (reading)

There are, however privates from the permanent corps sent down to Rockcliffe for fatigue purposes. They are used in various ways as shown in the attached schedule. It will be observed that the proportion of officers' servants to officers is much smaller than that allowed by regulations.

Mark these words :

It would be a great hardship to prevent these men making extra money as officers servants ; most of the men count on making extra in this way when coming to Rockcliffe.

These men are paid for the work which they do, yet the hon. gentleman did not give the slightest indication of the fact that the men are doing this duty voluntarily in the first place and in the second place are paid for it. There was not one word in the hon. gentleman's statement to indicate that fact.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Every fool would know it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would invite the hon. gentleman—since the matter has gone so far and since he is still absolutely certain that all the statements he made are absolutely true, and since I have given up the vain attempt to satisfy him that they are not true—to be good enough to give me the names of the officers or men who made this complaint.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman want a statement ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that when I find him writing a letter to Colonel Ponton, an officer on the reserve list——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am asking for the names. I insist upon my right to go on.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Very well I wish——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to give me the names now or to send them to me I shall be glad to get them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In order that the hon. gentleman——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But I demand the names, and if he is not prepared to give them I will conclude.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By what right does the minister demand a name from me ? He demands the name. Who is he that demands a name ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, one more point.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the reason that I will not give the names.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, attempts to give the impression that there is something of a star chamber organization at the Rockcliffe Rifle Ranges. He speaks of men being brought up there and questioned as to what has happened. He knows perfectly well that it is a rule of military life that the men in the ranks or non-commissioned officers at any time when on duty, may be asked by their superior officer whether everything is satisfactory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, that is right I know, but that is not what they were asked.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He knows that perfectly well, but let me tell him and this House that I am informed and I have no doubt whatever of the fact that these men asked their superior officers to give them the opportunity——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—to make a statement and deny these objectionable charges.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Now, Sir, with reference to the order. The hon. gentleman has asked me why a certain order which I have not seen has been issued. I was not aware that an order had been published but I do know that it is intended by the department to keep statistics in reference to all those who have attended the militia camps this year ; to keep a record of all the names of the officers, non-commissioned officers and men. This has been established as a rule of the department for this year and for the future, for statistical purposes, chiefly for the purpose of enabling the pay department of the militia to compare the pay-lists which have always been kept with this list of names and addresses in order to prevent an evil which has existed in the past by which some men go from one corps to another, enlist in different corps and draw money from the Dominion treasury improperly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I wish to make a personal explanation. The minister asked me why I will not give this name. In the first place the minister himself has upset the rule by trying to dragoon Colonel Ponton.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What has that got to do with it.

Mr. SAM HUGHES.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It shows the spirit of the minister and in the second place I——

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I repudiate his authority to ask me for a name and in the second place I am not going to submit any officer or man of the force of this country to any petty persecution on the part of any official be he ever so high or ever so low.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just one word in respect to the discussion which has taken place and the reason for my addressing the House will become obvious as I proceed. It has been suggested by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that these men were paraded, and, practically compelled to make a statement in respect of this matter. Now it so happens that a day or so before the men made their statements two of these men came to me in the House and stated that every man in the force was very indignant at the aspersions cast upon them by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in the House and that they desired in the most practical and forcible way to express that indignation. They asked me to take the matter up in the House. I stated that it was a proper thing for the men themselves to take up and that a course which was quite open to them would be to go back to the camp, talk the matter over among themselves and ask the commanding officer for an opportunity to express their opinions. I have no doubt that that is exactly what they did and that the course which they pursued was based upon the suggestion which I made at that time. So that so far from these men having been paraded and forced to make this statement it was an expression of their indignation and truly states the facts of the case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Will you allow me a word ? In view of the somewhat violent and abusive attack which has been made from the other side on the British government I think it is desirable——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is desirable that a word or two should be said on that question. There are many matters in which the Canadian government and the Canadian parliament would naturally desire the co-operation and assistance of the government of the mother country, and in all such cases we would naturally appeal to that government for aid and assistance. But there are other matters in which no such aid is needed, and this unhappy Dundonald business was one of that kind. Mr. Arnold Foster, very

correctly stated—and it is perhaps the point of his observations which we appreciate most—that this is a matter in which the Canadian government have shown that they were well able to deal with the situation themselves. It was stated correctly by Mr. Arnold Foster that this government have made no protest whatever with regard to Lord Dundonald. We have not felt called upon to make any such protest. Lord Dundonald was an official of the Canadian government when he made what I regard as an unfortunate mistake, a mistake which many a brave soldier makes when he comes to deal with civil affairs. We felt that we had to deal with that question as between the Canadian government and one of its public officials. It is not to be supposed for a moment that any Canadian official, a servant of the government—I do not use the word in an offensive sense, because each one of us is a servant, using the word in its proper sense—can be permitted to go out and make public attacks upon the ministry of the day without being rebuked or dismissed. It is not necessary to discuss what had happened prior to that. It was enough to know that a servant of the government of Canada had made the grave mistake of making an attack upon the ministers who were his superiors in power. It was necessary for the vindication of our self-respect, it was necessary for the vindication of the principles of responsible government, it was necessary for the vindication of all that Canadians have valued in their struggles for self-government, that the right of the responsible ministers of the day should be asserted, and there seemed to be no other way of asserting this right than by dismissing that eminent and distinguished officer. That being the case we did not feel it necessary to make any protest as to his further action, but nevertheless, we appreciate in the highest degree the manner in which that question was dealt with yesterday in the imperial parliament. The statement that was made in the imperial parliament that Lord Dundonald was being exploited for the benefit of a political party in this country is unhappily too true. Whatever motives Lord Dundonald may have in the matter, and I will not attempt to question his motives for a moment, we all know that gentlemen politically opposed to the government of the day have seized upon this question in the hope that they may turn it to political advantage. They have been endeavouring to beguile some Liberals into a participation in the movement, but I venture to believe that after the experience that has been had in the city of Toronto, no other example of that kind will be given. I therefore desire to say that I endorse emphatically the statement that the Dundonald question was being exploited for the advantage of a political party and that in that respect, whether willingly or not, Lord Dundonald was being used as an instrument in a movement not calculated to advance the best possible relations between the civil and military authorities, or between the imperial and colonial governments. While we made no representations on the subject we rejoice to know that the Secretary for War, Mr. Arnold Foster, Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Lloyd George, whom, notwithstanding the reference of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), I am bound to speak of as one of the most distinguished members of the imperial parliament, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and all the members of parliament who spoke on this question in the great House of Commons of England recognize and appreciate the position of Canada, that they recognize that this is a purely Canadian question, that they recognize that the Canadian government and the Canadian parliament are the proper people to deal with the question, and in their intimation to Lord Dundonald, a distinguished soldier, that it was not desirable that he should participate in these party conflicts they have taken a step which again proves that the mother country can be relied upon at all times to uphold and to appreciate the principles of responsible government which we Canadians fought for many years ago.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you cannot have failed to have observed the extraordinary nature of the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with this incident so far as the debate has gone. The right hon. Prime Minister declined to say a word in condemnation of the Solicitor General, for the uncalled for and improper utterances he is credited with having made because the report of these utterances appears in the newspapers; yet, when reference is made to Lord Dundonald by the newspapers based on imagination or otherwise, is there a word of protest? This whole incident we are discussing in so far as it is connected with what has happened in the old country, is simply based on the statements of newspapers. When the newspapers say that the opposition are exploiting Lord Dundonald for the purpose of making political capital, that is sufficient in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite to condemn the opposition. Even if this were a true statement of the utterances of the Solicitor General, would the right hon. Prime Minister condemn a word of them? This question since it was first brought up, has been widened by hon. gentlemen opposite, been widened into an attack upon the Conservative party and upon the bête noir of hon. gentlemen opposite—Lord Dundonald. I was glad to observe that neither the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) nor the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) ventured to say one word in disparagement of that distinguished

soldier who was lately our commander in chief here. I was glad, because this is in marked contrast with the course pursued by some of their associates, with some of those who sit behind them and in marked contrast with the course universally pursued by a strong element of the Reform press. They have not hesitated in any way to accuse him of everything that it is possible to imagine. Ever since what? Ever since, with the courage of a patriot, knowing it was to his own disparagement, admitting like a soldier, a gentleman, and a Briton, that he was, prepared to pay the penalty, he felt himself impelled by his duty to speak out. Before I dwell any more upon that, let me call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to one thing that he did. I say that it was not worthy of him to describe Lord Dundonald as a servant of the people. It is true in one sense; it is not true in the larger sense. He is not the servant of the people in one sense. He is no more so than the members of the government who are the representatives of the people in the higher sense and I would not think of applying that term to the hon. Minister of Finance or to any man sitting in his place because of the distinguished position he occupies in this country. He (the Minister of Finance) is more than the servant of the people; he is the representative of the people. So is Lord Dundonald. He is an official of the Canadian government, but I regretted to hear the word 'servant' so frequently used in connection with a distinguished gentleman, always distinguished since he entered the great imperial service and a gentleman who upon his own merits during the course of his military career, has fought his way up to the exalted position he now occupies. It was not worthy of the hon. Minister of Finance to do as some of the satellites behind him have done; that is to bring up the question of Lord Dundonald being a servant of the people so as to make the people think they had a power over this gentleman which the law of the country does not give them. Then, the hon. gentleman brought up the question of responsible government. A good point was made by one hon. gentleman opposite, this morning, one that I appreciate because I do not think it is necessary that we should be called upon in both parties to defend our loyalty as often as we are called upon to do. I agree with the proposition that according to their light all the people in this country are loyal. But I do make this charge, and I regret it exceedingly—I am too near the end of my term of service in this country to say anything which I do not believe to be absolute reality—that gentlemen in the province of Quebec endeavour to make their compatriots believe that we in the province of Ontario do not believe in their loyalty and that we are abusing and maligning them. I have stood up for the rights of my French Canadian compatriots and I have paid for it by a hard political fight when I had to give a vote to preserve the constitutional rights of the people of Quebec, I say stop that, stop that the Prime Minister, stop that the Solicitor General stop it all. We in Ontario, Reformer and Conservative are as much as possible stopping it. It does not do any good and it does a great deal of harm. Why does the hon. Minister of Finance then bring up the question of responsible government? Why is it necessary? We have heard more about responsible government since the Dundonald incident than it ought be necessary for us to hear in five years. No principle of constitutional government is imperilled, and if it were, Conservatives and Liberals alike, would rush to safeguard it. Let these gentlemen opposite give us some argument to show that constitutional government is in danger, and let them cease to play to the gallery and expect such nonsensical talk to be taken as argument. If I am put in possession of a single proof that the Conservative party is open to the charge of exploiting Lord Dundonald, or trying to make political capital out of the incident, I will go against my party. No, Sir, the Conservative party is too noble a party to betray the late Commander in Chief, a man who has proven himself to be a hero, and who to his own discomfort, and, when at the apex of his great career, has placed himself in at least a delicate position, in order to right the wrong. I am beginning to think, Sir, that we have been too careful in this matter and that too little has been said by us in defence of Lord Dundonald.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TISDALE. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh if they please, but I will substantiate this statement. I can tell them that their cries of militarism, constitutional government, and responsible government will not blind the good sense of the people of Canada. I have come to the conclusion that the Conservative party, in very fear of introducing politics into this, have neglected to defend Lord Dundonald as he ought to be defended for the manly part he has taken. There is no difference of opinion as to the power of the government if they saw fit to do so, to dismiss Lord Dundonald. But, Sir, there is another view of the case; there is a larger view of the case, and that is that the people of Canada must set about to remedy the evil which Lord Dundonald impelled by patriotism and a high sense of duty has exposed. Is there a Reformer in Ontario who will deny that it was patriotism and a high sense of duty which impelled Lord Dundonald to the action he took. Can any other reasonable or unreasonable motive be suggested? I can tell these gentlemen opposite that the people of this country, as distinguished from the

politicians, will appreciate the very soul of the motives which inspired Lord Dundonald. He is a reformer and he has sacrificed himself to bring about reform. Martyrs are made for the good of the christian, as well as for the good of the political world, and I have no doubt that history will realize that for the sake of the Canadian militia Lord Dundonald has offered himself up as a sacrifice. He is not a politician. His military and his private career show that he is an honourable and noble man. His name is a household word in the British empire and particularly in Canada since the relief of Ladysmith. Our brave young lads who God has spared from the risks of war, brought to their Canadian homes, honour and praise for Dundonald's name. He came here to serve the empire and his great inducement was that he might make soldiers in a simple way of the brave Canadian lads who, Conservative and Reform ,are similar to those who served under him in South Africa. A part from the politicians and apart from the party press, Lord Dundonald is honoured in Canada and his motives are correctly appreciated. And what objectionable demonstration has he taken part in since his dismissal ? The first was a private dinner at the Rideau Club, which I had the honour of attending and at which there was no politics. The next was a great demonstration in the capital of my province, the centre of commerce and education, a city worthy of any country, a city that is the pride of Ontario, and the pride of myself, because although I was not born there, I was educated there and lived there part of my life. The citizens wanted to honour Lord Dundonald, and a committee composed of men of all political beliefs was named to entertain him and present him with an address appreciative of what he did. Thousands of Conservatives and thousands of Reformers assembled in Toronto to do Dundonald honour. They expected him to make his defence against the charges hurled against him, and they would have been disappointed if he had not done so. It would be too much to expect that he should keep his mouth closed. When the address was presented he made the speech of an honourable man, the speech of a true soldier, and even in his defence he revealed no departmental secrets. In that he was unlike the Minister of Militia who tells us whatever he pleases about Lord Dundonald's report and then refuses to produce it. In a manly and straightforward way Lord Dundonald answered the charges that had been made against him in public and in private.

Beyond that he ventured not a foot. I cannot understand how people, even to advance political interests, could pretend that in that speech and in that gathering there was anything political. Ask the people who were at it, unless paid partisans or representatives of party papers. It was a great spontaneous tribute which any man should be proud of. Now, with regard to the recall. Hon. gentlemen opposite shouted when they heard of it ; but how has he been recalled ? We do not know. But I will venture to prophesy—because there is only one way, under British rule and British law, in which he can be recalled. He is no official of the British government. He was an official of Canada. When he was dismissed, he was free to discuss anything. I doubt if there is one hon. gentleman sitting on these treasury benches who would have kept his mouth closed as the general has done, about things which have happened in the department. He did not say anything about his report, but he did deny some which seemed inspired from their knowledge of things unpublished as to the alleged 'Private' report suppressed by the Minister of Militia. He acted as a gentleman, as he is ; he acted the man, who is more than the gentleman in some ways ; he acted not only the man but the brave man and the patriotic man ; he told the truth, and the people of this country will believe him. I want to tell these hon. gentlemen that in attempting to exploit this matter upon us, they are exploiting it upon themselves. They are suffering the consequences to-day, because the people will believe the man, not the politician, but the great imperial soldier that he is, and he tells the truth. As to his return, what is he to-day ? He is a soldier on half pay ; and you will find, with all this talk, that he is going home because he has been called home for some service. I want to say—and this is only incidental—that I never saw the general but twice, both times at dinners. He would not know me if he saw me on the street to-day. I know his aide-de-camp, whom I have met two or three times socially. I asked him when the general was going to leave, saying that I would like to call on him before he left ; and he told me that he was going to leave the first of the week after next. Probably the recall had been made then. Mr. Arnold Foster, like the right hon. the First Minister, does not tell the House more than is necessary on these matters, and it is not proper that he should. I will venture to say that Lord Dundonald has been recalled for some duty, and that he was recalled before this incident occurred.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TISDALE. Hon. gentlemen will all agree with me in this, that he cannot be recalled except as a soldier. So that his recall is no very great matter. In England they know too well what such cries mean to make any demonstation over it, unless they want some politics over there too, and unless the newspapers make a great deal of exitement. I will guarantee that he has not been recalled on account of this incident.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. May I interrupt the hon. gentleman for one moment? The report published in this morning's 'Citizen' places in the mouth of Mr. Arnold Foster the following words.

Mr. TISDALE. We have had them already.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. But they are entirely in contradiction of the statement which has just fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman. They only occupy three lines.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is quite welcome to all the comfort he can get out of them. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was there, but nothing could render his arguments more ridiculous than this. His distinguished leader in this House has said that you must not put faith in newspaper reports, and there was not sufficient justification for him to say whether his colleague in England had made the statements imputed to him or not.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. This is in the 'Citizen.'

Mr. TISDALE. I want to get through by one o'clock, and if my hon. friend wants to make a speech, he can do it afterwards. It really has nothing to do with the subject. I may be wrong in regard to Lord Dundonald having been called home before this incident; but if the public press is to be received as an authority, we all know that it was announced ten days ago that he would sail from Montreal on the 29th of this month, and the whole programme was given. So that I am not much of a prophet in one way, except that I am giving as the probable reason that he has been recalled for some service. A man who is on half-pay cannot be called back unless it is for duty. So that all this talk about that matter is aside of the mark. In confirmation of the position I take, I want to quote the following from an independent paper, the 'News'—and Goldwin Smith said the same thing in the 'Weekly Sun:'

> Mr. Lemieux makes a curious demand of the British government when he declares tha it must 'recall' Lord Dundonald. The for mer General Officer Commanding holds no po sition from which the British government ca recall him. He is at present a major-general on half-pay. He held that status from the day that his South African brigade wa broken up. He was 'lent' by the War Office to Canada. When he was dismissed, he re verted automatically to half-pay. As long as he remains unemployed he has the liberty of action enjoyed by any British subject. He can travel in Africa, live in Canada, or tak part in British politics. Major-General Wauchope, who fell at Magersfontein, in 189 contested Midlothian against Mr. Gladstone. Lord Charles Beresford varies his sea-services with spells of work in the House of Commons. Captain Lambton, of Ladysmith fame, recently stood for parliament on a aggressively Liberal platform. The only way in which the British government can 'recall Lord Dundonald is to make haste to give him another post. That would be taken as evidence that it approved his attitude here. Even then he could decline an appointment which he did not wish to accept. Generals are free men, like the rest of British subjects.

I have got tired of all this talk about Lord Dundonald's recall. I have been wondering whether it was possible that our hon. friends opposite were so driven by the near approach of the elections as to be alarmed at the expression of feeling in the country, not so much about Lord Dundonald as about the truth he has told in regard to the present state of the Militia Department. They will not hesitate to try and cast a distinct slur on a general who did more for Canada in the time he was in command of our forces than any previous general has done in twice the time. Not content with making him pay a penalty for speaking out as a patriot, they want if possible to make the people in the old country believe that he had turned politician and went on the public platform to excite public opinion against the government. But the general himself has given an answer which proves the truth of the statements he made, and completely disposes of this personal attack; and, wherever he may go, he will be followed by the good-will of the Canadian people, and I am only giving expression to that goodwill when I say 'may God bless him whereever he may be.'

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. A. C. BELL. The matter which we were discussing when the House rose at one o'clock—the Dundonald incident, as it is usually called—has attracted, and is likely to attract, a good deal of attention in this country. I do not know that I should have thought it necessary to say anything at all on the subject on this occasion were it not for the very definite and explicit manner in which the hon. the Minister of Finance strove to fasten on the Liberal-Conservative party the charge of making this an issue in this country or, as he put it, exploiting this incident for political advantage. That charge has been made by a gentleman with a good deal of authority, and therefore is worth noticing, but that gentleman has not thought it necessary to support his assertion with any evidence whatever; and I think it will not be difficult to show that all the evidence tends to prove that while some effort has been made to turn this incident to political advantage, that effort has been entirely made by the Liberal party, led by no less a gentleman than the right hon. the First Minister. From the moment this incident became public, the government recognized how dangerous it was for them. They should have remembered, however, that the incident was not the creation of their opponents or of Lord Dundonald, but

that it owes its existence to one of their own number, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). And it was not hard to see, from the moment this matter came before this House, that the government had made up their mind exactly what line they were going to take. The right hon. gentleman himself, on the first occasion, unquestionably decided that he would treat Lord Dundonald as an opponent of his administration and an ally of the Conservative party, and practically accused him of endeavouring to dragoon the government of the day. And in order to make that charge as offensive as possible, he proceeded further to inform the House and the country that the one who was endeavouring to dragoon the government was a foreigner. Nothing could have been better devised to raise the feeling of the Liberal party against Lord Dundonald and any gentleman whom it might be the policy of the government to associate with him at a later stage of the affair. There could be no question at all from the very outset that the government had determined to stand by the Minister of Agriculture and dismiss the General Officer Commanding; and in order to justify their doing this, they determined to make it a political matter and fasten all the odium on the opposition. On general principles, we might at once conclude, from the fact that the Finance Minister accused the Conservative party of making capital out of this matter, that they themselves were doing the very thing with which they were charging their opponents. From the moment this incident became known to the people, the government treated Lord Dundonald with very little courtesy. He was spoken of by the First Minister as a stranger and a foreigner who had undertaken to dragoon the administration, and the Minister of Militia, a little later on, sneered at the general as a nobleman and a patrician, and said it was wonderful condescension on his part to speak to him, a plebeian and an ordinary citizen of Canada. It seems to me that it was anything but good taste for a gentleman known as Sir Frederick Borden to sneer at titles. If the Minister of Militia has a right to feel a reasonable pride in the fact that the British government has seen fit to honour him with the title of 'Sir,' he should have some respect for the higher title worn by Earl Dundonald. But the hon. gentleman was not the only one to indulge in that course. He was followed by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell), who said, in a mocking tone: Is this a time for discoursing when we have to deal with lords and dukes?

Mr. COCHRANE. And judges.

Mr. BELL. That came in a little later. So that from the beginning it was manifestly the purpose of the government to endeavour to belittle the effect this incident must naturally have on public opinion by trying to excite popular prejudice against Lord Dundonald personally and any hon. gentleman on this side who might say a word on his behalf. When this matter was discussed Earl Dundonald received very little support from hon. gentlemen opposite; and it was nothing more than ordinary fair-play that some gentlemen on this side should have taken care that the general's side of the case was fairly presented to the people. That was done, and nothing else beyond that; and I would like my hon. friends opposite to point to one single act or word on the part of any Conservative leader here or elsewhere which can be used as a basis for the charge that the Liberal-Conservative party was endeavouring to make political capital out of this incident. It was not sufficient for the Finance Minister to reiterate that the Conservative party was exploiting this matter for political purposes. And what we want in this matter is evidence to show that something of that kind is being done. There can be no doubt that all the evidence is to the contrary—every particle of it. There had been a constant effort made by the members of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite to throw odium on Lord Dundonald. We have, first of all, Mr. Preston, who writes letters to the British press, for which he is censured and notified that he will be dismissed if he repeats the offence. We have then Mr. Lemieux, a member of this administration, practically making the very same statements—begging the question and practically calling upon the government of Great Britain to recall Lord Dundonald from this country. Then we have Sir Elzear Taschereau. Is he speaking in the interests of the Conservative party? He is Chief Justice of Canada. He is on the other side of the Atlantic: yet he makes the assertion that this is being made a political question in this country. On what authority does Sir Elzear Taschereau make that statement? He says that the London 'Times' is being stuffed or loaded up by Ottawa Tories——

Mr. COWAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. And his statement is endorsed by my clever friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL—and, in fact by every hon. member on the other side. They all endorse that statement of Sir Elzear Taschereau, that the London 'Times' is being loaded up by Ottawa Tories. The London 'Times' is regarded as the most independent journal published in the world. I remember, when, a few years ago, hon. gentlemen opposite were quoting the London 'Times' with great delight because, a little hastily and without fully knowing all that was involved, it bestowed a degree of praise on the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, which they entirely failed to deserve, for their preferential tariff. The London 'Times' was then quoted as a great authority by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was not then loaded up by Ottawa Tories. But would it

be fair for us to assume that it was then loaded up by Ottawa Grits ? If we are to believe that that great newspaper can be loaded up by interested parties that would be a fair assumption. I do not think there is the slightest warrant for what Sir Elzéar Taschereau said. Is he exploiting this incident for political purposes ? Who is that gentleman ? With whom are his sympathies ? Will it be said that he is exploiting this incident for Conservative purposes ? Would it not rather be said that he is exploiting it for Liberal purposes ? Is not that what is being openly done by Preston, Lemieux, Taschereau and the whole party from the Prime Minister himself down to the last joint in the tail of his following ? And my hon. friend from Nova Scotia (Mr. Fielding) gets up and is so zealous in support of British connection and has such strong condemnation to utter of any one who would exploit such an incident for political purposes. We know how his loyal, honest, honourable soul is wrought upon to think that anybody should do such a thing. Would he do it ? Not he. Why, he never thought of such a thing and he is burdened with grief to think that any party would do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that hon. gentleman, and I know his record, and the record of those who have been associated with him. And I know that in every case where we have had an opportunity of looking upon their deeds we have found that every act they condemn, they only wanted an opportunity to proceed to do in the most extreme manner themselves ; if they denounced opponents for having taken any course, they only waited a chance to so completely outdo their opponents in that course that thereafter those opponents would never be mentioned in that connection. The people of this country know their record, that record of broken promises, absolute failure ever to do anything they promised, and of readiness to do everything that they had sworn not to do. So, there is no occasion to fear that the utterances of the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) will for a moment deceive the people of this country as to their course on this question. The Finance Minister has said that the government of this country is able to take care of itself. Unquestionably it is. He says that it has not appealed to the British government for any assistance. I presume not, since he says so. But I say this—that if the British government have recalled Dundonald, then, it is perfectly true, as my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) said that they could only recall him as a half-pay officer. They might invite him to return, but they could not order him to do so, except as half-pay officer. And, if they have recalled him it is probably because they desire to advance him to a position of higher honour and power. They know that his action was taken with a view to strengthen the defences of this country and so make Canada more valuable as a part of the empire and to strengthen the bonds that unite it with the empire. The British government, if it has acted as suggested has acted very generously to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his supporters. It is always inclined to do so. I presume it may have thought it expedient to do so. Because the threats—for Sir Elzéar Taschereau did not hesitate to threaten the British government with the displeasure of this government, for he says, 'I cannot see how the British government, even in its own interest, can fail to recall Lord Dundonald before the end of the week.' What interest of the British government was threatened by the presence of Lord Dundonald in this country that Sir Elzéar Taschereau must inform them that there was danger to that interest in allowing Lord Dundonald to remain here ? It strikes me that this interview which purports to have been given by the Chief Justice is a forgery, or else Sir Elzéar Taschereau was so ill-advised as to utter, in the course of his interview a threat—I was about to say a veiled threat, but it was not at all veiled, but very distinct and very plain, that the presence of Lord Dundonald in this country would militate against the interest of the empire and would justify this government in taking such a course as would not be in the interest of the British government. What else can the language mean, if it means anything at all ? But I do not believe for a moment that the British government in this case has done more or less than they have uniformly done in dealing with the government of the right hon. gentleman. They have acted with him and with the people of Canada as they have acted with all the colonies, in a most generous fashion. They are probably far enough away from this little matter to view it calmly, and probably to view it in its proper proportion. For, to my mind, it was not a great matter in the first instance, and, if the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had acted with proper dignity and not descended to an attack on Lord Dundonald and every one who called himself Lord Dundonald's friend, it would never have been other than a small incident. But, as I say, the British government have acted generously ; they have acted as they do toward friend and foe, toward the colonies, toward the United States and toward every country with which they have any dealings, with the greatest magnanimity. If Lord Dundonald's presence is embarassing to the administration, no doubt the British government is willing to withdraw him and, as far as possible, to relieve them from the embarrassment from which they are suffering. It is not the first time the British government have acted generously with hon. gentlemen opposite. For twenty years the Conservative party in this country, which certainly deserved well of the British govern-

ment if any party ever did, for there was never any question as to their willingness to do everything in their power to strengthen British connection and to make Canada a source of strength to the empire—for twenty years that party endeavoured in vain to have the Belgian and German treaties denounced by the government. And it was only when the present government had involved themselves in a morass of difficulties, after they had got into a slough of despond from which they could never hope to extricate themselves, that, to release them from their difficulties, the British government denounced those treaties. And, in this case, also, if the British government have acted as stated, they have simply followed the course that they have always followed in acting generously to the hon. gentlemen opposite. And I think hon. gentlemen on this side have no objection to seeing that step taken by the British government. But we must remember that, in what they have done they have stretched their courtesy. Why should they have recalled Lord Dundonald from this country? For, even if it can be proven that he was taking an active part in hostility to this government, is that a reason why the British government should take such a course?

Why should they do it? He was no longer a servant of this government, but a half-pay officer of the British government. Major General Laurie was a half-pay officer of the imperial government when he carried the county of Shelburne and sat in this House as an active opponent of hon. gentlemen opposite. Was there a question of recalling him because he took an active part in political warfare in this country? There is just as much right to recall Lord Dundonald on account of any action he takes in connection with the political history of our country as there would have been to recall General Laurie at a time when he was an active fighter in the Conservative ranks in Canada. The Liberal-Conservative party are charged with taking such steps in this matter as would give a political complexion to this Dundonald incident. They have never done so in any one respect. The courtesies shown to Lord Dundonald everywhere throughout Canada have been extended to him as a man and a soldier. The demonstration in Toronto was participated in by members of both political parties.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. He will be welcomed in Ottawa in a few days by members of both political parties and the men who will come together to do honour to Lord Dundonald will, in so doing, do honour to themselves. He is now no longer an official of this government; he is simply a resident in this country who is entitled to honour and distinction because he is one of the brightest and bravest fighters in the British service and one of those who have done most to add honour and lustre to the British arms. He is a man whom our young men would do well to copy and if he had remained in Canada he might have been an inspiration to young Canadians, and might have influenced many of them to rival the deeds of arms that have made Dundonald and his race famous. Lord Dundonald need not feel sad because he has been turned down and gored by the Liberal party. Have they ever treated any one even in their own ranks any better? What treatment did they accord to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) a short time ago? What treatment did they accord to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair).

Some hon. MEMBERS. He's all right.

Mr. BELL. The very same gentleman from Hants was set to work to buzz and sting about the Minister of Railways, who was cast loose out of the mosquito net a short time ago to entertain our friend Colonel Hughes. Alexander Mackenzie knew, what that treatment was. Mr. Blake knew what that treatment was. In my own province the man whom Nova Scotians and Canadians generally would unite in saying was the greatest and brainiest man of his time, Joseph Howe, was hounded to his grave by that party, the moment he had ceased to serve them as they thought they should be served. Lord Dundonald, who, no doubt, is looking upon all their efforts and attacks with equanimity, may well console himself with the knowledge of the fact that in being the object and butt of their attack he is simply one of a glorious company who have suffered in the course of time from that same attack. It would be better for the Liberal party if they would treat this question as it should be treated, as one that must necessarily occur in all departmental matters. If the right hon. the Prime Minister had taken a different line when he got up to initiate the attack on Lord Dundonald the incident would never have attained the importance or extent it has. It is to the attacks of hon. gentlemen that all the importance of this question and all the dangers to that party which may arise out of it are due. If they had treated it as they should have, if they had treated Lord Dundonald as a gentleman, as they should have, after he ceased to be an official they would not need to have that alarmed and uneasy feeling in their breasts to-day that induced the Minister of Finance to rise in his place and quote one of his most oft used expressions, insinuating that the Conservative party in Canada are endeavouring to make any political capital whatever out of this. I defy the Minister of Finance, I defy the Prime Minister to furnish any proof.

Mr. COWAN. You are doing it now.

Mr. BELL. I point out that every utterance of every hon. member opposite, of every official or quasi official, on the other side of the Atlantic, who could obtain access to the columns of the British press, is directed towards the effort to injure the Conservative party in connection with this matter. Is the Conservative party responsible for Preston ? Is the Conservative party responsible for Lemieux ? Is the Conservative party responsible for Taschereau ? Is the Conservative party responsible for Sir Frederick Borden, who gets up here and sneers at the title of Lord Dundonald ? In every respect, in every point of this matter in which anything like an attempt has been made to arouse feeling, the charge can be successfully made against the Liberal party and its leaders in this House.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I had no intention whatever of taking any part in this debate which I had hoped would not last very long in view of the length which the session has already attained and the fact that we are all very anxious to get home. But inasmuch as it deals particularly with a question in which I am always interested and further because certain statements have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite which I think should not be passed over, I will ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes. I shall not attempt to deal with the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just concluded (Mr. Bell) beyond saying one or two words with regard to points made by him. I was surprised to find that the hon. member for Pictou should descend once more to attempt to stir up strife between the various races of this country by introducing that word 'foreigner' into this debate. The hon. gentleman has asked for proofs from the Minister of Finance and other members on this side of the House that the Conservative party was trying to make political capital out of this Dundonald question. I say that proof can be laid on the table of this House to-morrow when the unrevised 'Hansard' is published and the speech of the hon. gentleman is seen. I was present in this House when the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made use of the word 'foreigner,' and I heard him withdraw it before the Conservatives entered their protest—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, you did not.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON—quick as they were to do so. Since that time I have read in 'Hansard,' although I was not present in the House when the speech was made, the acceptance of the explanation of the Prime Minister by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and yet the very next day after that leader had accepted that explanation, his leading journal in the capital city of Canada, the Ottawa 'Citizen,' devoted an editorial of almost a column exploiting once more, for political purposes, the inadvertent use of the word 'foreigner' by the Prime Minister. And now here again to-day we find this lieutenant in the maritime provinces of the leader of the opposition reintroducing this word and once more endeavouring to stir up strife because of it. It does seem to me that our charge that the Conservatives are attempting to make political capital out of this whole question is proven and proven to the hilt by the speech of the hon. gentleman. I was glad of one thing however. I would be sorry indeed to think that His Majesty's loyal opposition were a unit in the view as to the British government expressed by one of their leaders, the belligerent member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who called the British government a set of cowards or words to that effect. I was glad to find that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), on the contrary, pronounced them a set of magnanimous gentlemen. But all this goes to show, all this quarrelling in the family circle of hon. gentlemen opposite, all this breaking away by their party press, from the acceptance of the premier's explanation by the leader of their party goes to show that there is a dreadful lack of discipline in the Conservative party and that certain prominent gentlemen in the Conservative ranks will in their turn have to be recalled if the leader of the opposition is to have an easy time in future. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) said—and his chest was visibly expanded while he said it—that Conservative loyalty at least, had never been challenged in this country. Mr. Speaker, I fancy it never has been challenged since the days when sundry gentlemen, at the time feeling somewhat sore over the Rebellion Losses Act, actually went so far as to rotten-egg the representative of His Majesty, Lord Elgin.

It is quite possible that it was impugned at a later date when the then leader of the Conservative party went so far as to say, in discussing a certain tariff issue, that if the result of the tariff then adopted, the national policy, was to injure British connection—then so much the worse for British connection. However, I would not willingly recall these matters had not the hon. gentleman practically challenged the loyalty of the great Liberal party of this country. For my part, I do not believe that there is such a thing as disloyalty in the Dominion of Canada. I have yet to meet a man, either Liberal or Conservative, who is disloyal. I believe we are true to the last man to Canada under British connection, but I do think it is bad taste indeed for hon. gentlemen opposite to rise in their places in the House and try to create the impression in Canada, yes, and beyond its borders, that the Liberal party, representing as it does more than half the people of Canada,

is absolutely disloyal to Canada and disloyal to the British empire.

But, enough of this. Let me rather come down to something which has arisen out of the recent utterances of Lord Dundonald in regard to the administration of militia matters in Canada. I would refer to his phrases 'fool's paradise' and 'government indifference to the militia.' I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that in the last three years we have spent $10,000,000 upon the militia of Canada, that this year we are spending $3,500,000 upon it and that we have increased the annual expenditure upon the militia by from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000. I do not believe you can find a greater test of the good wishes of the government towards any particular branch of the public service than that which is afforded by the estimates. If you find that the government is supporting a certain branch of the public service by liberal expenditures and taking the chance of criticism from the opposition and from those people in the country who are against large expenditures you may say at once that the government is not indifferent to that particular branch of the public service. But, if we live in a fool's paradise to-day what kind of a fool's paradise did we live in before 1896? The rules of the House will not permit me to characterize the kind of fool's paradise that we lived in prior to 1896. But then I can prove to you by comparison that it was certainly a very superlative kind of fool's paradise as compared with the fool's paradise in which we are said to exist now. We find that the government is now giving the militia of Canada annual drills. I have been in the militia of Canada for nine years under the late government and for eight years under this government, so that I think I am in a position to speak with some little knowledge and authority on this subject and I say that there never was anything more detrimental to the true interests of the militia than the system which was pursued under the Conservative government in this connection; that is the system of calling out the militia every other year to get its training. I had almost made a bull by speaking of calling it out every other year to get its annual drill. As a matter of fact the regiments simply went to pieces because of inactivity, consequent upon the two years of idleness which intervened between one camp and another. It was reserved for this government under the energetic and able management of the present hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to call the militia out every year, but two, I think, in full strength, and in these two years in very tolerable strength, the officers and non-commissioned officers and a portion of the rank and file being drilled during these two years. That fact is one of the best evidences that can be adduced in proof of the interest that is being taken in the militia of Canada. Then, I am going to refer to something which, although it is a small matter, still has its significance. It was reserved to this government to obtain for the Fenian raid veterans medals which they had earned a third of a century ago. It was reserved for this government to obtain a long service medal for every officer and man who has served twenty years in the militia. It was reserved for this government to put an end to the life and good behaviour tenure of commanding officers, something utterly subversive of the best interests of the militia, because we found in regiment after regiment colonels who had retained their commands for periods ranging from twenty to thirty-five years, with the result that there was no promotion in the ranks junior to that of the commanding officer to be looked forward to and it was impossible to get men to go in and take an interest in such a force as that. If the government and if the active head of the Militia Department had been indifferent to the militia, do you imagine that these matters, some of them small in themselves, but which are somewhat important to the militia, would have received their close attention, the best evidence of which is that these changes have been made? Not at all. But, let me give a little further testimony. What about the cadet corps to-day? It was reserved for this government to develop this system of cadet corps. To-day, we have thousands of boys coming up in the schools all over the country getting their preliminary drill and their training in the art of rifle shooting in consequence of the energy and thoughtfulness of this government and entirely in the absence of any thing being done under the old government. We have organized an army medical corps. We have a splendid army medical staff and bearer corps. Whereas in the past hon. gentlemen opposite had their regimental surgeon with his little pill-box, we have this army medical corps with field hospitals and stretchers for the wounded men and officers of the militia force, all of which are necessary to an army in the field. If an army corps were called upon to-day to go upon active service it would take no time to organize the medical part of the army corps because we have the nucleus for doing it and inasmuch as that is a scientific branch of the service it is something that could not be improved or dealt with in a haphazard way. But, as a result of the organization of this service our fellows, if they were called upon to take the field, would have careful treatment for their wounds or in case of disease.

Mr. WARD. Under what General Officer Commanding were these improvements made ?

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. These improvements were made under the present government ; I do not care from what General Officer commanding the suggesting came. As I understand it, it is the government that has the power of the purse-strings and the power to say whether this or that shall or shall not be done, and the members of the government, as wise men will take the advice of experts. We do not necessarily expect those in the civil departments to be experts in certain lines themselves, but if they take expert testimony, and if having obtained good advice, they act upon it, then they deserve the credit if they give us a good up to date system. We have an intelligence department which we were before entirely without. This department is made up of picked men, selected from the militia in various parts of Canada to collect information which would be of the greatest practical use in case the force was called out upon active service. We have organized the engineers, another corps, that cannot be improvised. We may have had a few in the old days, very few, but today we have an engineer corps which is a most useful part of the militia force and in the city of Toronto that corps has been organized in connection with the school of practical science which increases its usefulness, because as young men finish their course in the school of science they scatter through Canada and each man becomes a valuable instructor in each particular locality. The government have organized rifle clubs and established rifle ranges. These are things upon which we all agree in this House. Everybody says that our young men in Canada ought to be taught how to shoot. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said within the last week that he heartily approved of this plan and that he would use his best endeavours to encourage the practice of rifle shooting in the part of the country from which he came. What government was it that first introduced rifle clubs and spent thousands of dollars upon rifle ranges upon which these riflemen could practice ? It was the Liberal government, the government which assumed the reins of power in 1896, the government which had been pronounced indifferent to the militia, the government which is training up our young men to be proficient in rifle shooting and providing magnificent material with which to fill the ranks of the active militia should it be found necessary to extend it to a war strength. The government have established a school of musketry. We have under able men who have gained their experience in the South African war, organized the school of musketry in spite of the fact that according to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) some persons have been compelled to do the boot-polishing of other people.

Then Sir, we have the Dominion arsenal (and this to my mind is a matter of very great importance) and it will surprise many of the people of Canada who do not keep posted in these matter to know, that whereas in the days of the Conservatives that factory could turn out about a million and a half cartridges a year, this government has increased its productive capability six fold and the output will be further enlarged I have no doubt. We have to-day a small arms factory in Canada. We had been told we have too few rifles in Canada, I have said so myself, but I am glad to say that this government with an energy which is most commendable has entered into a contract with Sir Charles Ross, the result of which is that he has established a small arms factory capable of turning out 1,000 rifles a month, and which working day and night, would be capable of turning out 24,000 rifles a year, which is more than half as many rifles as are in stock in Canada today. More than that, it is this government which has voted large sums of money to buy more rifles so that the unsatisfactory present condition of a shortage in rifles will cease, and yet this is the government which has been accused of indifference towards the militia of Canada. I pass on. We are now making in Canada steel gun carriages which we never made here before. That is Canada for the Canadians in the true sense of the term. We are spending our money within the limits of Canada ; we are giving employment to the people of Canada, and should an accident happen to any of the artillery paraphernalia we could remedy that accident ourselves without having to send the broken parts to England in time of war even, and await their return. I believe that if the progressive policy of the Minister of Militia is followed out as it will no doubt be, it is only a question of a short time till we will be manufacturing the cannon themselves in Canada as well as the steel carriages and the small arms.

We have heard a great deal about the troubles in the permanent force. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who is not in his place much to my regret, thought it a shocking thing that members of the permanent force should be asked to clean the boots of sundry officers at the Rockliffe ranges. Here, by way of parenthesis I must be allowed to express my great admiration for the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who to my mind is utterly wonderful in his versatility, for he certainly runs the gamut of man from the belted earl to the bootblack, and to-day it was the bootblacks turn. The fact of the matter is, that these men of the permanent force are glad to accept the position of officers, servants for the time being. Their work is

not heavy ; they are liberally tipped ; and I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) what about himself ? For years he was a colonel in the active militia and as such entitled to an officer's servant in camp. I wonder if he allowed a servant to blacken his august boots.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no ?

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I fancy he had a servant, and that servant was probably drawn from some farm in North Victoria, and yet the hon. gentleman rises in horrified indignation over the fact that any young farmer in Canada should have to clean the boots of any other man. I do not for a moment suppose that the one and only Turpin ever cleaned his boots, but they are not all Turpins after all and I fancy that in camp for years past, he, in common with all other mounted officers, has permitted his servant to black his boots, and has even tipped him for so doing, because after all the hon. gentleman is not lacking in generosity. It is true that the permanent force has been asked to furnish servants for the rifle ranges ; that is a bagatelle ; I explained it.

What has this government done for the permanent force. In my opinion the permanent force is an extremely important part of the active militia in Canada, because it is that force that furnishes instructors for the balance of us, and for that reason its officers and men should be among the very best obtainable in Canada. It was reserved for the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to introduce a pension Bill, the result of which will be that these officers and men when they reach the age limit will be reasonably taken care of by the people of Canada, and to my mind nothing has ever been done which will go so far to encourage the enlistment of the right class of men for officers and privates as the introduction of this pension Bill. And, Sir, this was done by that government which is indifferent to the militia of Canada. I might go on multiplying examples, but I must hurry along.

There was one other little matter that I noticed in the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) with feelings of mingled pity and amusement. He attacked poor Arnold Foster and fairly wiped him off the slate. It was the passing of the second Foster. It aroused feelings of pity almost, in my breast, and I have no doubt also in the breast of some hon. gentlemen opposite. That was bad enough, but when the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in connection with the now historic bootblacking incident, threw in the words that the bootblacking was done for a 'lot of snobs.' I think I am justified in offering a word of protest. I have had many years experience with the officers of the Canadian militia, and the expression 'a lot of snobs' is about as inapplicable to them as to any body of men I ever knew in my life. I understand that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) himself once took a commission in the active militia. He did not follow it up I regret to say, and he is not now a member of that honourable body, but I sincerely trust that he did not leave the force because he found his fellow officers to be a lot of snobs. I have known the men of the regiment which comes from his constituency intimately for years, and to tell the truth, Mr. Speaker, a more gentlemanly or more pleasant lot of fellows it would be hard to meet. I trust the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) will withdraw that very offensive expression, which I am sorry to say was accepted by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes).

There is still another matter with which I wish to deal for a moment. I refer to the attack of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) upon the Solicitor General, who is not now present in this House. I have the greatest respect for the Solicitor General and I believe he stands high in the estimation of the members of this House on both sides of the Speaker's chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Yes, and it does seem to me to be rather a cowardly thing to introduce into this debate the expression alleged to have been used by some other man ; that so great was the treason and treachery of the Solicitor General that if he had his deserts he should be behind prison bars. I can tell you, Sir, that in my opinion it will be many a long day indeed before the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux is ever found behind prison bars. I can tell you, Sir, that the loyalty of Mr. Lemieux will stand comparison with the more noisy loyalty of the hon. member for Victoria. I can tell you, Sir, that the Solicitor General comes from a race who have proved their loyalty by more than word of mouth : A race who proved their loyalty in 1776 beneath the walls of old Quebec, thirteen years after they had passed under the British flag; and who proved their loyalty once again in the campaign of 1812, when but for their magnificent courage and cleverness at the battle of Chateauguay the left flank of the British defence in Canada would have been turned, and to-day we would not be discussing questions of loyalty in a British parliament. It ill becomes any man in this House, or any man in Canada to attack the loyalty of the Solicitor General, or of the French Canadian race from which he springs.

And now, Sir, one word by way of personal explanation and I have done. I think I may say truthfully, that while not being a carping critic, I have been at least an honest critic of militia matters in this House. Last session I made a speech with regard to the then state of the rural militia, in which I used an expression which

it appears has become somewhat famous, although at the time I did not realize it would be so frequetly quoted. I said that owing to the lowness of the pay then prevailing the rural militia had faded away until it could only be described as the skeleton of a skeleton. I do not apologize for that expression; I believed what I said then, and I believe now that what I said was then true. But, Sir, we have a government which is just waiting for advice. We have a government which is not so high and mighty as to get up and say : No, we will have none of this advice ; because this man was so outspoken we will show him that what he says does not cut any ice (to use a vulgarism). On the contrary, we have a government which says: We will look into this ; this is a charge laid by one of our supporters who ought know something about it because he is one of the militia force himself. And, Sir, the government did look into it, and the result is that an increase of pay to the force for which I and others were asking was granted, and to-day I am glad to tell you, Sir, that the skeleton of a skeleton has disappeared, and once more we have in Canada as fine a rural militia as this country ever boasted, and that is saying a good deal.

I have come from the camp where we had under canvass this year more than 5,000 men. In my own regiment we had a force of 350, and I can assure you their physique was as far ahead of the physique of the fifty cents soldier as their numbers were ahead of the numbers of the regiment in the last camp. I have read reports from the other camps published in the 'Canadian Military Gazette,' which of late has been very harsh in its criticism of the administration of the day, giving glowing accounts of the personnel and the numbers of the regiments at London, Laprairie, Sussex, and every other point where camps have been held. And so what I have said has been justified by events. This up-to-date government, taking the advice of those who were in a position to know and acting upon it, has so reclothed this old skekleton with flesh and blood and skin and so rejuvenated it that I could scarcely recognize it if I saw it stalking through the streets. Now, I have finished. I thought that ten minutes would be enough for me to say what I wanted to say ; but when one begins to discuss the magnificent improvements made in the militia of Canada by this government, time is all too short in which to complete the task.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. We have had an admirable illustration to-day of the saying that a certain class of people will rush in where angels fear to tread ; because if there is a man in this House who might with absolute propriety have remained silent on this question, it is the hon member for Haldimand (Mr. T. S. Thompson). He did not touch upon a single subject, it seemed to me, on which he was not himself vulnerable ; and the criticism he directed towards others might with great propriety have been directed towards himself. He talked about the loud lip-loyalty of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in what he had said and done. The hon. member for North Victoria gave to the world an example of his sterling loyalty—not lip-loyalty, but fighting loyalty—to that extent that he was ready to go to any part of the world to support and maintain the British flag under which he lives. Was it so with the hon. member for Haldimand ? He was on hand at the dress parade at the Queen's Jubilee. He was before the eyes of the world in a large degree then. He was willing to take all that was going on a free pass, as a soldier on dress parade ; but when the South African war came, where was he ? Did he offer his services then ? Did he join the hon. member for North Victoria and go to maintain the British flag in South Africa ? No. Some said he was under the bed. That loyalty of his, which is so demonstrative to-day, was mere lip-loyalty at the jubilee ; but when there has been any fighting to be done. there has been a notable absence of it in his career. After that came the coronation, and there he was for another dress parade.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear—free lunch.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, a free lunch, and the hon member for Haldimand was on hand again—dress parade, lip-loyalty. free advertisement He was one of the magnificent men belonging to the militia of Canada. Well, that kind of loyalty the world will size up at its proper value. He is always a great loyalist for dress parade, but when any hard work or any fighting is to be done, he is not there. I will leave him to the people of Canada, and they will deal with him.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I am satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. member for Haldimand referred to the fact that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) once belonged to the militia, but had left it. Well, when they began to feed them on dog biscuits, it was about time to leave them ; but I will guarantee there was something behind that. The hon. gentleman went on to criticise adversely the staetment made by the hon. member for North Victoria regarding the present Solicitor General, Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, and his family, and regarding the statement that if certain persons had their deserts they might be behind prison bars. Does the hon. gentleman remember anything about the incident? Was the hon. member for North Victoria justified in referring to it ? He only desired to give the world an idea of the class of man who was acting

with that high-handed authority when in the mother country representing the Canadian government. Do you remember the act? His own father denied his name, and gave another name in order to put his son in parliament; and yet the son comes and justifies that act in this House. Is that creditable to the man? If the people in the British parliament knew it, I venture to say they would attach that importance to his statement which it deserves, and no more. The hon. member for Haldimand made the statement that the Conservative party were exploiting Lord Dundonald for political purposes, and that it was susceptible of proof. He made that staetment positively, but did he give any proof? He never attempted it; he simply gave his own bare, bald, unvarnished statement. If there was any proof of it, the hon. member either had it or ought to have had it, or he should not have made the statement. He did not attempt to substantiate it by any proof. Was the proof of that statement found in the complimentary dinner given to Lord Dundonald in the Rideau Club, when the Reform element of the club went around and asked their friends not to go there lest they might do him honour? Among all the Conservatives at that dinner, not one single reference to politics was made that could in any way be regarded as an attempt to make political capital.

Mr. A. T. Thompson. Very different from the meeting at Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE Any one reading the account of that dinner could not fail to come to the conclusion that the utmost propriety was exercised both by Lord Dundonald and those who were there to do him honour. We hear a great deal about what took place in Toronto. I do not wonder that there was some demonstration in Toronto, where the loyal sentiment is so strong.

Mr. TALBOT. You have a monopoly of it?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying we have. If I were looking for any degree of monopoly of loyalty, I would not apply for it over there. Considering that the military sentiment is so strong in Toronto, that the Scotch element is so strong, that everything that goes to make a military esprit de corps is so strong in the city of Toronto, and considering what was done to the man whom the people regarded as the very highest type of military man, I am not surprised that there were some demonstrations and some evidences of dissent at the shabby way Lord Dundonald was treated. I am not surprised at it by any means. The hon. member says that the loyalty of the Liberal party was challenged. I did not hear anybody directly challenge the loyalty of the Liberal party.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON I did not say directly; I said challenged. It was challenged indirectly.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be either directly or indirectly challenged. If it was not challenged at all, why was there any need to refer to it?

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. It was challenged.

Mr. SPROULE. Where and when? The hon. gentleman has not given us a single evidence of example. But why is the statement made? To furnish an excuse for drawing attention to the fact that, as he said, the Conservative party had rotten-egged the Governor General over the rebellion losses Bill, and this was done to show that there might be some disloyalty in the Conservative party. But that tu quoque argument is no argument at all. Two wrongs can never make one right. If the hon. gentleman had shown us that allegations had been made that the Liberal party, as a party, were not loyal and that he was endeavouring to combat that charge, I could have respected the argument; but when the argument was simply, you are another, it is one which the lowest class of individual in the country can use, and I will allow the hon. gentleman to reap the full benefit of it. Above all men in this House he should be the last to defend the government or the Minister of Militia, because only a year ago he treated us to a most scathing condemnation of the government with regard to their administration of the militia.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will do me the honour of reading that speech, he will see that my criticism had relation to but one portion of the militia, the rural infantry, and that within the present year I gave the government great credit for having established these subsidiary services, and not ten minutes ago I explained that the cause of my criticism had been removed and everything was right again.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are very often called upon to explain away their own words and take great pains to do it. But what was the gist of the hon. gentleman's whole argument? It was that the militia of Canada had been reduced to such an attenuated condition that it was only the shadow of a skeleton.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the management, development and equipment by this government, that was the condition of our militia, and that would be the fighting capacity of the rural battalions if they were called upon. What kind of a body would they have been to send to South Africa? I repeat that the hon. gentleman's speech was a scathing condemnation of the government. It show-

ed how utterly they had mismanaged the militia during the seven years they have been in office. Therefore the hon. gentleman is the last man who should rise and attempt to say anything in defence of the administration. He then went on to show what the government were doing. He said they were waiting for advice and were willing to take it and act upon it, and that the result might be seen in the capital turnout of the militia this year. He said that the government were responsible, because they controlled the purse strings, and unless they doled out the money our militia could not have reached its present state of efficiency. Well, if the General Officer Commanding furnished the brains, if he devised the plan, and the country supplied the money, what right had they to claim so much credit? The General Officer Commanding outlined the plans and furnished the brains, and the only credit to which the government is entitled is for having done what they were told, and if for the time being they controlled the purse strings and paid out the money of the people, I do not see that they are entitled to much credit on that account. I would not have thought it necessary to say anything on this question but for one statement made by the Minister of Finance, which I thought very much uncalled for. There is nothing in the facts to justify it. He said that he repudiated the attack of the opposition on the British government. But when did the opposition make any attack on the British government?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) speaking for the opposition, did.

Mr. SPROULE. In my judgment he did not, and I leave it to the House and the country to judge between us. All he did was to draw attention to the fact that the criticisms in the old country came largely from the Little Englander class, who are not the highest type of loyalists in England—the pro-Boer element; but so sensitive is the British government lest anything might be done which would alienate the colonies or create any hard feeling between them and the home government, that they availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to put a stop to anything of the kind. What is their position? Through misrepresentations they were led to believe that there might possibly be more of a political character in this controversy than any injustice to the General Officer Commanding. Their attention was drawn to it by Mr. Lemieux, the Solicitor General, who made statements that I consider were not warranted by the facts. What was his version? I have the paper before me containing it. In that paper I find that Chief Justice Sir Elzear Taschereau, said that the London 'Times' was loaded up from Ottawa Tory sources and that there were few Scotchmen at the back of the whole agitation. He said it was a trivial affair which the opposition were endeavouring to magnify and use for political purposes. Then Mr. Lemieux followed on the same lines, and told the government that if Lord Dundonald were not recalled within a week, their failure to do so would be regarded as an attack upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier rather than a defence of Lord Dundonald, and it would weaken the ties between the Canadian colony and the motherland. Is it any wonder then that the British government should have availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to put a stop to anything of the kind. All that my hon. friend from Victoria meant to say was the British government were sensitive in this matter, that they were so afraid something might be done, which would stir up feeling in the colonies, and were so afraid these might be true in the statements and misrepresentations made them that they availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to try and stop any possible complications.

Mr. TALBOT. But he used the word 'cowardly.'

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I do not think it was the best word that might have been used. But what was he referring to when he used the word 'cowardly'?

Mr. TALBOT. The government of Great Britain.

Mr. SPROULE. No, he spoke of the party which was dealing with the subject, and it was in this connection I understood him to use the word 'cowardly.' He meant it in the sense that they were afraid to stand up for their rights for fear of causing irritation and because of their anxiety to conciliate the Canadian people. It was on this account that they were afraid to come out as boldly perhaps as the circumstances would justify. That was the sense in which he used the word, as I understood it, and in no other sense did he use it. Now we are told that Lord Dundonald did something he should not have done. He should not have spoken. Well, we pride ourselves in declaring that every man in Canada should have British fair-play. But is it British fair-play to attack a man in this House and not allow him to defend himself? Is it British fair-play not to allow Lord Dundonald to make use of the only channel of which he could avail himself in his defence? He did not use it without having been solicited to do so.

Mr. TALBOT. He chose it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is making a statement he is not warranted in making.

Mr. TALBOT. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. That laugh reminds me of the scriptural quotation: 'For as the

crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of a fool. This also is vanity.' What justification is there for the hon. gentleman making that statement ? Lord Dundonald was invited by the hon. member for North Victoria to give him information with regard to the facts, and he did so. A member of parliament went to him and asked him for the facts. Was he doing an improper thing in giving that hon. gentleman the facts ? Did he invite the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to defend him ? There is not a word in the correspondence that justifies the belief that he did. And no person has made such an allegation, until the hon. member (Mr. Talbot) made it here to-day, and he has made it upon grounds that do not justify his statement. We pride ourselves upon our British fair-play. And yet here was an officer who was regarded as a man of the very highest type of honour, a man of great ability, a man of known sterling character and integrity, a man belonging to an ancient and honourable family, who is maligned and abused ; and yet, if he says a word in his own defence, he is spoken of as one not to be tolerated in decent society. Is that fair-play ? Is there a chivalrous Frenchman on the other side who would say that it is fair-play ? I know they would repel such a suggestion, for there is too much chivalry in their nature to favour anything but honour and justice. Yet here is this officer summarily dismissed like a dog from the service ; and when he avails himself of the right of every British subject to defend himself—not to attack the government, but to defend himself—he is denounced as interfering in politics. It was not any desire on his part to enter politics or to interfere between parties that led him to speak in his own behalf. He has himself most positively declared that he never did interfere in political matters. And, though his whole course is known to his opponents, there is not a single example given to show that he introduced politics in anything he said or did since coming to Canada. He scrupulously avoided saying or doing anything of that kind. There is no claim that he violated the proprieties of life by introducing partisanship in any form. Yet, though he is thus unfairly attacked, the attempt is made to deny him the right to reply. We are told that even a worm will turn if trod upon; shall we say that a British soldier shall not defend himself when attacked ? Some say that he was a British officer on half-pay and had no right to speak in opposition to the government. What does Arnold Foster say about that ? He says :

> Lord Dundonald could stand as a member of the Canadian parliament and could not be deprived of the right to take an active part in public life.

If he could stand and be elected to this parliament, as another did before him, if he could take part in all the discussions of public life, was he not free to defend himself ? Would any hon. gentleman opposite deny him that right—would he dare to do it ? These hon. gentlemen sit here sheltered by the privileges of parliament, and cannot be attacked in the courts or elsewhere. But Lord Dundonald is responsible to the courts for every word he utters. Above all, he is responsible to his own honour, and he has too high a sense of the proprieties of life to say anything wrong. I have read every one of his speeches, and it seems to me that he has shown himself one of the most discreet men who ever spoke on a public platform. He has carefully refrained from attacking the government. When invitations have been offered him to speak under circumstances in which his speech might be susceptible of that construction, he has not accepted them. To deny him the right of self-defence is to do him a great injustice, and not only him, but many warm admirers of his among his own countrymen. I see that Sir Elzear Taschereau says that there are a few Scotchmen behind Lord Dundonald, thereby implying that the whole thing is insignificant, and that only a few Scotchmen pay attention to what Lord Dundonald says. I want to tell him that the Scotch element in this country is a force which, when the day comes, will make itself known with no uncertain sound, and will declare its opinion of the treatment meted out to this member of their nationality. I very much mistake their temper and sense of fair-play if they do not resent the insult cast upon one of their race, a man of the very highest honour, an officer of conspicuous gallantry, and the descendant of a noble line. At any rate, I am quite content to leave it with them. But I could go further and say that you will find the same spirit to-day, not only amongst the Scotch, but amongst the Irish, amongst the English, amongst the Germans and amongst the chivalrous French. I am much mistaken in my judgment of human nature if many French Canadians do not resent the treatment of Lord Dundonald. They admire chivalry, they admire courage, they admire honour ; and I would not do them the injustice of saying that they admire these less in a man of another race than in one of themselves. It was said to-day—at least it was insinuated—that Lord Dundonald was making a race and revenge cry out of this affair, and that he was doing injustice to the French. He denied that and repudiated it. And has a single example been given to this House, even one of the smallest kind, that would go to show that Lord Dundonald had been guilty of even anything that bore the semblance of doing injustice to the French race or to any of its members ? Why, the very reverse is the case. He said that in every respect he admired them, that he loved them and was ready to give them an equal place with men of every other nationality in the country. He had nothing to say of them, except what was in their favour. But people desirous of making

political capital for themselves are willing to do injustice to Lord Dundonald by endeavouring to create the impression that he was desirous of doing what was wrong to the French Canadians. That was unworthy of any man outside of this House, and much more unworthy of any one who has the honour of a seat here. If such a statement is made here, it should be made upon proof, instead of being put in the form of an insinuation against a man who is not here to defend himself, and to whom, if they could, these hon. gentlemen would deny even the right to speak on his own behalf on the public platform.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP. I rise, Mr. Speaker, not to attack Lord Dundonald, nor to defend him, but merely to draw attention to two striking omissions in the observations of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). When the motion was made this morning that you leave the chair, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) called attention to two utterances of a member of this government who is now in the old country, one touching the Dundonald incident and the other on the subject of preferential trade. Regarding the Dundonald incident, the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) very properly took the ground that it was not fair to attack a public man on the ground of reported utterances of his unless it was shown that those utterances had been revised by himself. If so I can quite see that it would be improper to condemn the Solicitor General until his words had been proved to be those with which he was charged. But, Sir, even while the right hon. gentleman so spoke, it seems to me that a glorious opportunity was afforded him. Without in any way repudiating his Solicitor General he could have said, disbelieving that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) spoke as he was charged, that had his Solicitor General so spoken, had he said that unless Lord Dundonald was recalled within a week it would be an attack upon the Laurier government, he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) might have repudiated any such statement as that. The right hon. gentleman in addressing that House on that utterance of the Solicitor General, in no way repudiated the sentiment alleged to have been uttered by that gentleman, and when he went on to attack Lord Dundonald for his conduct, the one conclusion that could be come to by the House and the country was that when the right hon. gentleman abstained from expressing any difference in opinion from the alleged utterance of the Solicitor General that he agreed with the Solicitor General in the utterance he had made. It seemed to me that all throughout this discussion not only to-day but on other occasions the main point at issue has not always been reached by hon. gentlemen on either side. It always seems to me that there is a great desire on the part of the government and its supporters to concentrate attention on the fact that Lord Dundonald was guilty of an indiscreet utterance and was punished therefor. If Lord Dundonald was guilty of an indiscreet utterance and was punished therefor that question is closed and we have nothing more to do with it. But I venture to say that the members of this House and the people of this country are deeply interested in the charges made by Lord Dundonald and the point which this country would like to see cleared up is whether the charges of Lord Dundonald are true or false. If they are true, a lamentable state of affairs exists in our militia system. If they are false, the sooner, for their own sake, the government prove them false the better. To show how hard it is for ordinary laymen like myself to discover the truth in regard to the militia system let me remind the House of the utterances of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. A. T. Thompson) this afternoon. That gentleman is always eloquent, and always speaks well and I will do him the justice of saying that I never knew him more eloquent and apparently sincere than he was this afternoon. When I heard his glowing eulogium on the militia system and the credit which he gave to the government, and especially to the Militia Department, on the industry, ability and skill which had been brought to bear on the militia forces in the last eight years, when in tones of proud triumph he called attention to the fact that in the last three years—that is not including this year—we had actually spent $10,000,000 for the improvement of the militia system, I was reminded of an incident which occurred in this House only a short year ago. In my effort to discover the real situation as to the Militia Department I referred back to the 'Hansard' and now let me give the House the opinion of an expert, a colonel commanding a regiment, speaking in this House with a full sense of responsibility. This is what the House was then told :

> Well, Sir, in all seriousness, after due consideration and recognizing the importance of the assertion, I say here to-day in my place in parliament that the militia, so far as the rural part thereof is concerned is in an infinitely worse plight to-day than it was two years ago, and that in my opinion another year under present conditions will utterly demoralize it.

That, Sir, is the opinion of an expert, the colonel of a battalion only one short year ago. Let me go further. I find in the same speech, this sentence :

> I have shown that we were called upon to furnish the skeleton of a skeleton, I now state that we have actually turned out the shadow of a skeleton of a skeleton. Can anything so ghost-like be longer called a militia force. True the officers and non-commissioned officers, the most important part, showed up in very fair numbers, but this will not continue. Men must have a pride in their unit

or they will cease to act. I know the case of one company which this year had two officers and six non-commissioned officers to command two men, one of whom was the cook.

Perhaps the Minister of Militia can inform us how many of these officers now belong to the corps in which seven lieutenant-colonels are required to command 100 men. This apparently is above that average, two officers and six non-commissioned officers to command two men, one of whom was the cook. And that was the Canadian militia system under the admirable administration of hon. gentlemen opposite at the end of three years, during which we spent $10,000,000 to secure their efficiency. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. A. T. Thompson) this afternoon said that the only fault he had to find with the government last year was the meagreness of the pay. This gentleman last year, addressing the House, said :

A great deal of unnecessary trouble was caused this year by withholding notice for camp until within from three weeks to ten days of the time ordered. Knowing that some regiments were not to be called out, a feeling of uncertainty pervaded the whole, and I can assure you that recruiting is too unpleasant a job to be undertaken on chances. When the summons did come, it was found that some of the best regiments had been overlooked.

That, Sir, is an opinion of the administration of the militia by the Militia Department given by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. A. T. Thompson) in this House last year. I do not wish to contradict anything he said to-day. Far be it from me to impute any improper motives to him, but surely we are entitled to some explanation from the hon. gentleman which will account for the marvellous discrepancy between the statement made a year ago and the statement given to this House to-day. That hon. gentleman gloried in the fact that in the last three years we had spent $10,000,000 on militia affairs, and were spending this present year $3,000,000. Does he not see that that proves the loyalty and generosity of this House, and it proves the confidence the representatives of the people had that the people would support any reasonable expenditure to maintain the efficiency of our militia. But, Sir, what sort of a commentary is it that $10,000,000 have been spent on the militia and at the end of three years that is all we have to show ? Surely it is not in the interests of this country that we should have an hon. minister at the head of the department quarrelling with and dismissing a gentleman who is admitted to be the most competent man we ever had in such a position in Canada, a gentleman who, during the last year by the assurance of the hon. member for Haldimand this afternoon, has raised the militia to a degree of efficiency that could not have been conceived possible a year ago. What are we to think of the business ability of the head of a department who will lose the services of such a man for such a paltry incident, take it at the very worst, as that he spoke inadvisedly at an inopportune time ? Surely the interest of the people of this country should be considered. It is all very well for the ministers to be touchy about their own dignity and importance, but in view of the statement made by the hon. member for Haldimand a year ago and to-day, the people of this country have some right to ask where we are when this business administration deprives us of the services of the best man we ever had, shutting the door for ever to the coming to Canada of such another man, for having made the statement that a minister had interfered outside his own department, in the Militia Department, a statement which that minister himself has admitted during this session was true to the very letter. So we have this conceded that Lord Dundonald has spoken the truth from beginning to end and Lord Dundonald is punished, the Canadian militia must lose his services, simply because he told the truth. There is of course an old saying that the greater the truth, sometimes the greater the libel.

I wish to protest against the attention of this House being called exclusively to the question whether or not Lord Dundonald was right or whether or not Lord Dundonald should have been dismissed when the real question that now interests us, the incident of the dismissal having been closed, is what we are getting for the $10,000,000 we have spent and the $3,000,000 we are spending this year.

There is one other question raised by the quotation from the speech of the Solicitor General read by the leader of the opposition, and I was surprised at the Finance Minister not referring to it. The Solicitor General, speaking in the old country, must of necessity speak with a certain authority. I do not propose this afternoon to blame him for what he said. If I were to blame him for what he said, I would be blaming myself, inasmuch as a short time ago, I said that I thought it was only reasonable that a man should not be judged by newspaper reports. Therefore, I do not intend to blame the hon. Solicitor General so much for what he did say, but I desire to call the attention of the House to the opportunity that presented itself to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he rose to speak, it being particularly within his functions, in regard to the alleged statement of the hon. Solicitor General that Canada did not want a preference for what we had given to the old country by way of the preferential tariff because we had given it freely and ungrudgingly without desiring anything in return. This is perhaps the most important question that is now before any portion of

the British empire to-day. We must remember that we have a fiscal warfare going on in the old country at the present time. Great Britain is distracted as it has not been since the days of the Reform Bill or possibly the Repeal of the Corn Laws over this great question of preferential trade. We know that it has been said in the old country by some that representatives of the present government, when attending the conference there a few years ago, expressed their approval of the principle of preferential trade. We know that in the election of 1896, when the right hon. Prime Minister went to London, Ont., he delivered a speech on the subject of preferential trade, when, to do the right hon. gentleman justice, I think he made the ablest and most eloquent presentation of the advantages of preferential trade to Canada that I have ever seen or heard, a presentation that must have convinced every one present, of the benefit and advantages that would accrue to Canada. He went on in his powerful appeal to point out from his standpoint that he and his party were the only ones who could secure this great boon for Canada, that the Conservative party could not secure this boon saying: Place me and my party in power and our first duty will be to secure preferential trade. No more powerful argument could be addressed to the people than that which was used by the right hon. Prime Minister. So, there are some people in the old country, who, knowing what took place in the Intercolonial Conference, and knowing of such utterances as that by the right hon. Prime Minister, believe that this government is in favour of preferential trade. There are others in the old country who, being deceived by the position which the right hon. gentleman took at the Cobden club, are convinced that this government is opposed to preferential trade. What a glorious opportunity was given this morning to the hon. Minister of Finance or to the right hon. Prime Minister, without agreeing with or disagreeing from the utterances of the Solicitor General to say: If he did use that language we repudiate it because we are in favour of preferential trade. If the government desire preferential trade the government could have done more in one minute this morning by such an utterance as that from the hon. Minister of Finance than the opposition could do by six months of touring through the country and speaking from every platform from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I appeal to the government and I ask them to take advantage of this chance. One of the reasons why I rose this afternoon was to call the right hon. Prime Minister's attention to the fact that the government are already committed to the principle of preferential trade and here to-day, without a vote of the House, with one single utterance, he to-day, could have given an impetus to the cause of preferential trade, if it would be the boon to Canada which the right hon. Prime Minister proved it would be, and in that I heartily agree with him, If he had done so he would have done more for Canada than he has done in many a day gone by. But, I can see that the hon. Minister of Finance was embarrassed because the hon. Solicitor General, speaking with a certain amount of authority, is reported to have said that we were not in favour of a preference because we have given a preference to the mother country without expecting anything in return. The right hon. Prime Minister, I remember, when speaking two years ago, flatly contradicted that utterance. We have his statement on 'Hansard' that we did not give this preference as a matter of gratitude expecting no return, but that there were sound business reasons for giving this preference, that it was a benefit to ourselves, that it would get us goods cheaper—good sound free trade doctrine—and that it was hoped that as a result of giving them this preference they would give us something in return. There seems to-day to be a large portion of people in the mother country who are ready to give us something in return and I would appeal to the hon. minister to take advantage of such an opportunity and state frankly that the preference was given in the hope that we would be given something in return. And that we are prepared to deal with the mother country along this line. I would endorse the hon. minister in going further, having said that much, and saying that if the mother country declines to deal with us in the matter of a preference we will have to recall what we have done, having done it in good faith and having failed. I sincerely hope that the charge that has been made by the government against the opposition and the like charge which has been made in the old country will turn out to be without ground; that is that the opposition are trying to exploit Lord Dundonald for their own purposes. I have no hesitation in saying that if the opposition were to take hold of the Dundonald incident and endeavour to use Lord Dundonald's sympathy for party purposes they would be unworthy of their positions in this House, but, I can quite understand altogether apart from party ideas, that, be they Reformers or Conservatives, Scotch, Irish or English, the citizens of Canada who have an admiration for Lord Dundonald regret the particular mode in which he is leaving the country. I can quite understand that they feel it due to this gentleman who came to Canada, who has done so much for the militia as the hon. gentleman for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has proved this afternoon, and who has to leave this country under circumstances which are very much to be deplored, should desire to show to him and show to the world, that, whether he was right or wrong in that particular, small controversial question, Canada believes he was true to Canada and true to the empire.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I might not be excused for taking part in this debate if it were strictly a military or militia matter, not being a military or militia man, but as it appears to be largely a political matter I presume I have the privilege of addressing the House. The question, as far as I understand, which has been particularly argued to-day is as to whether Lord Dundonald has or has not been exploited as a political issue by the opposition party. Apparently that question has aroused the interest of a more important body than ourselves, apparently the decision there has been that he has been made a political issue by the party of the opposition, and apparently that decision has not found favour on the other side of the House. To-day we have had the tune carried from treason by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to blasphemy by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) in expressing their views in regard to this matter. For my own part I think we might consider it in a little different light from that in which it has been considered so far in the debate. As to whether hon. gentlemen opposite are exploiting Lord Dundonald as a political issue or not—I think they have afforded the proof to-day. They have denied and reiterated the denial with a persistence that I think would entitle them to the appellation given by Lord Beaconsfield to his opposition at one time; that is to say, an organized hypocrisy, for if any body of men have without regard to rhyme or reason taken Lord Dundonald as a political issue it is our friends of the opposition and their party press. I will not depend upon mere assertion to prove this. I suppose every one will admit that the Montreal 'Gazette' is an exponent of the Conservative party, and its leading exponent if the test of respectability is to be applied. In the Montreal 'Gazette' of July 16, I find the following paragraph in the editorial notes:

> Goldwin Smith thinks a great wrong is being done Lord Dundonald by making his difficulties with the government a party question. There is no necessity for worrying. It will not be a party question after the Laurier government has been buried under in the next election.

If that is not a plain and explicit statement by the leading and most respectable organ of the Conservative party, that with Lord Dundonald they expect to win the coming elections, I admit that I do not understand the English language. I will not burden 'Hansard' with other quotations of similar character, but every gentleman of this House can read such expressions in the Conservative newspapers from day to day and from week to week. I cannot imagine what is the purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite in making the preposterous assertion in this House that they have not carried Lord Dundonald into their politics, for surely they cannot expect that the country, much less their own constituents, will believe it.

But, Sir, there is something more than this exploiting of Lord Dundonald by the Conservative party. I have noticed that their campaign has lagged considerably of late, until to-day the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), revived the silly slander against the Prime Minister in connection with his use of the word 'foreigner' as applied to Lord Dundonald. I may be pardonald for putting this case in a way in which I have not yet heard it put. It is within the knowledge of every member of this House, and within the knowledge of every man in the Dominion who read the remarks of the Prime Minister, that instead of making the most remote allusion to Lord Dundonald as a foreigner or a stranger to the Dominion of Canada, the expression was simply applied to Lord Dundonald as a stranger in the eastern townships, a fact which no one will deny, and least of all Lord Dundonald himself. That being the case, the expression cannot be construed as being in any way offensive to Lord Dundonald or as properly or improperly describing his connection with Canada. When these gentlemen opposite carry on this campaign in such a way, and then come to the House and declare that there is no politics in it, it is an evidence of hypocrisy that has seldom been equalled in this little world of ours.

The conduct of the Conservative party in this campaign, reminds me that when some nations which are neither honourable nor courageous are engaged in warfare, they, upon occasion, place their women, their children or their hostages between themselves and the enemy, and then should these be injured by the bullets of the enemy, they raise the cry that non-combatants are being slaughtered. If Lord Dundonald is not a party to this political campaign, the Conservatives in this country are putting Lord Dundonald in front of their battle ranks and holding him there to receive the attacks that may be made on them. Then they complain that Lord Dundonald is attacked.

Well, Sir, we will not attack Lord Dundonald; we will get around behind Lord Dundonald and just for one moment discuss the position of these gentlemen who are using him in this dishonourable way. The charge made by Lord Dundonald against this government; the charge that has a purpose and that means something to the people of Canada, is, that the government has neglected the militia corps. That charge is the gravest one that could be made against any Canadian government, because it means disloyalty to Canada and disloyalty to the empire if it be true. I say, Sir, that this government does not suffer by a comparison of their loyalty either to Canada or to the empire, with the loyalty of the govern-

ments which have preceded them and which are honoured by the support of the Conservative party. Who speaks of loyalty to the empire ? The empire has been engaged in many wars during the last half century, but it was a Liberal government that first sent Canadian soldiers to take part in the wars of the empire. It was a Liberal government who did this, and Sir, it was the very government whose loyalty forsooth is called in question by members of the opposition, and by insinuations made against it by Lord Dundonald. When has occasion arisen for the manifestation of loyalty to the empire, that the Liberal government of Canada has not responded ? In case of war the instance is recent, in matters of trade the instance is almost as recent. It was a chieftain of the Conservative party who once said : If our tariff is bad for British connection, so much the worse for British connection. And, yet, the followers of that chieftain are the men who to-day charge disloyalty against this government which has given the British manufacturer a preference in Canada and asked for no return. But more than that, because it did not ask for a return in kind from the motherland, this government is accused by the Conservative party of disloyalty to Canada and to Canadian interests, and in every manufacturing city in the Dominion the campaign is daily waged against it on that ground. We do not fear a comparison of our loyalty with the loyalty of the Conservative party. Whether in French Canada or in English Canada, the Liberal party has been true and loyal to the British empire.

And now a few words in regard to Lord Dundonald himself. Lord Dundonald is spoken of as a soldier and a gentleman ; a great soldier and a noble gentleman. We do not find fault with either his military title or his civil standing. He is welcome to it all, and our friends on the other side are welcome to all the advantage the qualities of Lord Dundonald bring them, when they use him for their party purposes. But, I would like to call the attention of the House and of the country to this fact : That Lord Dundonald cannot be protected in the mantle of his noble lineage and his high military position, and at the same time act as a party hack and agent of the Conservative party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear ; it is your shame.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. OLIVER. Hon. members ought to be ashamed ; I am sorry they are not. The attempt is being made to hoodwink the people of this country in regard to this question and to claim immunity for Lord Dundonald for his action as a Tory party-heeler on the ground of his lineage——

Mr. OLIVER.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. OLIVER. All right—and on the ground of his military position. It has been questioned to-day whether Lord Dundonald had a right to speak out as he has done on political platforms here and there throughout this country. No man properly questions his right. He had a perfect right to do so—to go on the platform in Toronto and speak his mind, and make such charges as he pleased against the government of this country—to charge disloyalty if he liked ; but he cannot expect to be protected in doing so by the sanctity of his position ; and that is what hon. members seem to hope that he is able to do. They hope to get the advantage of a nobleman and a general of the British army fighting in their ranks, while he, so to speak, shall be encased in 'that divinity which doth hedge about a king,' and which shall prevent legitimate criticism by his and their opponents.

Let us judge the action of Lord Dundonald by the standards that would be applied to a common, every-day colonial civilian—the Minister of Agriculture if you like—and see just how he stands, and whether he is or is not a partisan of hon. gentlemen opposite. I was struck by a very strong expression which his lordship used in his speech in Toronto. He said he had turned the search-light on the inner workings of the Militia Department. I think a little turning of the search-light on the action of his lordship on that particular occasion would not be amiss. Under what circumstances did he turn on the search-light, and what was the occasion ? The occasion was a private or semi-private banquet given in his honour by militia officers of the city and district of Montreal. The banquet, I say, was private or semi-private, I am not prepared to say which ; but it was certainly not public, inasmuch as only one newspaper was represented at it—so the newspaper itself has stated. Lord Dundonald has told us in his manifesto and on the platform that he had great grievances against this government of Canada, that the empire had great grievances against it, that the loyal people of this country had great grievances against it, because of its neglect of Canada's imperial defences ; that we were living in a fool's paradise at the mercy of our neighbours because of the neglect of this government. Could language be stronger ? Could charges be more severe ? Lord Dundonald did not deal with those charges at that Montreal banquet—a proper matter to be dealt with, if ever there was one, at a strictly military banquet. That surely would have been a subject worthy of turning the search-light on ; but it was not upon that subject that he turned the search-light. His search-light was turned upon the inner workings of the department.

It was turned upon the appointment of one Dr. Pickel to a position in the militia force; and when the question came to be thrashed out in parliament—and it has never yet been denied—the position of the Minister of Agriculture was found to be the correct position, and the position of Lord Dundonald the wrong position, looked at from a strictly military point of view. The Minister of Agriculture had asked that a competent man be placed in a position requiring competence. Lord Dundonald was offended because a man who was not competent was not placed in that position. The charge was not even made against the Militia Department of which he was an official and with which he was connected; it was made against the government of the day through the Minister of Agriculture. The charge was political interference under the administration of the government of the day. It was not a military matter; it was not a militia matter; it was not turning the search-light on the defenceless condition of Canada. What was it? If the Minister of Agriculture or some other plain colonial had attended a banquet as a guest under such circumstances, and had made that statement to the gentlemen present, what would he have been doing? He would have been attempting to arouse political dissatisfaction and animosity in the minds of the officers of the militia there present against the government of the day. Lord Dundonald was not turning any search-light on, because it was a private or semi-private banquet, and not a public demonstration. It was so private that his remarks were not published when the proceedings of the banquet were published. They were suppressed—'suppressed' is the word used—at the request of Lord Dundonald's friends. Did he turn on the search-light? It was only when some injudicious partisan of the opposition, having heard accidentally of the remarks of Lord Dundonald, thought they were too good to let drop. He wanted to use such good political ammunition in public. He was not willing to let it go as it was intended to go and stay where it was intended to stay, where it would poison the minds of the officers of the militia against the administration, but would not bring discredit upon the General Officer Commanding. But when this injudicious newspaper friend gave the matter to the light of day, and when his lordship was called in question about it by the militia authorities, when he was brought to the mark and had to either say that he had said it or take it back, then he turned the searchlight on. I take the liberty of saying that the action of Lord Dundonald at that banquet in Montreal, what he said and the way he said it, is fair evidence that what he did there he had been doing on previous occasions, and had he not been brought to book at that time, he would have been doing it yet. And what would he have been doing? Acting as the political agent of the party of the opposition, abusing his position as an officer of the imperial government and as an officer of the government of Canada, for the purpose of advancing the party interests of hon. gentlemen opposite. What else? Had a private individual done this, no one would have had a word to say in his defence. How much more guilty then was Lord Dundonald, who lent the prestige of his name and reputation to everything he said? Let us have fair play in this matter. Let us deal with these things on a fair footing and call them by their right names. If we are to have fair play, let us have it; and if we are to have treachery, let us have treachery and deal with it as such.

This incident does not stand alone. Some weeks have passed since that time, during which Lord Dundonald has been the recipient of numbers of demonstrations in his honour. It was the privilege of Canadian citizens to give such demonstrations in his honour as they wished, and the privilege of Lord Dundonald to accept them if he saw fit to do so. He saw fit to accept them as being strictly non-political. They were given to and accepted by him as non-political. There was a demonstration in Renfrew and another in Ottawa in his honour, and it was perfectly understood of both of these that they were strictly non-political. A demonstration was offered him by the people of Toronto, which, it was also understood, would be strictly non-political as were the others. I presume that that demonstration was accepted by His Lordship on the same understanding as were the others. There were many people gathered in Toronto at that meeting for the purpose of doing honour to His Lordship and the position he held in the army and the English nobility. No doubt many were present who felt aggrieved at his dismissal and others who acquiesced in that dismissal, as I believe every member of the opposition does, because although that question has been raised two or three times in the House, not one member of the opposition has ever dared to challenge a vote of the House on the course taken by the government or so place on record his views with regard to it. People went to that non-political demonstration, knowing it be such on the authority of the chairman of the committee. But what happened? Lord Dundonald made there a violent attack on the government of this country. He abused as he had done before, the position in which he found himself. This we have on the authority of Mr. Ellis, the chairman of the committee. He took advantage of the demonstration, in which he must have known there were Liberals taking part, to make a violent attack on the government

and its policy. He had a perfect right to do so as a citizen, but he cannot be upheld in doing so as a man of strict honour. I think it is well that we should have a straight understanding with regard to this question, and just in order that there may be no mistake in regard to what I say, let me quote the words of Mr. Ellis, as published in an interview which appeared in the Toronto 'World.' Mr. Ellis, I may say, is a leading Conservative of the city of Toronto. In that interview he said :

> I was surprised at the whole tenor of his remarks. I do not think the committee expected it ; I certainly did not.

There was therefore a distinct breach of faith with the committee which organized this demonstration—at least as far as the chairman was concerned and a large number of those who attended. It appears that his attitude and the remarks he made were so far aside from what was expected, so far regardless of propriety, that they brought about this discussion in the British House of Commons, and the statement by the Secretary of War that he has been requested to return to England to speak in his own defence. I was somewhat amused at the construction placed upon this statement by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). He said he would venture the prophecy that Lord Dundonald was being recalled in order to give him some higher position. Well, although I am not familiar with the workings of the British government, I know that it is customary in the management of public affairs in that country for the government, when they find it necessary to discipline some of its high officials, to let them down easy by apponting them to some other office. We have heard of appointments to the Chiltern Hundreds, and there are other appointments of a like character. It is quite possible that Lord Dundonald may receive some such appointment from the British government, and no one here will object to anything which the British government may do with or for him. But I would like to call attention to this fact, and I think it is perfectly right that I should do so, because we have heard a great deal about the transcendent military ability of Lord Dundonald. If he is a great military genius, if he has a great military record, then certainly, let the cause be what it may, the loss of his services to Canada will be considerable. But if it should happen peradventure that his record is not so transcendent, that his abilities are not so marvellous, then the loss to Canada will be considerably minimized. And in looking over the papers, I find that at the time when the British army needed the best officers it could get, at a time of stress and trouble, the British government apparently did not think sufficiently of those transcendent abilities or this marvellous record to appoint Lord Dundonald to a command in South Africa. He went there just as our friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) did, as a soldier of fortune, and secured an appointment in the field after he got there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I object to the use of the words 'soldier of fortune'——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES——coming from a gentleman of such calibre as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

Mr. OLIVER. I will withdraw the expression and say instead a soldier of misfortune.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A victim of the intrigue and cowardice of the Liberal government.

Mr. OLIVER. As the hon. member has charged the British Conservative governments of the present and past with cowardice, we can accept with equanimity his criticism of this government. I wanted to say that this was no discredit to Lord Dundonald, and I do not wish to be understood as impugning any discredit to him. He may have been a most successful soldier in South Africa. He may have been even as successful as our hon. friend for North Victoria.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER. Although we must admit that he did not say as much about it. I merely want to point out that this record of his, and these military qualifications of his, the loss of which are so much bemoaned on the part of this unfortunate country, do not seem to have struck the British government at the time when they needed the best talent, and the most of it, that they could get. Therefore, I am bound to suppose, in view of all the circumstances, that, when His Lordship comes to take his place in the fighting ranks of the members of the opposition as a soldier of fortune once more, neither will they gain so much, nor will Canada lose so much by being deprived of his military services. We do not grudge hon. gentlemen opposite their new recruit. We wish him luck of the company he has, and we wish them luck of the qualifications he has brought to them. The campaign which they instituted on his behalf throughout this country is of a character according thoroughly with the campaign which his lordship himself initiated while he was still in the service of the country.

Mr. E. B. OSLER. The last speaker (Mr. Oliver) has echoed, perhaps in stronger language than we have heard from other members, but probably all the more truly, the sentiments of the members of the government towards Lord Dundonald ; in fact, has expressed them with a frankness which they have not yet ventured. They

have made the charge that Lord Dundonald is being exploited by the Conservatives for political purposes. I make the charge that Lord Dundonald was exploited, was intended to be exploited and is being exploited by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, for political purposes entirely. I attended the meeting in Toronto held in honour of Lord Dundonald. It was a spontaneous tribute to that gentleman, such a meeting as I never thought to see, such as I never thought could be held in any city or any community. It was not a political gathering; it was an expression of feeling by the people themselves. No political party could ever expect to hold such a meeting. I want to answer one charge made by the last speaker—and it is the only one I shall deal with—that Lord Dundonald committed a breach of faith in making the statement he did. I lunched with Lord Dundonald on the day of the meeting. I only arrived in town that day, but found the invitation to lunch awaiting me. I sat next to the chairman, Mr. Ellis. I asked him what the proceedings at the meeting were to be. He told me who the speakers were. I asked him what Lord Dundonald had to say, and he told me that the committee had discussed that, and that they had decided that they would make absolutely no allusion to politics, but that Lord Dundonald was free to say what he liked; they had never spoken to him, or suggested that his utterance should be restrained. I think that that answers the charge. That meeting, being such as I have described was, it seems to me, compensation to Lord Dundonald for all the discredit the present government hoped would be cast upon him. It was a meeting to compensate any man for misfortunes of that kind. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that five thousand people went to that hall expecting to hear Lord Dundonald speak about the weather, or to ask them how they did? They expected to hear Lord Dundonald defend himself—not so much against the charges made in this House, because he had a reply to the charges made here, though the minister tried to suppress it—but to those base slanders issued against him by the various newspaper organs of this government. He was perfectly entitled to reply to these charges, to reply to them in the strongest manner possible; and I will venture to say that of the 5,000 people who were in that hall 4,900 went away perfectly satisfied with what Lord Dundonald had said on that occasion. If this is made a party matter, if it is made more a party matter than is necessary, the fault is entirely with the government and the manner in which they have dealt with this question. What is a party matter, and one that the opposition are quite right in taking up, is the report that Lord Dundonald had read in this House as to the condition of the militia. And one point every speaker on the other side has tried to avoid—has tried to lead the discussion off to side issues by attempting to make this a personal issue between the government and Lord Dundonald—and that point, the main point which the people want to know, and do know by the utterances of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is that the government are interfering for political reasons with the militia of this country. Take that fact away, and the whole matter would fall as flat as any agitation ever did. That is the one point in which the people are primarily interested. On that point they believe Lord Dundonald absolutely, and he tells them that the militia is being made a political engine. We had the denial of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) on that point when the matter was first brought up; we had his unqualified acceptance of it and his admission that this was the truth, before he sat down. We had the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) also accepting it, though it was strongly denied at first. And when hon. members opposite got used to it, one after another verified the statement that the militia was as much a party question as the letting of contracts or the appointments to be made from one end of this country to the other. That is the point that interested the people—not the personality of Lord Dundonald—not the fact of his dismissal—but the fact that he has turned the searchlight on the scheme of this government to make a political engine of the militia of this country. Now, the dismissal of Lord Dundonald, as one hon. gentleman said, would have passed off with very little comment had it not been that the manner of that dismissal roused the feelings of the people. I venture to say that there is not a business man in this House on either side who would have dismissed the lowest clerk in his employ, even for the gravest offense, unless it were an offence against honesty, as Lord Dundonald was dismissed by this government. To an outsider it would look as if they deliberately considered how they could heap the greatest insult upon him. And, to my mind, that is the gravest charge next to the charge that has been proved and accepted—that the ministers are debasing the militia of this country into a mere political machine, which, as I say, is the point that is most regarded and most keenly resented by the people. Now, quotations have been made from the London despatches. Those against the government, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), tells us, must not be accepted because they may not be true. But those in favour of the government hon. gentlemen opposite accept without hesitation. Yet the very despatches that they object to are those that are sent over by the Canadian Associated Press which are paid for by this government to the amount of $15,000 a year. Now, let me read the closing words of one of the speeches, that of Mr. Lloyd George, Liberal. He says:

It was grossly unfair and mischievous that Lord Dundonald should be allowed to stir up strife—a feud between the two races in Canada.

Now, Sir, Lord Dundonald in his speech in Toronto made a very pleasing and earnest reference to the French Canadians of Canada. He stated that in all his military career and since he came here he had made no distinctions between religions and nationalities and he also stated that he had the greatest admiration for the French Canadian citizens. He spoke with enthusiasm, and no part of his speech was received with greater enthusiasm by that vast audience than the sentiment expressed from his heart on that one point. No man could have spoken more earnestly, no remarks could have been more appreciated. Now let me read an extract from a telegram to the Toronto 'Globe,' of December 20, 1901. It is as follows :

London, Dec. 12.

The meeting at Birmingham has sent the following telegram to Mr. Chamberlain :—

Lloyd George, the traitor, was not allowed to say a word. The citizens have passed resolutions, expressing confidence in the government, and their admiration of your unique and fearless services for King and country.

That is the class of men who are making mischief in this country. Can you imagine a man who is doing more mischief than such a one as this, who makes false statements, who puts false views into the mouth of any man in this country, publishes them in England, whence the Canadian Associated Press, paid for by this government, cables them out here That is the kind of literature that makes trouble, if trouble there is, between the nationalities. I listened with pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and I think that if we all paid attention and took to heart the words which he spoke we would be the better for it. I can assure any one of my French Canadian fellow citizens, on that side of the House or on this side, that if they come to Toronto or to any other place in Ontario they will have a reception as cordial, as enthusiastic as they will get anywhere in their own province.

Mr. LANCASTER. From the Conservatives.

Mr. OSLER. I will not say from the Conservatives, but from the Orangemen. I am not a member of that body. From the people of Ontario the French Canadians will get the warmest possible reception. I deplore greatly that there should be this constant bandying of words as to differences between one nationality and another. If it should be so that there was a feeling of hostility it should be the duty of every one of us to try and overcome that because we have to live together in this country, whether we like it or not. There is no such feeling, Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, and I say that it is despatches of this sort, the work of these mischief makers, who are looking through every page of the newspapers to clip a word here and there, publish them, and magnify them, that are making the mischief and trouble and I appeal to every member of this House to, as far as he can, endeavour to put a stop to that state of affairs.

At the meeting in Toronto, Lord Dundonald said :

I had almost forgotten to mention one other charge insinuated against me in parliament, of having made a difference between a French Canadian officer and an English-speaking one—in favour of the latter. I have already shown in the paper and it has not been contradicted, how groundless was this charge. Here in this great capital of the great English-speaking province of Ontario I desire to say that no man's race or religion has ever biased me. The French Canadian militia know full well that I have always had their interests at heart and have been actuated by the utmost possible friendliness for them.

That statement was cheered to the echo, and I know that sentiment is the sentiment of the people of Ontario, notwithstanding the trouble that men like Lloyd George tried to bring about. Let me repeat that the charge that the Conservative party are endeavouring to make political capital out of this Dundonald matter is absolutely untrue. If political capital is to be made out of it the charge is to be laid at the door of the members of the government and their supporters who have from the very beginning of this question endeavoured to abuse Lord Dundonald, to make it a personal matter as against Lord Dundonald, to connect him with the opposition, so that they may hide away from the public gaze the grave charge which His Lordship has made that the government are debasing the militia for party purposes.

Mr. H. A. WARD. I listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. A. T. Thompson). He spent nearly half an hour in an elaborate defence of the government and particularly of the Militia Department, but he seemed to be perhaps unaware that in making that elaborate defence he was at the same time pronouncing the greatest possible eulogy upon Lord Dundonald. Every one of the reforms in the militia system which he mentioned during his short speech was I believe, with perhaps one exception, introduced by the late General Officer Commanding. I believe that if the hon. gentleman were to speak out what is actually in his heart he would say, as every militia officer in this country would say, that Canada did suffer a great calamity in the loss of Lord Dundonald's services to the militia. My hon. friend in referring to what has been done by the Minister of Militia referred chiefly to the army service corps

and the medical corps, but he left out one which is perhaps of as much importance as the two which the mentioned, namely the intelligence corps which was established under the advice of Lord Dundonald. Laymen perhaps may not understand what the army service corps is and what they have accomplished in the camps in this country. But I will tell hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, what the army service corps has done. That corps has introduced into the camps of the militia of this country, not only good bread but good beef which they very seldom had before that reform was introduced. Every animal that was used by the militia in camp was slaughtered by this army service corps and the bread which was of the best in the country, was baked by the army service corps and delivered to the quartermasters of the different regiments in camp. At the camp at Kingston this year through some strange mistake made by some of the officials of the Militia Department, instead of live animals being called for in the contracts, dead meat was called for and the consequence was that after having an experience of the best beef that could be produced in this country during the camp last year, we had to submit this year to beef of a very inferior quality for the men. How that mistake occurred, I am not going to say but it was more than whispered that some contractors in Kingston desired to make a little out of the camp which they had not made last year, and as a consequence that little mistake crept into the calls for tenders for the contract for beef there. I certainly hope that the Minister of Militia does not intend to abolish that portion of the service which the army service corps has given to the militia camps but that next year he will see to it that no such mistake is made in the advertisement for tenders for beef and that we shall have the beef as it was last year, of the very first quality.

In reference to the intelligence corps, which was initiated by Lord Dundonald, who brought a very efficient officer of his staff to this country to establish the crops, I may say, as every one knows who followed the progress of the campaign in South Africa, that the British were terribly handicapped by not having proper maps of the country over which they were fighting. Lord Dundonald, recognizing this fact, introduced an intelligence department here, which will give to the militia of Canada military maps of all the country over which an army operating in Canada would possibly have to fight. That would be about two years ago. Another thing which was referred to by the hon. member for Haldimand was the magnificent improvement which has been made by the present Department of Militia and Defence in the manufacture of cartridges. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is not in his seat at the present time, because I would like to draw his attention particularly to this fact. The hon. member for Haldimand stated that the present government had increased the capacity of the cartridge factory in Quebec sixfold. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, if this is a fact, where are the cartridges that are manufactured in this cartridge factory in Quebec. I am informed that at the present time there are only sufficient cartridges to supply the whole militia force of Canada, if in the field, for about two hours, and if that factory has a capacity six-fold as great as it had under the previous government, I would ask in all sincerity where are the cartridges that are being manufactured? There is another thing that may properly be brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, and it is this: We have only one cartridge factory in this Dominion. Supposing, for the sake of argument, we were having trouble, and that the cartridge factory at Quebec was shut off by an army coming into this country, what position would the province of Ontario be in? I think this is most important, and I am glad to hear that there is some chance of the government taking up the matter of establishing another factory somewhere in the west.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Again on Lord Dundonald's recommendation.

Mr. WARD. They are doing this, as my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says, on Lord Dundonald's recommendation. It was rather amusing to listen to the speeches of the hon. member for Alberta and the hon. member for Haldimand. They both set up a straw man, and, as it were in strident tones, knocked him down again. I have never heard any charge of disloyalty made against the Liberal party from this side of the House, and yet these hon. gentlemen spent several minutes in trying to prove that such a charge had been made; and after setting up this straw man, they undertook to knock him down again. We all believe in our loyalty, and there is not a man on this side of the House or on the other side who is required to say anything about it. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, I am glad to say, is not in his place, but——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am here.

Mr. WARD. I see the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Alberta said, in the course of his remarks, that Lord Dundonald was altogether wrong all through these proceedings, and that hon. gentleman used language which, I am glad to say, has been peculiar to himself and has not been adopted generally by hon. members on the other side of the House. But he has nothing whatever to say about the action of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, for whom I have great respect, said at a ban-

quet—and it is something for which he ought to be commended—at Montreal, given to Sir Percy Girouard, that he would not tolerate any interference with the militia even by a colleague, and that the interference of a colleague, or of any person politically, would sap the very foundations of the militia system. I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence should have seen fit to have abdicated his functions and delegated his duties to the hon. Minister of Agriculture at the time he knew there was a controversy going on in regard to the formation of this regiment in the eastern townships, in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture was taking a great deal of interest. I say it is an unfortunate thing that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence should have delegated his functions to that hon. gentleman, knowing the facts of the case, and allowed him to manage his department during his absence. If 'Hansard' reports him rightly, he said that the trouble could not possibly have occurred if he had been present at the time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sure the hon. gentleman will allow me once more to correct that statement. I said nothing of the kind. I said that if I had been in Ottawa at the time that the organization of the corps in the eastern townships was commenced I would have consulted my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, and that probably this trouble would not have occurred.

Mr. WARD. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, but I think that what he has said virtually bears out the statement I made. I simply wish to convey this fact to the minds of hon. members that he did say something to the effect that if he had been present during the organization of the corps this unfortunate trouble would not have occurred. It is extremely to be regretted that it did occur, and I simply wish to emphasize the feeling of the militia corps generally throughout the country, that Lord Dundonald was the best officer we ever had, and that the militia has suffered a great disadvantage as the result of his removal. What is to be regretted still further—perhaps this is not exactly the time to make statements of this kind, but I had not an opportunity of taking part in the two debates that took place in the House—is the summary and unceremonious manner of the dismissal of Lord Dundonald. We know very well that all through this unfortunate incident very scant courtesy has been shown that brilliant soldier, and that in no way has the government recognized the services that he has rendered to this country. I was surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Finance speak so positively on the strength of what had been said by Mr. Winston Churchill in the British House of Commons of the Conservative party exploiting Lord Dundonald. I have looked in vain in the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to-day to find any evidence in confirmation of that statement. In the city of Toronto, as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has said, there was not a word of political significance uttered by any of those who made speeches there, and if the government are inclined to take what Lord Dundonald has said in his own defence, and very rightly said, as evidence of his acting with the Conservative party, it is their business. There has been no effort, as far as I can learn, or as far as I have seen, to exploit Lord Dundonald. He is quite capable of taking care of himself in every sense of the word, but it is to be most deeply regretted that we have lost the services of this gentleman to the militia force, and I cannot reiterate that statement too often. Many things have been said of Lord Dundonald of a very derogatery character by the press of the country and by hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House, and it is not to be wondered at that he should take the very first opportunity of defending himself, as he did most effectually in the city of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen may have remembered not very long ago the accident which happened in New York, by which a very large number of people were drowned on the 'General Slocum,' and that afterwards reference was made to one of the ballads of Colonel John Hay, who is now, I think, Secretary of State of the United States government. It was referred to in this way, that in the fact of the engineer having died at his post, another 'Jim Bludso' had been found. There is another poem of Colonel John Hay, which hon. gentlemen supporting the government might take to heart in connection with this very Dundonald incident. It is a little ballad devoted to the remarks of Sergeant Tilmon Joy, to the committee of white men in a western town who had got together and passed resolutions expelling a nigger. I will give you one of the verses, so that you can see the application :

> I reckon I git your drift, gents,—
> You 'low the boy shan't stay ;
> This is a whiteman's country ;
> You's Dimocrats, you say ;
> And whereas, and seein', and wherefore,
> The times bein' all out o' j'int,
> The nigger has got to mosey
> From the limits of Spunky P'int !
>
> Le's reason the thing a minute ;
> I'm an old-fashioned Dimocrat too,
> Though I laid my politics out o' the way
> For to keep till the war was through.
> But I come back here, allowin'
> To vote as I used to do,
> Though it gravels me like the devil to train
> Along o' sich fools as you.

Now gentlemen, there was no Tilmon Joy found in the Liberal cabinet when in that very unceremonious way, not a nigger, but a gentleman and a soldier, was expelled from the limits of Canada. There was not one found amongst the Liberal ministers

would stand up for Lord Dundonald and prevent his expulsion from this country. They all with one accord held up their hands for that magnificent Order in Council to absolve the Minister of Agriculture from any wrong doing—although they said in the document itself that these statements regarding the Minister of Agriculture were unnecessry to the record. They passed their Order in Council and sent it forth to the country, and the General Officer Commanding was expelled without one voice being raised in his favour in that cabinet council of Liberal ministers. I can tell hon. gentleman opposite, that they will find when they appeal to the country, that there will be a good many Sergeant Tilmon Joys in Canada.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER. I desire to say a few words on this question, not for the purpose of discussing the militia, but to repudiate as a Conservative, the imputation that the Conservative party has been using the Dundonald incident, or Lord Dundonald himself for political purposes. I assert, that if it had come to the knowledge of the Conservative party, that the Minister of Agriculture had interfered and meddled with the appointments to the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons as we now know he did, we would have taken the course we have taken whether Lord Dundonald had been at the head of the militia or not. No matter who the man might have been who was the General Officer Commanding, the position we took would have been taken, and would have been persisted in as we intend to persist in it. I go further and say, that if Lord Dundonald had condoned the action of the Minister of Agriculture, if he had been silent on the subject and the matter had come to our knowledge, we would have taken this same action, regardless of Lord Dundonald or his opinion. The point is, not what Lord Dundonald thinks or does not think, but the interests and welfare of the militia of Canada, and the absolute necessity now and at all times to prevent such political interference with appointments to the militia as that which we have been condemning. I object to the language of the Finance Minister when he speaks of this as a Dundonald question. It is not a Dundonald question as regards this House or as regards this country. It might more properly be called a Fisher question ; but above all it is a militia question, and a question of the non-interference of politicians with the militia. That is the question before the House. I object to the Minister of Finance charging the Conservative party with using Lord Dundonald for political purposes. The Conservative party has never thought of such a thing, and I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Conservative party as a party are not quite such fools as to treat the question in that manner. The matter is a very serious one; it has gone to the hearts and will stay in the hearts of the people of this country, and we would only weaken the attack we have made and will continue to make upon the government, by treating it as a personal question relating to the gentleman who happened to be the Commander in Chief at the moment. I want to say a word as to a quotation made by the Minister of Finance. I do so because in apparently making a quotation he has used language conveying a very different signification from what appears in the paragraph he was reading from. The report in the paper says :

> No representation had been made by the government of Canada, which was able to take care of itself.

That is a very simple statement indeed ; a commonplace remark ; that the government of Canada is able to take care of itself. Let us see how the Minister of Finance turned it, or I would say twisted it, in order to give it a different meaning. These are his exact words, I have obtained them :

> But there are other matters in which no such aid is needed, and this unhappy Dundonald business is one of that kind. Mr. Arnold Foster very correctly stated, and it is perhaps the point in his observations which we appreciate most that this is a matter in which the Canadian government have shown that they are well able to deal with it themselves.

That is a very different thing from the report of what Mr. Foster said, as it appears in the newspapers. The Minister of Finance uses language that would convey to the people of Canada, that Mr. Arnold Foster has approved of the past action of the government of Canada in this matter, that the government of Canada in what they have done have shown that they were well able to deal with it themselves. Why does the Minister of Finance want to turn the words ; why did he not use the exact words in the newspaper report ? why did he want to use Mr. Arnold Foster as apparently approving of the action that the Canadian government had taken in this matter ? The Minister of Finance had the exact words before him, and I object to his wrong interpretation of the words of Mr. Arnold Foster, which interpretation is as far from being the truth, as is the statement that we are using Lord Dundonald for political purposes. The Minister of Finance went out of his way to pay a compliment to Mr. Lloyd George. He said :

> Mr. Lloyd George, I am bound to speak of as one of the most distinguished members of the imperial parliament.

Well, I think most of us know something of Mr. Lloyd George, and we know that if he is distinguished for anything it is for his extreme political opinions. He is distinguished as being one of the small party that were known in England as the pro-Boer party ; a party which would never have

sent a soldier to South Africa if they had had their way. Mr. Lloyd George is a gentleman who would have withdrawn the British flag from South Africa if he had had his way, and this is the gentleman the Minister of Finance belauds here as if he were one of the greatest men in England There is a rather significant paragraph in this paper which was not read.

Mr. Lloyd George spoke of 'the pain this controversy would cause Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, as was truly said, was one of the staunchest friends of the empire at the time of its great struggle.' Well, those who know Mr. Lloyd George know perfectly well that the man he would call the staunchest friend of the British empire in that great struggle would be a man holding his own opinions as to submission to the Boers; and I doubt very much whether the First Minister of Canada will take it as a compliment that that remark has fallen from Mr. Lloyd George. If the hon. Finance Minister wants to stand on the same footing as Mr. Lloyd George does, he will accept that compliment; but I think there are few men in this Dominion who would want to stand in the same shoes as Mr. Lloyd George does with regard to South Africa.

Now, Sir, when we took up this question in this House, I was under the impression, as I think most gentlemen on this side were that we were doing our duty as members of the opposition. We were criticising one of the departments of government. We had heard of certain things that were being done in the administration or non administration of the Militia Department that ought to be condemned, regardless of the source from which the information came, except that we knew the facts stated to be true. We condemned what had been done. Was that not our duty? What would be the object of our sitting here as an opposition if we were to allow such a matter as that to pass uncondemned when we were considering the Militia Department? For what purpose are we here? We criticise and condemn the railway administration. Are we exploiting somebody when we do that? We took up the Grand Trunk Pacific matter a year ago and criticised it and condemned it, and we had the assistance of Hon. Mr. Blair in doing so. Were we exploiting Mr. Blair? Surely the fact that Mr. Blair happened to join us in our condemnation of the government was not an exploitation of Mr. Blair by the opposition. Nor is the fact that we happened to think and speak about the Militia Department as Lord Dundonald did, an exploitation by us of that eminent soldier for party purposes. Our view of the misconduct of the hon. Minister of Agriculture in meddling with the militia has nothing whatever to do with the General Officer Commanding. We have exploited—as apparently we want to use that word so much in this House—the Treadgold Commission, and with some effect; but I do not know that in doing that, we exploited any particular gentleman connected with it. We have been taking up the Audit Department. Was that exploiting Mr. McDougall? Surely we can take up and discuss and criticise a department without acting for or using a particular individual who happens to be connected with it. Now, I object to the Finance Minister trying to sidetrack this question by diverting the attention of the public from the conduct of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and that of the hon. Minister of Militia to Lord Dundonald. Lord Dundonald can defend himself. We do not attempt to defend him here. It is not our business to do so. Our business is to criticise hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the conduct of the affairs entrusted to them, and we generally do so, no matter who the man may be who may be helped or hurt by our criticism.

At Six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. L. P. Demers.

SUPPLY INTER-IMPERIAL PREFERENTIAL TRADE—DISMISSAL OF LORD DUNDONALD.

House resumed debate on motion of Mr. Fielding, for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BARKER. Before six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the action of the opposition in the House with regard to the question under discussion as it affected the militia, and I ask what could the opposition have done when it learned what had been attempted with regard to the Scottish Dragoons, other than it did. I ask whether we did more than our duty, and I think that question can only be answered by the statement that the opposition did its simple duty and no more. If there has been any exploiting, who has been guilty of it? Did the Conservative party exploit the Montreal banquet? I think not. I do not think that any hon. gentleman on the other side would pretend for one moment that the Conservative party, any more than the Liberal party, had anything to do with or any knowledge of that banquet, before it took place. Did we exploit the publishing of the proceedings at that banquet in the press? I think not. It is not even pretended that we did. Did we exploit the minister's letter demanding from the General Officer Commanding an explanation of what occurred at that meet-

ing ? Certainly not. Nor did we exploit the publication in the press of that correspondence. We took no part in it. It all took place without any interference of the Conservative opposition. I do not believe, Sir, that anybody will question that statement. The incident arose entirely outside of the Conservative party. Whatever interference there was before the matter was brought to the attention of this House came from the Liberal party alone. When the facts came before us, we condemned the Minister of Agriculture for his interference and meddling. We condemned that minister who, not content, Mr. Speaker, with the plough-share, wanted to don the sword as well; who, not content with the management of one department of the government, which certainly should exercise all the qualities he possesses, undertook to interfere with and control another department with which constitutionally he had nothing to do. Nor was it a mere temporary interference with the departmental functions and duties of his colleagues. No, this had been going on for months. It began in the early days, almost at the very inception of the organization of this regiment. We find, as was shown in the discussion in this House, that from the very beginning the Minister of Militia was almost ignored in this matter. From the very outset, the Minister of Agriculture was interviewed by the officers and by everybody interested in the formation of that dragoon regiment. They came to him as if they were dealing with something affecting the experimental farm. They never went near the Minister of Militia, and one would have wondered why they went to the one gentleman and not the other, had not political developments been brought to light, had we not found that the Minister of Agriculture was interfering, not because he had more experience in militia matters than his colleague, but because his own political interests were involved. It was for this reason alone he interfered in this matter and took it entirely out of the hands of his colleague, the Minister of Militia, who, I regret to say, calmly submitted to the interference. And indeed there can be very little doubt that the Minister of Militia went out of the way at a convenient moment in order to give his colleague full swing and let him deal with this matter to suit his own political purposes. He dealt with it, not in the interests of the militia, but in the interests of his political party—a party of course which would not think of exploiting such a thing as a regiment of dragoons or any other regiment for party purposes. That, Sir, was the position under which the matter came before this House, and we dealt with it in that light. We had some notable words from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), words that we could find no fault with. He said, as reported at page 4582 of 'Hansard':

> No political consideration should be allowed to interfere.

Well, Sir, there is nobody on this side of the House who will dispute that, for it coincides exactly with our own view ; and, if the hon. gentleman had only practised what he professed, there would have been no discussion upon this subject in Canada, there would have been no discussion upon it in the British House of Commons, nor should we have had all this turmoil and trouble over the question of the General Officer Commanding, who, probably, had it not been for the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, would have been General Officer Commanding to-day and would have continued in that position for some years to come. What is the fact ? In the face of these good professions of the hon. gentleman that no political interference should be allowed to interfere, we find the true state of things explained at page 12 of the papers brought down by the government, in which the colonel of the regiment who speaks at peril of his commission,—so that, I think, we can accept every word of what he says as certainly not going beyond the truth—puts the facts in this form :

> Mr. Fisher objected to him——

That is, to the proposed major of the regiment.

> —for no other reason than that he was a strong political opponent of his, and was quite determined to block the whole organization unless Dr. Pickel's name was withdrawn.

That, Sir, is the fact. That is the way the hon. Minister of Agriculture acts in the fact of his profession, put on 'Hansard' that 'no political considerations should be allowed to interfere.' And yet we are charged with using for political purposes this question that has been brought before the House and before the country in such a manner. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what is to be the result of this sort of thing if it goes on. If we are to have militia trained on political lines, where are these regiments and the officers who command them to find themselves placed ? Will the colonel of the regiment sit at his mess table, and arrange all the good grits on his right hand and on his left all the bad Tories ; or if the other party happens to be in power the Conservatives on the right and the Grits on the left ? And when the question arises of which soldier is to be raised from the ranks and made a corporal, is the first question to be considered what his politics may be ? Are they to consider whether he is a good party man or an indifferent party man ? Are they to consider, when they are making a man a sergeant, whether he has done his whole duty as a politician, or whether, perhaps, he has a cousin, or a nephew,

or a brother, who happens to be on the opposite side? Are these the considerations that are to be taken up whenever anything is to be done for the militia? And yet, that would be the inevitable result of the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture, and the conduct of the Minister of Militia in submitting to this uncalled for and unconstitutional dictation. That most unfortunate conduct of ministers led to the speech made at the banquet at Montreal. Sir, I do not care whether that speech was an indiscretion or not. There have been many indiscreet things done that have resulted in good; and, however, indiscreet Lord Dundonald may have been—and we need not enter into the discussion of that here—I trust and believe that the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture in this matter will result in great good to the militia of Canada, for the outcry against his interference on this occasion will put down, once for all, any desire of a minister, no matter to what party he may belong, to ever again interfere in such a manner with the appointments in the militia.

I do not care to pursue that subject further; we discussed it pretty fully when it was before the House, and for my part I think it ought to have been left there. But was it left there? After we had discussed the question in this House, was it ended? And, if it did not end, who continued it? Was it the Conservative party? I think not. Who was it made attacks, after the discussion in this House, upon Lord Dundonald? Did not we find the whole Liberal press filled with the attacks on the General Officer, charging him with political intent, charging him with incompetency, and reflecting upon him in every possible manner? Why, I think the Minister of Militia went so far as to question the English used by the Earl of Dundonald. There was nothing that they did not say. Was that exploiting the Dundonald incident? Was that continuing the Dundonald question and using Lord Dundonald for political purposes? I do not care whether they used it for attack upon their opponents or for their own defence, the men who pursued that policy used the Dundonald incident for political purposes. And hon. gentlemen opposite, and not the Conservatives, are the guilty parties. But there was more, Sir. Who furnished to the Liberal papers information that was contained only in private or suppressed reports? Who conveyed to the Toronto 'Globe' information on which to base charges that Lord Dundonald had made extravagant demands on this country? Was that exploiting this incident on behalf of the Conservative party or was it exploiting it on behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite? I think they were carrying on the warfare on political lines when they were acting in this way. Was not the attack upon Lord Dundonald in nearly every Liberal organ? And, when Lord Dundonald was asked up to Toronto to address the people, was he to go there and be silent with regard to the matter on which he had been attacked? Were hon. gentlemen to be given the opportunity to say that Lord Dundonald, by silence, admitted what was charged against him? These hon. gentleman would have been delighted if only Lord Dundonald had held his tongue. They would have come out next morning and said: Lord Dundonald dared not deny the charges they made. And as to the people who asked him to speak is it to be supposed that the ladies and gentlemen of Toronto who went by the thousand to receive him, expected to listen to a lecture on cavalry tactics or to a reading of the latest edition of his work upon drill? What did they go for? Why, the question was red hot in the country, Lord Dundonald being the hero of it; and these people went to hear what Lord Dundonald had to say in his own defence against the attacks that the Liberal papers were making upon him. That is what they went for, and there was not a man or woman in that hall in Toronto who would not have been disappointed if he had left unsaid the things he said—there is no question about that. It is absurd for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that Lord Dundonald took advantage of the position. Why, it would have been sheer nonsense to ask such a man to go from Ottawa to Toronto to address five or six thousand people in Massey Hall and yet say nothing on the only subject in which they were interested. And are we to suppose, do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose, that the people of Toronto are so unintelligent that they do not appreciate the proprieties? Do the gentlemen opposite suppose that the reception which the general met with on that occasion did not show clearly where the hearts of the people were on the subject? Do they suppose that the acclamations with which he was received meant nothing? Do they suppose that when the people of Toronto took the horses from his carrriage and dragged it to the station they did not endorse everything he did and said? Does it mean nothing when a man receives in Toronto, the chief city of Ontario, the grandest reception that any man ever received there? And yet hon. gentlemen say he is being exploited for political purposes. I can understand how he might have been exploited. I know that if only 400 or 500 people had gone to that meeting he would have been exploited for the Liberal party. The difficulty is that it was a grand success, that the people showed their sympathy with the man. The whole difficulty lies there: it was not that he went to the reception, it was the fact that he carried the people with him and that he made it plain that he has got the heart and sympathy of every man in Canada. I do not care whether you speak of the incident as regards Quebec, as

regards Ontario, or as regards any other province. I believe that Lord Dundonald to-day could go into any county in Quebec or in any other province in this country and meet with as good a reception as he met with in Toronto. It is absolute nonsense to say that Lord Dondonald was seeking a political result. I believe that there are few men within sound of my voice who know what Lord Dunuonald's politics are. For my own part I do not know ; I never heard what they are, and I do not think any one here can give me that information. Lord Dundonad cares no more about the politics of Canada than he does about the politics of Australia or New Zealand. He is a British subject and soldier, who is here for one purpose, to do good for the militia of Canada. That is his sole purpose and whether Conservatives are in power or Liberals are in power is a matter of absolute indifference to him. Nobody can question that, and I venture to say that if a Conservative government had been in power and the Conservative minister had done what the present ministers did, Lord Dundonald would have acted in precisely the way he did, Mr. Speaker, I should have liked to have heard the denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite if in such an event they had been sitting on this side of the House. It would be a treat to hear the First Minister get up and denounce as an outrage upon the people of this country that an officer sent here to command the militia should be treated in such a manner for political purposes. Had a Conservative minister of Agriculture taken advantage of his position to meddle in the organization of a militia regiment, and to prevent the giving of a commission to a political opponent to a reputable man simply because he happened to be a Liberal, what an outcry we would have had ! If the First Minister could only come over here and make such a speech for us it would be worth reading a dozen times over. But it is the other way around, and hon. gentlemen opposite look upon it in another light. The Minister of Agriculture is allowed to interfere, to intrude upon a matter with which he has nothing to do, and to do more mischief to the cause of the militia of Canada than he can do good in his agricultural department if he lives a century. I have served in my time in all ranks in the militia from private up to commanding a company. I can carry my mind a great many years back and in all my time, until this intrusion of the Minister of Agriculture, I never heard of political interference in the militia. I know, Sir, that in the city of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives, we have an old regiment, the 13th of Hamilton, which is a credit to the country. That regiment for years was commanded under the Conservative government by a Liberal Colonel, a Liberal of the Liberals, the present Attorney General of Ontario, and I say to his credit that I do not believe that in all the many years that he commanded the regiment there was ever a question on his part or on the part of any officer of his regiment as to whether an applicant for a commission was a Liberal or Conservative. The great difficulty in these cases is to get the men who can afford to take the positions. I can understand thoroughly the position of the people down in Sweetsburg. In Hamilton, where perhaps we have at our command more men of means than they have at Sweetsburg, the trouble is to get men who will assume the expense, and it is rather a favour to a regiment than otherwise for a young man to accept a commission. A new regiment has recently been formed, a Scottish regiment too, and I can only say that I hope and believe it will always have as excellent a reputation as the old 13th for freedom from party politics. I know too that in the battery of artillery that has been for many years a credit to the city of Hamilton, there were under a Conservative government, four Liberals and only one Conservative officer and I have been assured by gentlemen connected with that battery they never heard one word as to the political leaning of any man holding a commission in it. I think that what I know of Hamilton is the case in Toronto and throughout the province of Ontario, and I have yet to learn that there is any other condition in the province of Quebec. I believe that the same spirit has actuated the people of the province of Quebec and that it has remained for the Minister of Agriculture to endeavour to start a new order of things and to intrude politics into the militia to affect, perhaps, the chances of the return of some particular man to the local legislature or to the House of Commons.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I would not interpose to prolong the discussion of this matter, which to my mind is a most unfortunate affair, both in the interests of Canada itself and in its relations to the British empire, but for the fact that there is involved in this discussion a principle which is of the utmost importance not only to Canadians but to British subjects throughout the world. It involves to my mind a principle which is being unwarrantably violated by the government of the day. The principle to which I refer is this : Shall a British subject in any part of the British domain be denied that privilege which we all claim to enjoy—the right of free thought and free speech ? I do not believe that in Canada such a sentiment as that, the denial of free thought, and free speech will be tolerated by the people. I do not believe it would be tolerated in any other part of the British empire and it is because this principle is involved that I take this occasion to offer a few remarks upon the question of the dismissal of Lord Dun-

donald and the action of the government in connection therewith. Prior to the speech made by Lord Dundonald in Toronto I concede that the matter was fairly treated and might be fairly treated as a matter of etiquette as between himself and the government under whom he was serving, but once the government had satisfied itself by wrecking its vengeance on Lord Dundonald by the summary dismissal of that gentleman from its service he ceased to be under the control of this government and as a free born British subject he was entitled to speak as he did speak in the city of Toronto. He was, as my hon. friend says, after his dismissal by the government an elector of the Dominion of Canada entitled to all the rights and privileges appertaining to a British subject in this country.

I want just for a moment to contrast the action of the government in its dealings with Lord Dundonald with its action in its dealings with another and as celebrated an individual but one who is not celebrated upon the same lines. The offence charged against Lord Dundonald was an act of indiscretion. It was charged that he was guilty of a breach of etiquette as between himself and the government and without calling upon Lord Dundonald to justify himself or make his defence before this government or before the country he was summarily dismissed as every hon. gentleman in this House knows and as the country knows full well. He was not offered the privilege of any ordinary British subject, not possessing the merit that Lord Dundonald has won, of making his defence. He was not accorded the privilege which is offered to the ordinary criminal of the land of making amends for his first offence by trying to do better. He was not offered the opportunity of retracting what he had said and endeavouring by his conduct in the future to satisfy the government of the day and to satisfy its requirements in regard to his position. He was a man as full of honours as he was full of years. A young man though he may be, I venture to say that the honours which have been heaped upon him as a result of the service which he has rendered to his country very much predominate, override and overshadow anything that has occurred during the few years he has spent here. I venture to say right here that the name of Lord Dundonald, although he may have been discredited by this government, will be held in honour and in reverence by the people of Canada and of the British empire when this government has gone down in disgrace. But, Sir, let me refer to the analogy that I spoke of a moment ago. We have in the service of the government to-day another man who has a history in Canada. He is not the hero of Ladysmith. He is not the man who had the courage to lead our Canadian boys to victory in South Africa. He is not the man who had the courage to take his life in his hand to defend the British empire. He is the man who went throughout the length and breadth of Canada to do dirty nefarious, political election tricks and was afterwards appointed to the position that he now occupies in Great Britain. I refer to Mr. W. T. R. Preston. There is this difference between the two gentlemen that I speak of: One, Lord Dundonald, full of honour; the other, W. T. R. Preston, practically driven from Canada by dishonour. How does the government treat these two men? The man who would command the respect of this government, who would command the respect of the people of this country is cast out and discredited. Mr. W. T. R. Preston is given a position of emolument, a position of profit, an important position under this government and not only that, but, Sir, he is guilty of the very same offence, if it may be considered an offence, that Lord Dundonald has been charged with by this government. During the discussion of this very matter and since Lord Dundonald's case has come before the government, Mr. W. T. R. Preston has taken occasion to write a letter to the public press. What for? For the purpose of defending Lord Dundonald?—no, For the purpose of defending the British people?—no. For the purpose of the business for which he is employed?—no; but, for the purpose of defending this government that he felt was in need of defence. When he was guilty of that indiscretion what did this government do? Did it say to Mr. Preston as it said to Lord Dundonald: You have been guilty of a grave indiscretion and off comes your head without a defence?—no, no; not at all. When it found out that he had been guilty of an act of indiscretion and when the matter was pressed home to this government very strongly, so strongly that it felt it must do something, what did it do? The government wrote home and told him that he must not do it again, that it would give him another chance. I am reminded of the fact that his salary is to be increased this year. Perhaps this is the reward for his activity in serving the government in this way. This is only one instance of the way in which this government has treated Lord Dundonald in comparison with the way in which it has treated gentlemen in its employ who are favourable to it. I do not mean to have the House infer from this that Lord Dundonald is unfavourable to the government. I do not believe that Lord Dundonald is unfavourable to the government. I believe that Lord Dundonald by every expression he has given utterance to since this matter has come before the people and by his acts during the time he was employed in the administration of military affairs in this country, has shown that he is not unfavourable to this government, that he is not unfavourable to this opposition, but that he is favourable to

the whole people of Canada and that he is true to the British empire. So, I think it is paltry, it is low, it is mean for any one to charge Lord Dundonald with being unfavourable to either one political party or the other. High as our political standard may be, Lord Dundonald looks to a still higher standard; his object is that of a true patriot. I wish to call attention to another matter, and I make reference to it particularly because it occurred in the riding I have the honour to represent, and it illustrates as forcibly as can be illustrated, the honesty and the integrity of Lord Dundonald and the high purpose of the man. It proves that he was not actuated or influenced by political, or any but the highest motives. Lord Dundonald spoke of this matter in his speech at Toronto, and the facts are these. Shortly after Lord Dundonald took office in this country, Lieutenant-Colonel Ponton, of Belleville, a gentleman who occupies in the riding I represent, and in the entire district in which he lives, a reputation that might be the envy of any man. Colonel Ponton comes from military stock; his great grandfather, his grandfather, and his father had the privilege of occupying the positions of colonels or lieutenant-colonels in the British army. He is a military man from start to finish. He commenced his service in the Queen's Own, passed to the 15th Argyle Light Infantry of Hastings and ultimately became commander of that regiment. After a long and honourable service in the militia, he was retired retaining rank. After his retirement from the service, at a citizen's banquet which was in no way concerned with military affairs, Colonel Ponton was asked to respond to the toast of the army and navy, on account of his long service in our active militia. He took occasion to point out some of the weaknesses of the present administration, in conducting militia affairs. I have Colonel Ponton's own word for it, that within three days after he made the speech, he had a letter from the department here demanding to know whether he had used these expressions or not. Colonel Ponton is a man of the stamp of Lord Dundonald, and his answer to the department was: I did give expression to these opinions, I am a retired officer, I was exercising my right as a British subject, and I refuse to withdraw a single word I uttered. What was the result? It has only come to linght since the Dundonald matter has been under discussion. As an appendix to that letter, he said to the minister: Having answered your question I demand to know who has made this charge against me, and in what way I have violated my duty? That letter was handed over to Lord Dundonald with the request from the department, that he should recommend the dismissal of Colonel Ponton, but what did Lord Dundonald do? He refused to allow political exigencies to interfere with the proper administration of the militia of Canada, and as Lord Dundonald told us in Toronto, he ordered the correspondance to be pigeon-holed, and Colonel Ponton still occupies his position as a retired colonel of the 15th Argyle Light Infantry and this government did not have the courtesy or courage to answer Col. Ponton's demand. But this is not all. During the time that controversy was going on between the government and Lord Dundonald, there was a correspondence between Lord Dundonald and a most honourable gentleman who at one time occupied the most prominent position in Canada, and who is to-day honorary colonel of the Argyle Light Infantry, and the action of Colonel Ponton upon that occasion was justified by that gentleman, and Lord Dundonald's action also upheld. And Sir, I have not the slightest fear that when the investigation that is mooted—I was going to say ordered—when the investigation comes that will probably take place in regard to Lord Dundonald's action in this country; when the evidence comes to be sifted in the old country after his return, I have no doubt whatever that Lord Dundonald will be able to answer satisfactorily the charges made against him, and to confute those who are opposed to him. I have every confidence that Lord Dundonald will be able to acquit himself honourably at home as he has already honourably acquitted himself in Canada. And, what is the charge made against Lord Dundonald? They say he has been guilty of an act of indiscretion, but the real fact is that the charge against him amounts to an indictment that Lord Dundonald told the truth, a thing which is entirely antagonistic to the principle of this government. Lord Dundonald endeavoured to the best of his ability, in the report which he signed and presented to the government, to bring before the people and parliament of Canada the things that were necessary to put our militia force on a proper footing. After he had exhausted, as he says himself, every reasonable means of gaining redress, he was driven, on account of the political interference with the establishment of the 13th Scottish Dragoons, to give public expression to his utterances at the Montreal banquet. There was no other alternative left, and we can but praise the man who had the courage to sacrifice his own chances of advancement for the purpose, not of helping the government or the opposition, but for the purpose of benefiting the whole Dominion of Canada. Reference has been made to publications in the press of Great Britain, dealing with this Dundonald incident. I have had placed in my hands to-night the latest reports in regard to that matter, and as the search light is turned on, and the British people begin to understand the true inwardness of the affair, public opinion becomes more and more in accord with Lord Dundonald. Let me read to the House a state-

ment in a cablegram published in the Montreal 'Star' to-night:

Winston Churchill although attacking Lord Dundonald admitted that the allegations he made were probably only too true.

Mr. Arnold Foster, Secretary of War, said he pronounced no opinion upon the merit or demerit of Lord Dundonald's action, before Lord Dundonald had been heard in his own defence.

The British government would not condemn a man before he was heard, but I am sorry to say this Canadian government has been guilty of that offence.

The 'Morning Post' says:

His offence was a splendid indiscretion in a case in which position and reputation were risked to serve the public interest.

To my mind that fairly expresses the sentiment of the people of Canada, Lord Dundonald has made a sacrifice for the people of Canada, and I doubt not that when the time comes—and it cannot come too soon—the people of Canada will show at the polls that they uphold Lord Dundonald, and that they uphold the Conservative party who uphold him, by defeating the government which has without just cause or excuse inflicted this great and unjust punishment upon this patriotic soldier of the empire.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM ACCOUNTS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. For some time past members of the government and their supporters have asked me: Taylor, when are you going to let us away; as much as to say that the chief whip of the opposition, or the opposition itself, could decide the length of this session. I thought the government were anxious to get through the work of the session, and I know the opposition, consistent with their duty, are anxious for prorogation. It is the duty of the opposition to criticise, and criticise fairly, not only the estimates, but every measure introduced by the government. Consistent with that duty, the opposition were willing to work night and day in order to hasten the end of the session. Last evening, Mr. Speaker, before you left the chair, I gave notice that to-day I would discuss for a short time a report which has been published by the Minister of Agriculture and circulated through this country, which is not in accordance with the facts. This morning, after the House had been moved into Committee of Supply, the hon. leader of the opposition brought up a matter on which, I think, the country was anxious to hear something said; that was the course pursued by the Solicitor General in the old land. After the hon. leader of the opposition had made his statement, the right hon. the Prime Minister replied. Then my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) had something to say, and the matter, to all intents and purposes, was ended. I rose to perform the duty of which I had given notice, when the Finance Minister asked me to give way and allow him to say a few words. He then took occasion to repudiate his leader, because when the leader of the opposition brought to his attention the fact that a member of the government had made statements not consistent with his position as such, the right hon. leader of the government said we should not believe newspaper reports. Yet the Finance Minister, abandoning that rule, immediately read a press report of something that happened yesterday in the British House of Commons, and upon it based a political speech. That started the ball rolling. He had to be replied to from this side of the House, and then the government put up the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. A. T. Thompson) to swallow himself and the speech he made last year, when, after this government had been in power for seven years and had spent millions of money, which had been voted freely by the people of this country, he said that we had only the skeleton of a skeleton of a militia force in Canada. To-day the government asked him to get up and clean the slate, and say that no government had done as much for the militia force as this government. After that they put up the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to speak of Lord Dundonald, one of the greatest statesmen and one of the ablest military men we have ever had in this country, as a Tory heeler and to apply other offensive epithets to him. Then the debate continued, and the whole day has been wasted by the government. Yet they ask the opposition: When are you going to let us away? The opposition are prepared to stay here, and will stay here, as it is their duty, to fight every measure brought in by this government which they consider not to be in the interest of the country.

This government came into power in 1896, and the right hon. the Prime Minister, when he announced his cabinet, informed the farmers of this country, on every hustings from which he addressed them, that he had put one of themselves into the responsible position of Minister of Agriculture—a horny-handed son of toil, like one of themselves, to administer that important office. Every member of the cabinet boomed the Minister of Agriculture as being a practical farmer and a thorough business man. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the Prime Minister and all the members of the cabinet booming him, but he takes occasion, through his own paper in Montreal, to boom himself. In the report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ended October 31, 1903, his last report, the hon. gentleman starts by saying, 'May it please Your Excellency,' and in the very next sentence he puts a lie or a misstatement into the Governor General's mouth by saying that during the last session of parliament he had secured the passage of an Act to prohibit the im-

portation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated butter, oleomargarine, butterine or other substitute for butter, and to prevent the improper marking of butter. If the hon. gentleman had been honest and true, he would have stated to His Excellency : 'Thirteen or fourteen years ago the hon. member for Leeds introduced a Bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of adulterated butter ; the hon. member for Leeds was a supporter of the Conservative government which was then in power ; I was in opposition ; I opposed by my voice and my vote the passage of any such measure ; the Conservative government adopted the suggestion of the hon. member for Leeds, and put on the statute book a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter, and it has been the law for many years.' And yet the hon. gentleman says to His Excellency that he introduced such a Bill and that it became law, although such a law has been in force for the last ten or twelve years.

An hon. MEMBER. Stole your thunder.

Mr. TAYLOR. The farmers of this country know that it was through my action that that law was placed on the statute-book of this country, in spite of the opposition of the present Minister of Agriculture, who spoke and voted against it.

Now, I want for a few minutes to show how this practical farmer and business man is conducting the Department of Agriculture. It is no wonder that this immense surplus of $57,000,000 has been accumulating owing to the good times since this government has been in power, through no action of theirs. They cannot point to any expenditure of public money which has been made for the general advantage of Canada, or to any great public work which they have accomplished with this $57,000,000. It has all been squandered, and the Minister of Agriculture has helped to squander it. In the year 1895-96 the Conservative government conducted the experimental farm in the same way in which the present Minister of Agriculture is conducting it, and yet the expenditure, as shown by the Auditor General's Report for that year, at page B—7, was $34,205.87, to which should be added goods supplied by the Department of Public Works, as shown on page Q—70, amounting to $5,999.44, making a total of $40,205.31. Less the revenue $3,784, showing a loss to the country in that year of $36,420.57. That was under the Conservative administration. How is it now under my hon. friend's administration ? 1892-3 (see Auditor General's Report D—36) expenditure $59,287.60 and V—94 of same report $9,996.92, making a total of $69,284.52. Against this there is the revenue from sales of steers $4,082 and of other articles $2,947, making a total of $7,056, thus leaving a loss to the country of $62,228.52, as against $36,482.57 under the late administration, or nearly $30,000 more under the hon. gentleman's administration, which the experimental farm cost, than it did under the preceding government. I have here a detailed statement of the expenses of each department in connection with that farm :

	1895-6.	1902-3.
Salaries, general	$3,434 43	$5,974 96
Farm work	3,929 99	5,073 23
Care of stock	1,738 45	3,087 45
Dairying department	323,36	611 02
Horticultural department	2,163 51	4,896 37
Chemical department	191 74	4,332 62
Botanical and etomological	275 75	3,755 06
Poultry	416 91	1,588 93
Forestry	1,502 82	1,392 51
Office expenses	1,760 08	4,395 06
Draining	225 50	1,546 72
Drawing manure	299 05	213 56
Distribution of seed trees.	117 50	1,613 67
Distribution of seed grain.	664 30	
	781 80	
Seed testing and green house	775 50	1,089 19
Preparing exhibits	212 60	388 81
Arboretum	341 88	1,730 24
Distribution of bulletins	525 50	75 00
Fencing lumber	175 63	.....
Contingencies	38 75	.....
Apiary	.....	32 00
Road making	.....	12 81
Experimental department	.....	2,655 07
Drawing gravel	.....	104 00
	$19,173 25	$44,478 28
		19,173 25
Increase		$25,305 03

This shows an increase in every department and an increase in the cost of salaries alone of $3,000 under the hon. gentleman's administration as compared with the late administration. Why ? Because the hon. gentleman has picked up a lot of supporters and stuffed them everywhere he could and they are drawing salaries and doing very little work. That is a sample of the way in which the $57,000,000 of the people's money have been wasted. A lot of it has gone in the employment of useless officials who are drawing large salaries and spending heavy sums running around the country to no good purpose. And not one supporter of this government can point to any great work such as the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway to account for this immense expenditure. Nor can he point to anything in return but the most trifling reductions in our public debt.

Take the decennial census and compare what it cost under this government with what the late government did it for. The Conservative government had a

census taken two or three times and all it cost was about $500,000 a year. But this administration has had the census taken once, and although it is not through yet, it has cost to the present one and a quarter million dollars or two and a half times what the Conservative administration did the work for.

Then my hon. friend is a sort of a faddist. He is not satisfied with running these experimental farms, but branches out into all sorts of useless expenditures. I moved for a return a short time ago to see how much he had wasted in another fad. He made up his mind that the farmers, who were building up a cheese business long before he became minister, did not know anything about it, and he set to work to establish cheese curing rooms at Brockville, Woodstock, Cowansville and St. Hyacinthe—two in Quebec and two in Ontario. I have the return here in detail, and I presume some of my hon. friends behind me would perhaps deal with this question more fully. I find that in these four stations which he had built to show the farmers how to cure cheese, he spent $82,327.56, according to the return brought down, which he says is up to date. But though he built those stations, the farmers will not patronize them, and he has had, in order to get them to fall in with his scheme, to pay them for drawing their cheese and putting it into these rooms. The one at Brockville would not have a single cheese in it if the farmers were not paid for hauling it in. And not satisfied with that, he bought a lot of cheese last year, for which he paid a high price and that cheese he is holding to-day when the price is low. I moved for a return to date and it does not show that any of the cheese he bought was sold up to the date at which this return was made. I do not purpose dealing with this matter further, because at Brockville every cheese manufacturer, be he Grit or Tory, condemns the scheme as one of the worst ever perpetrated by any government. One of the strongest Grits in the country has been particularly outspoken in his denunciation of that scheme. Before the government decided to incur this heavy expenditure, why did they not say to the farmers: we have an idea that cheese can be cured by a cooling process better than by the way you are doing it, and if you will establish factories of a certain size all over the Dominion, we will give a bonus of from $200 to $500 to each factory, provided you will adopt the process on a plan prepared by the department. But instead of that he went to work and established these four factories which cost as follows:

At Brockville	$16,606
At Woodstock	25,705
At Cowansville	22,352
At St. Hyacinthe	17,656

And he made these expenditures in sections where there is practically no cheese. At Brockville station there are a few factories close by, but they have to go away out into the interior to get a sufficient quantity of cheese to keep the station running, and they have the station marked 'Government Cool Storage Illustration Station,' and pay the farmers for hauling the cheese, and the cheese is shipped from that station when the sales are made. No practical farmer nor any practical Minister of Agriculture would have adopted the plan such as my hon. friend has established at these four different points in Ontario and Quebec.

Then, not satisfied with running his experimental farm and running cheese curing roms, my hon. friend started another fad, and invited the farmers all through the country to go into chicken fattening stations, a lot of which he established at different points. Let me show you how he has managed this business. Here is a table showing the different places where he established these stations, showing the result of each, taken from the Auditor General's Report D—106:

——	Cost.	Sales.	Loss.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts
Alberton, P.E.I.	371 75	206 47	165 48
Eldon "	571 76	237 77	333 99
Glenfinnan "	786 02	372 69	413 33
Mt. Stewart "	462 62	249 05	213 57
Rusticoville "	171 16	51 08	120 08
Vernon River "	722 67	329 93	392 74
Amherst, N.S.	1,352 04	591 71	760 33
Mabou "	615 96	228 55	387 41
Andover, N.B.	1,106 51	285 39	821 12
Rogersville "	324 64	54 90	269 74
Bondville, Que.	2,229 12	495 15	1,733 97
Chicoutimi "	734 55	104 25	630 30
Bowmanville, Ont.	2,191 18	327 84	1,863 34
Holmesville "	2,793 79	564 57	2,229 22
Renfrew "	324 42	151 64	172 78
Calgary, N.W.T.	191 10	76 86	114 24
Total	14,929 49	4,327 85	10,601 64

And when I brought up the matter last year, the minister said that the reason why the expenditure so greatly exceeded the receipts at all these stations was that the cost of labour was so great and that these experiments were carried on for the benefit of the public, in order to show the farmers how to make money out of fattening chickens. Well, Sir, I have gone through the expenditures of these several stations and have made out a table showing the receipts, and against these the expenses for purchase of chickens and for feed, leaving out altogether the expense for labour, and still I find that there is a loss in every case:—

CHICKEN FATTENING STATIONS.

Table showing receipts compared with expenses for purchase of chickens and cost of feed—cost of labour omitted.

Station.	Cost of Feed, &c.	Receipts	Loss.
	$	$	$
Alberton, P.E.I	281 45	206 47	74 98
Eldon "	41.) 26	237 77	181 49
Glenfinnan "	527 77	372 69	155 08
Mount Stewart, P.E.I.	362 62	249 05	113 57
Rusticoville, P.E.I	126 16	51 08	75 08
Vernon River "	366 67	329 93	36 74
Amherst, N.S.	923 48	591 71	331 77
Mabou "	379 94	228 55	151 39
Andover, N.B.	512 96	285 39	227 57
Rogersville, N.B	160 35	54 90	105 45
Bondville, Que.	892 94	495 15	397 79
Chicoutimi, Que	201 99	104 25	97 74
Bowmanville, Ont.	586 53	327 84	258 69
Holmesville "	1,020 42	564 57	455 85
Renfrew "	163 87	151 64	12 23
Calgary, N.W.T	95 10	76 86	18 24
Total Loss			2,693 66

And I have worked out the expenses for two places—Holmesville and Bondville, Que. For Holmesville I have the statement in detail showing exactly what was paid for the purchase of chickens and for various articles of feed, &c. :

Holmesville Poultry Station, details of expense, purchase of chickens and feed, &c., for same.

To 10 B. P. Rock Cockerels	$ 10 00
coal oil	13 40
300 lbs. blood meal	9 00
100 lbs. mica grit 75 cents, 100 lbs. digested wheat 85 cents	1 60
Flour $2.15, tallow $13.36, 1,700 lbs. milk at 25 cents	19 76
4,802 lbs. chickens	336 20
7,800 lbs. oat chop $95.44, 165 lbs. bran $1.65	96 09
Wheat $8.34, coal oil, 17 gall., $3.57.	11 91
Corn meal $15.10, oats, 2,931 lbs., $27.12	42 22
Plucking chickens	28 40
61 bushels barley	21 96
Mashing grain $5.93, buckwheat, 5,032 lbs. at 1 cent	56 23
Blood meal $2, 1,200 lbs. milk $3.00.	5 00
139⅜ bushels buckwheat	64 98
3,222 lbs. barley	24 16
2,658 lbs. oats, oats and barley bushels	36 86
1,329 lbs. mixed grain	11 96
88½ bushels, mixed grain	27 00
212 lbs. barley, 125 bushel roots	14 45
29 1-6 bushel wheat	22 30
6,640 lbs. milk	13 25
Express, freight and cold storage	61 22
Total	$927 95
Receipts	564 67
Loss	$363 38

Here we have a loss of $363. And yet the hon. gentleman is spending the money of the people of this country for gentlemen to go about telling the farmers that money is to be made by fattening chickens under his process, while the figures I have given show that actually more is spent for the chickens and the feed than he gets for the chickens when he sells them. And he explains that this is all an experiment for the benefit of the farmers. It is really to find employment for some of his supporters in different parts of the country. He certainly ought to have a revenue sufficient to pay the cost of the chickens and their feed. With the facts before them he will find it rather hard to convince the farmers of this country that there is money in the business as he would have them conduct it.

I could point to half a dozen other fads the hon. gentleman has engaged in, every one of them wasteful of the people's money. But, at this late date in the session, I shall not deal with these further than to say that everything the hon. gentleman touches, he makes a miserable failure of. Why, he thrust a meddling finger into the affairs of the Militia Department, and see the mess he has made of it.

The hon. gentleman has had printed and sent broadcast through the country not only the report of his department, but also the report of the Experimental Farm. I have here the report of the Experimental Farms for last year. At page 429 of that report, the hon. gentleman gives a statement of the expenditures of the Dominion Experimental Farms for the year ending June 30, 1903. He shows a total of $44,104.36 as having been expended on the Canadian Experimental Farm here. Then he credits the proceeds of sales and brings out a balance, showing, according to his figuring, that the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa costs the people of this country $40,622.50. Now, if that statement were correct, we could find no fault with it. But, as a matter of fact the statement is misleading. There is no farmer in the country or business man in the country who can learn from that statement the real expense of running this Central Experimental Farm. In the same way he gives the cost of the experimental farm at Nappan, of the farm at Brandon, of the farm at East Indian Head and of the farm at Agassiz.

These expenditures make a total of $84.-126.18. This, according to this report, is the total expenditure upon the experimental farms of this country. Now, we had this question up here before, and when the hon. gentleman asked supplies for the expenses of these farms, I stated then, as I state now, that these figures are not correct. Instead of $84,000 these farms cost over $103,000. Why, the hon. gentleman has not charged the experimental farm with any coal to keep the fires going nor with anything for lights. What farmer can run his business without taking into

account the expense of fuel and light? But the hon. gentleman, to show that he has been economical smothers that part of the account as well as some other items. And so he tries to make it appear that the experimental farms cost only $40,000 that year when the fact is that they cost about $60,000, as shown by the Auditor General's Report. Let the farmer run his business that way, and it would be easy for him to show a profit. He could say: I will not put in anything for wood, for the account is not paid yet. I have not paid for my electric light and coal oil. I will not put that in my expenditure. I will put in the expenditure so far as I have paid it, but what I have not paid for I will not put in the account but I will put in the receipts and in that way show that I have made a profit. But the hon. gentleman takes another plan; he puts down what he pleases and publishes to the farmers of this country, this business man of a farmer whom the Prime Minister tells the farmers of Canada is a practical, horny-handed son of toil, and a business man, who is to be believed in everything he says and yet he publishes at the expense of the people that report by the dozen. Yet the statements he gives to the farmers in it are not in accordance with the facts. I therefore beg to move:

That all the words after the word 'That' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

That according to the report of the Minister of Agriculture (pages 429, 430 and 431) the 'expenditure on the Dominion experimental farms for the year ending 30th June, 1903,' was as follows:—

Central Experimental Farm..	$44,104.36	
Less sales of steers..	4,082.00	
		$40,022.36
Experimental Farm, Nappan, N.S....	$13,329.95	
Less sales of steers..	1,830.00	
		11,499.95
Experimental Farm, Brandon..	$12,273.20	
Less sale of steers....	$566.05	
Grain supply, Ottawa..	125.48	
	691.53	
		11,581.67
Experimental Farm, Indian Head..	$12,190.51	
Less sale of steers....	$909.30	
Grain supply, Ottawa..	712.64	
	1,621.94	
		10,568.57
Experimental Farm, Agassiz, B.C...		10,455.63
Total..		$84,128.18

That according to the report of the Auditor General 'the expenditure on the Dominion Experimental Farms for the year ending June 30th, 1903,' was as follows:—

Central Experimental Farm, see Auditor General's Report, D—36..		$55,205 60
Central Experimental Farm, see Auditor General's Report, V—94...		8,205 68
Central Experimental Farm, see Auditor General's Report, V—112..		1,430 22
Central Experimental Farm, see Auditor General's Report, V—113..		110 65
		$64,952 15
Ex. Farm, Nappan, A. G. R., D—40..	$9,043.04	
Ex. Farm, Nappan, A. G. R., V—93..	30,06	
		$9,073.10
Ex. Farm, Brandon, A. G. R., D—44..	$9,251.09	
Ex. Farm, Brandon, A. G. R., V—93..	496.61	
		9,747.70
Ex. Farm, Indian Head, A. G. R., D—47..	$8,825.15	
Ex. Farm, Indian Head, A. G. R., V—93..	1,159.78	
		9,984.93
Ex. Farm, Agassiz, A. G. R., D—49..	$7,649.58	
Ex. Farm, Agassiz, A. G. R., V—94..	379.12	
		8,028.70
		$101,786.58
Special vote for printing and distribution of bulletins..		7,000.00
		$108,786.58

(See Minister's Report, page 432.)

Less revenue from sales, as shown in Auditor General's Report—		
Cen. Farm, Ottawa, D-130..	$2,974.00	
Nappan..	D-129.. 834.55	
Indian Head	D-129.. 702.12	
Brandon	D-129.. 591.23	
Agassiz..	D-128.. 410.84	
		5,512.74
Total expenditure above receipts.		$103,273.84
Whereas the minister's report says.		84,128.18
		$ 19,145.66

That this House affirms its belief in the correctness in the report of the Auditor General, and regrets that the Minister of Agriculture has omitted to set forth in his report a true and accurate statement of the expenditure upon the Dominion Experimental Farms.

That the difference between the expenditure as shown in the report of the Minister of Agriculture and the expenditure as shown in the report of the Auditor General amounts to no less than $19,145.66.

That this House regrets that the Minister of Agriculture has placed in his report a statement which must necessarily mislead those who do not fully investigate the matter.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The hon. gentleman has brought this question up to-night as a motion of want of confidence in the government on going into supply. I had supposed from what the hon. gentleman had said on a former occasion that he was going to discuss this question in Committee of Supply when the details could be discussed across the floor of the House. I shall not go into the details of the resolution which the hon.

gentleman has submitted to the House to any extent to-night. It seems to me that a discussion and investigation of that kind would be more appropriate in the Public Accounts Committee, than on the floor of parliament, with you, Mr. Speaker, in the chair. It is quite impossible for this House to follow a long detailed statement of figures of this kind, to investigate them and to go into them in a way that would be intelligible and which would elicit the exact facts and the full truth. The hon. gentleman on a former occasion, however, did make certain reflections based on a comparison of the statements in the Auditor General's Report and in the report of the experimental farms in reference to the expenditure of the various farms. I shall place before the House a few figures to show the hon. gentleman that while he appears to have found a discrepancy there is in fact absolutely no discrepancy at all. I have here a statement of the figures from the Auditor General's Report and also a statement from the farm report, from which the situation can be readily understood.

EXPLANATION OF TOTAL.

Central Farm expenditure for 1902-1903.

	Auditors'.	Farm.
Total expenditure..	$55,205.60	$40,022.36
Add to Auditor's figures.		
Expert services in London, England, determining value of 8 samples of Canadian wheat.. ..	25.54	
This item was not included in Auditor's statement	55,231.14	
Deduct from Auditor's figures—		
17½ p.c. salaries at Ottawa, charged to each branch farm	$4,182.47	
17½ p.c. botanical and entomological division charged to branch farm.. ..	2,345.00	
17½ p.c. chemical division charged to each branch farm....	3,296.76	
Seed grain distribution	$5,871.82	
Less value of grain from branch farms. ..	838.12	
	5,033.70	
Value of live stock transferred from Ottawa to Agassiz	350.00	
Freight on trees sent from Ottawa to Nappan..	1.20	
	15,209.13	
Deduct from farm figures— Freight on exhibition supplies to Nappan charged in error to Ottawa, in farm account..		0.35
	$40,022.01	$40,022.01

In other words the accounts are exactly identical except that the proportion of the salaries, which, in the Auditor General's Report, are charged to the central farm, have been in the farm report charged to the different farms and appear in the accounts of these farms on the succeeding pages. The whole thing comes out identically and exactly the same. Therefore, this accusation that the statements appearing in the farm report are inaccurate and misleading and not in accordance with the Auditor General's Report is unfounded because they are exactly and absolutely in accordance with the Auditor General's Report except for the difference in the division of salaries and expenses incurred by the different divisions of the experimental farms.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister if in his report at the end he puts in the accounts charged by the Department of Public Works to the experimental farm.

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not because these appear in a different department and apply to a different class of works altogether. The Public Works Department work at the experimental farms has nothing to do with the management of these farms. The report of the Public Works Department explains that. The report of the farms does not contain the work of the Public Works Department, but it does contain the work of the experimental farms and of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the farms.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Public Works Department supply coal and wood to the farms ?

Mr. FISHER. It does.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does my hon. friend charge that up to the expenditure ?

Mr. FISHER. No, coal and wood are charged to public buildings on the farms as elsewhere. That has been done ever since the establishment of the farm and it was the same under the regime which the hon. gentleman supported before 1896 as it is to-day. Exactly the same system was adopted and exactly the same charges were made in 1896 as to-day. The results are identically the same. The explanation of the difference which the hon. gentleman attempted to show which at the time I gave in general terms, I have now given in exact detail, and it fully sustains

what I said then. The hon. gentleman went on to talk about a number of other things connected with my department. I shall not go into the details as I said a few minutes ago. I am going to deal with the question on broad principles only. The hon. gentleman went on to speak about the census. I am surprised after what occurred last session in this House that the hon. gentleman or any of his friends should bring up that question. There was a motion introduced during the last session of this House upon which that question was thoroughly discussed, a motion which hon. gentlemen opposite moved on going into supply of censure upon this government, and especially upon the Minister of Agriculture in regard to the compiling of the census. I then showed very clearly what the result of that census was and the House was so satisfied with what I showed that it voted down by one of the largest majorities that a Liberal government ever had in this House, the motion of hon. gentlemen opposite. I freely admit that it did cost a great deal more than the censuses which hon. gentlemen opposite took in 1891 and 1881, but, Sir, I also showed and I was able to prove to a demonstration that the census of 1901 was an accurate census, was a census which gave full information in regard to the statistics of this country, whereas the census of 1891 was a census which was not only full of inaccuracies, but was full of deception and deceit and which went before the people of the country and showed falsehood and deceit on almost every line and page. I venture to say that it is far better for the people and far more to the credit of the government to be able to show true and accurate statistics of this country than to show inaccurate and false statistics even if the true statistics do require a little more money to get. It is easy enough to compile a census in the way in which the census of 1891 was compiled. It is easy enough to bring down schedule after schedule and inaccurately and carelessly compile them, but it is a different thing altogether to take these schedules and go over them and check them and go over them again and see that they are accurate. I need not go into that question as I did last year. I need not point out that in the whole of the province of Quebec while the census of the land area was taken in arpents and the census of the crops was taken in minots when the schedules came to be compiled in Ottawa the minots were written as bushels and the arpents were written as acres with the result that the whole province of Quebec made a poorer showing in its production than any other part of the Dominion. This is only one of the hundreds of specimens of the way in which the census of 1891 was compiled. It is easy enough to make compilations of that kind but if the census had been properly and accurately compiled I venture to say that it would have cost more than the census of 1901. I do not for a moment shrink from taking credit for the fact that upon the census of 1901 we have spent enough money to make it an accurate and true census of the statistics of Canada, not such a census as the census of 1891 was, and which has gone abroad to the country and to the world as misrepresenting the people of Canada, misrepresenting their numbers, misrepresenting their industries, misrepresenting their productions in a way that is a shame and a disgrace to the people who compiled that census and who are responsible for its taking.

The hon. gentleman has gone on to speak in regard to some other branches of my department. He spoke about the cheese curing rooms. He said that I have inaugurated some experiments in regard to improvements in cheese curing. That is quite true. I glory in the fact. I am willing to take all the credit or all the disgrace connected with that fact. It is true that a few years ago the quality of our cheese was being criticised on the English market because of the condition in which it arrived in Great Britain. It is true that a certain unevenness of quality was remarked and that we investigated the reasons so as to ascertain whether it was due to the fact that our cheese was not cured at the proper temperature to make it as good as it could be made. We had discussed this question with the cheese-makers in the country. Prof. Robertson, myself and other officers of the department had gone to the great dairy conventions of the country and had discussed the question as to what ought to be done to remedy this evil. We found, as a matter of fact, that the evil was largely if not altogether due to the uneven temperature of the cheese-curing rooms. Then, the question arose: How could it be demonstrated that our cheese should be cured in an even temperature? We discussed it with experts. The result was that we established large central curing rooms. There was no use in carrying on experiments of this kind on a small scale by which a few cheese might be cured here and there. It was necessary to cure enough to show that this method was the proper one to remedy the defect which then existed. We did that. These central curing rooms cost a good deal of money. The hon. gentleman has given a lot of figures which I cannot dispute. I have not the figures under my hand necessary to do so. I will have to take the hon. gentleman's figures as being correct which is rather a large supposition when the hon. gentleman refers to figures in this House.

The hon. gentleman must know, if he has studied the question, that the result of the cool curing has been an absolute success; that the cheese so cured brings a higher price and that the people who handle that cheese in the English market, our only market for the export of cheese, prefer it and pay a higher price for it than for the ordinary cheese. I shall not go into any lengthy details, but I will point out, that during the present session the cool-cured cheese sold in the markets of St. Hyacinthe, Cowansville, Brockville and Woodstock. On June 9th, in Brockville the board price of cheese was eight cents, but every cheese that came out of the government cool-curing room sold for from 8 3-16ths to 8⅛ cents. On June 16th, the ruling price was 8 cents, and the price of the cool-cured cheese was 8 3-16, 8¼ and 8⅛ cents. On June 23rd at Brockville, the cool-cured cheese commanded 7⅞ and 7 11-16ths cents as against 7½ cents for the ordinary cheese. This shows that buyers appreciate the superiority of the cool-cured cheese and are willing to pay more for it. On June 27th, the board price was eight cents, and again the cool-cured cheese sold for 8⅛, 8¼ and 8 3-16 cents. There is another remarkable illustration of this. There was a factory near Brockville which had not access to the cool-curing room because it had already all the work it could do. That factory went to the manager and said: If you allow us to bring our cheese to the cool-curing room we will not only pay you as usual, but we will treat our cheese ourselves and pay all the expenses of it, because a buyer in Montreal has offered to pay us ¼ cent more for our cheese right straight through the season if we can get it cured in the cool-curing room. One of the largest buyers in Montreal considered that cheese cooled in this way at the government station was worth one quarter cent per pound more than the cheese cured in the ordinary factory. I think I have said enough to show that the statement of the hon. gentleman in regard to the cool-curing rooms is absolutely without foundation. I have shown that the men who are engaged in the business, the buyers in Montreal and in England and that sellers in Canada, appreciate and understand the value this process has been to them, and are prepared to endorse the policy of the government. I may say that during last winter I have had application after application for the establishment of cool-curing rooms all over Ontario, and if the people engaged in the industry were not satisfied with it, they would not have made this application. The statement which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has made is absolutely without foundation and it only shows his ignorance of the cheese industry in this country.

And now as to the poultry industry. I may point out that before these fattening stations were established it was practically impossible in Canada to get fattened poultry for the table. We were exporting no fattened poultry to Europe, but immediately after the establishment of the fattening stations our poultry exports to Great Britain increased from $18,000 the year before, to over $230,000 the year after. Since that time our exports to England have dropped off, and the reason is that the Canadian market has awakened to the fact that good fattened poultry can be bought in Canada and to-day, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Halifax, Sydney, Hamilton, Guelph and the other cities within reach of these poultry fattening stations absorb the whole output so that they cannot export one pound of poultry, and the supply in fact is not equal to the local demand. The hon. gentleman says that these poultry stations have been expensive. They have been to a certain extent expensive, but it must be remembered that experimental and educational work has been going on at them. It is idle to suppose that an experimental and teaching station would meet the expenses by its output alone.

Mr. TAYLOR. The chickens should pay for themselves and their feed.

Mr. FISHER I will not pretend that an experimental station in this or any other country will pay its own way in revenue from its sales. If the hon. gentleman wishes to take issue with me on that, I am ready to go before any audience in this country and fight the point out with him.

Mr. TAYLOR. I invite the hon. gentleman to a mass meeting in my constituency and we will discuss it

Mr. FISHER. Very well, I will go there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Name a day.

Mr. FISHER. I will name a day when the elections come, and I will meet the hon. gentleman. I know the hon. gentleman thinks he has a Tory hive in Leeds, but I am not afraid in the least to face the hon. gentleman, or any other of his gang, and to meet them on the platform, because I believe that the farmers of Leeds in general are intelligent men. That is rather a difficult thing for one to believe in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has been representing them for so many years. But I still have faith in human nature, and I am led to the conclusion that the constituents of Leeds have not been told the whole truth about public affairs or the hon. gentleman would not represent them in this House. I state emphatically that experimental work is a good investment in the interest of the farmers and agriculturists of this country, even though it should cost more than it gives in money return. I believe that by reason of the experimental work which is being carried on by the gov-

ernment of Canada—a good deal of it carried on before I came into office, more of it carried on since I came into office—as a result of that experimental work to-day the farmers of Canada have at their command a mass of information which is of the utmost utility to them ; a mass of information which is better and more complete than the information which the farmers of any other country on the face of the earth have to aid them in their business.

That is not a boast which is undue or unfounded. It is a boast which I make because of the statements of the people in foreign countries who are coming to Canada for information, for models, for examples as to how best to carry on the work of agriculture. In view of that fact, I venture to say that the trivial criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite will fall to the ground, and farmers of Canada will support the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in its efforts on their behalf.

Before I leave this poultry business, I would like to read a few statements of men who, having learned of what could be done in the way of fattening poultry, have entered into the business on their own behalf, and have made it pay.

S. Cox, Auburn Ont., January 27, 1904 : The few chickens I fed I had very good success with and think it is the ideal way to fatten chickens. I received 10 cents per pound, plucked, not drawn, and could have sold ten times as many at the same price. I think the price for chickens not crate-fattened was from 6 cents to 7 cents per pound.

Arsène Tremblay, Chicoutimi, P.Q. : Profiting by the example of the illustration station at Chicoutimi, I fattened my poultry and obtained a much better result. The chickens sold for 95 cents a pair, that is to say, nearly 12 cents per pound, something to which we have not been accustomed. Until the last year we have sold our poultry for 40 cents to 50 cents per pair. I have only congratulations to make on the system taught by the Department of Agriculture. The happy result I obtained this year encourages me to increase my flock of poultry next year.

William Soules, Bondville, Que., bought several hundred chickens at 7 cents per pound, live weight, fattened them and sold them in Montreal at 12½ cents per pound, plucked weight. After deducting the price of feed and skim-milk from the price realized for the chickens, he stated he had made a profit of $20 per 100 chickens fatted.

James. W. C. Moore, Eldon, P.E.I., February, 1904 : Experience in chicken fattening has proved to me what can be done in making the business a profitable investment. Before the fattening stations were established chickens were sent to market in a poor condition and could not realize more than 5 cents per pound. Now farmers can realize 10 cents per pound.

D. Marchbank, Montrose, P.E.I., January 25, 1904 : My opinion is that most of our farmers make a great mistake in not taking more interest in the poultry business. I find it pays me for I ship my fowl to J. A. Leaman & Company, Halifax, and received 10 cents per pound for them last year. I received an order from them in February, stating that if I had any more of the same stock on hand they would pay 13 cents per pound, so I consider this much better than selling them in Alberton for 5 cents and 6 cents per pound.

James W. C. Moore, Eldon, P.E.I., February 1, 1904: Experience in chicken fattening has proved to me what can be done in making the poultry business a profitable investment. Before the fattening stations were established chickens were sent to market in a poor condition and could not realize more than 5 cents per pound. Now farmers are taking more interest in poultry and can realize 10 cents per pound.

If, by the expenditure of a few thousand dollars a year, such information can be given to our farmers as to enable them to sell their chickens at 10, 12 or 13 cents a pound, where they were formerly selling them for 5 cents a pound, I venture to say that the $4,000 or the $5,000 of expenditure is an absolutely good investment for the people of Canada. My hon. friend denounced me and the government pretty thoroughly for our extravagance and our increases of expenditure. I am willing to accept the full responsibility of the increased expenditure on the experimental farms and the other branches of the Department of Agriculture. Whenever I can see any way of profitably expending money so that money can be put into the pockets of the farmer of Canada, I am going to come to this House and ask for that money ; and I am glad to say, and I am proud of the fact that my colleagues and the majority of the House have abundantly supported me in that policy. I am proud of the confidence of the House in this respect, and I can assure the House and hon. gentlemen opposite that I will do my best to deserve that confidence in the future by studying how money can be profitably spent for the benefit of agriculture in Canada ; because in this young country, which is developing vast areas of agricultural land, a great live stock industry, including poultry, and various manufacturing industries which are closely allied with the agricultural interests, I venture to say that our prosperity largely depends on the success of our agriculturists. If to-day Canada is prosperous, if our trade and commerce is advancing by leaps and bounds, it is largely due to the fact that our farmers are increasing their products enormously from year to year, and are receiving extra prices for them. The result is that they have a large amount of money to expend on manufactured products, and they help the transportation interest by supplying the articles to be carried, and by consuming articles which have to be carried to them. Therefore, I believe that the expenditure of money on behalf of agriculture, if done wisely and well, is abundantly justified. When the hon. gentleman a little while ago was talking in a loud voice, somebody said his thunder had been stolen. No, Mr. Speaker, it was not

the thunder that had been stolen. The thunder was all there; the noise was all there; but there was no lightening for the hon. gentleman for it strikes nowhere and accomplishes no harm to those against whom he is speaking.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman who has just sat down had adopted throughout the whole of his speech the responsible attitude which he assumed in the last four or five sentences of it, perhaps we would not have so much reason to complain; but unfortunately it was only during the last four or five sentences that the hon. gentleman recollected that he was the representative of an intelligent and peaceful class of the community, the farmers of Canada. Before that he assumed an attitude which he has been fond of assuming lately, which I venture to say does not very well become him, that is, a belligerent attitude, in which he attempts to intimidate hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. So long as the hon. gentleman assumes the gentle, ladylike attitude which becomes him so well, we have no great reason to complain. The people of the country recognize that in having the hon. gentleman as a representative of the farming class, they have not exactly a horny-handed son of toil. Still, they are prepared to believe that he is a respectable citizen of Canada, endeavouring, according to the light he possesses, which is not saying very much, to promote the interests of the farmers of Canada.

But the hon. gentleman has not seen fit to meet the issue and has preferred to bluster and make an unseemly noise. The square issue is this. In his report on the experimental farm on page 429, the hon. minister gives the expenditure for the year ending 30th of June, 1903, as amounting to $84,128.18. That statement my hon. friend from Leeds has shown to be false and misleading. The true figures are $19,141.66 in excess of that amount. How that expenditure has been divided among the various farms is a matter of no practical interest at present. What we are concerned with is the fact that the total expenditure is over $103,000, whereas the hon. minister in his report puts it down as $84,000. On looking hurriedly at page V—94 of the Auditor General's Report, I find various items of expenditure in connection with the Central Farm at Ottawa—not one cent of which is included by the hon. minminister in his statement, amounting to $8,205.68, showing the total expenditure to be $84,000. Again on turning to page V—112, I find an expenditure, for instance, of $1,430.22 in connection with the Ottawa Experimental Farm not included in his statement, and on the next page, V—113, I find an expenditure of $110.65, which is equally left out. The hon. gentleman has been compelled to admit that in his statement he deliberately omitted the items, of coal and wood, light, &c.; and I venture to say that if he goes to the riding represented by the hon. member for Leeds or any other riding in this country, he may speak for hours and will not be able to convince the people that he has any justification for leaving out of the expenditures connected with these farms for coal and wood and other items amounting to over $19,000. Let him speak for any length of time he chooses, he cannot prevent ther coming to the conclusion that any statement which does not include these items is a garbled and dishonest account. Therefore when the hon. minister instead of frankly telling us that he has blundered, tries to excuse himself by saying he has followed the system which was pursued in the old days, he is using an argument which will not commend itself to the people. The question is not what former governments have done, because we are bound to progress, and those who cannot keep pace with the march of progress had better get out and make way for others who can. Let me say to this gentleman, who used to be content with the sickle and the pruning hook, but who now, while he dangles a scythe from his left hand, swings the sword in his right, that it ill becomes him to speak as he has done, and that it would be much better for him to try and give some reasonable explanation for his conduct. When he speaks, as he has done, of the constituents of my hon. friend from Leeds, as the gang led by that hon. gentleman, let me tell him that his head seems to be swelling larger and larger visibly because forsooth he thinks he has got the better of Lord Dundonald in the petty struggle which he has forced on that gentleman, and that when he attempts to decry the people who support such men as my hon. friend from Leeds and other members of the opposition in this House, he will learn perhaps before long that these men will show where their strength lies, and that even with his pruning hook and sword he cannot intimidate the great electorate of this country.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of following the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) in his general argument, but only desire to deal in a general way with a matter which has been alluded to, and to which, as I am acquainted with the facts, I feel justified in calling attention. Reference has been made to the poultry stations, and the one established at Holmesville has been especially dealt with. Holmesville happens to be in my own riding. It is in the centre of a strongly Conservative part of the constituency. Yet I challenge any hon. gentleman on the opposite side to come into the riding of West Huron and attempt to convince the farmers there that the government's expenditure on the poultry station at Holmesville was an unwise or extravagant expenditure and make a single

vote thereby. While the figures given in the Auditor General's Report show an apparent discrepancy between the receipts and expenditure, they are misleading to this extent, that, unless you know the circumstances, you cannot fairly judge as to the actual results of the work of the station As the hon. minister has said, there was no desire or expectation, in establishing these poultry stations—as is the case with other experimental stations—that they would be self-sustaining. But a large number of chickens are sold during the year after the Auditor General's Report is closed. If the report was made out to show the receipts for a year of the poultry station's operations, it would show that, except for expenditure on capital account—for buildings and so on—there would be very little loss. As a result of the work of the station at Holmesville—and I speak only of that, for it is the one with whose work I am familiar—in our section of the country, where we formerly bought chickens at 25 cents and 30 cents a pair the farmers are now selling them, as stated by the hon. minister, at 10 cents per pound. The people have so improved their raising of poultry through the lessons they learned in connection with the poultry station that they are now supplying the local demand at 10 cents per pound—and let me say that they cannot fully supply the demand even at that price. The hon. gentleman may take exception to anything he likes in connection with the Department of Agriculture, but I challenge him again to take exception in West Huron to the work of the poultry station in that riding. Even the hon. gentleman's Conservative friends endorse it. I know a large number of Conservatives who believe that it has been one of the best institutions ever established under the Department of Agriculture. Men who, at the outset, thought it nothing but an election dodge are willing to admit that it has been practically useful in the development of the poultry industry.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Inasmuch as something has been said concerning the poultry stations, and as the station established in the town of Renfrew has been referred to, I shall say a word in defence of it, if defence is required. I do not think that any one in the Dominion expects that the experimental farm is going to be an unqualified success financially, and that the balance will invariably be on the right side. But I know that throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion the people are fully satisfied with the work done there. If anything were necessary to prove that fact that proof would be found in the large number of excursions that come to the farm every year from every part of the Dominion of Canada. The farmers come because they expect to learn something, and they go away satisfied because they have learned something. And let me say one word of the work that is being carried on by Professor Saunders at that farm. If nothing else had been accomplished by the experimental farm except the successful crossing of wheat and the production of new varieties which will ripen two or three days earlier than others of equal usefulness and value, these experiments alone would make the experimental farm system an unqualified success. These new varieties of wheat will put millions of dollars into the pockets of the farmers of the Northwest, for they are looking for a wheat that will ripen early. The farmers are getting rich every day under the patronage of this government, and that I shall be able to prove. With reference to cool curing of cheese, if there is one thing in relation to the cheese industry which stands out prominently above the others as a marked success, it is the cool curing. If anything were necessary to prove that, I can furnish that proof. It is only a few weeks ago that a deputation of farmers came from the township of Ross to my own town of Renfrew, to the creamery company there, and asked if they could not make arrangements for the cool curing of cheese for the various factories in that section. They said that about twenty factories wanted to bring in cheese and have us cool them and keep them, because we have large cold storage rooms and we could care for the cheese better than they could be cared for elsewhere. They said they could get more for cheese that was cool-cured, and besides there was not the shrinkage that there was under the other system of curing, and they were prepared to give fair remuneration if we would undertake this work for the various factories in that vicinity. And that matter has been taken up for consideration. What the result may be it is impossible for me to say. Now, with reference to the chicken industry. Of course, nobody expected that these experiments were going to be a financial success in themselves, because it is impossible for one to get at once the right kind of chickens to make a success of the system of fattening. The first year it is likely to be a comparative failure. The next year they get a better class of chickens, and year by year the financial results are more favourable. With reference to the industry in my own town, I remember the difficulty we had in selling eggs years ago—say in 1893, Chickens were bought at 5 cents per pound, and we were glad to get rid of them at that price. The difficulty was to sell them. Now, the thing is changed, and chickens are readily sold at good prices. The same was true of eggs. In 1893 we bought them and sold them at 8 cents per dozen. Allow me to give you one little incident with reference to the eggs; and I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will pass it over to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). In 1893 I was purchasing thousands and thousands of dozens of eggs at 8 cents a dozen. A farmer came to my store with a basket of eggs and asked me what I would give him. I said: 'The best

I can do is 8 cents a dozen. Do you see those cases outside ? I have just sold them at 7¾ cents a dozen—I am losing a quarter of a cent on every dozen.' 'Well,' he said, 'what are the farmers of this country going to do ? We cannot raise eggs at that price. We will have to go to the other side, or do something else. The fact is that that price will not pay for the wear and tear of the hens.' Now, let me show you how all this is changed. And, in order to show, I will read a few lines from a circular I received the other day from Montreal :

Montreal, June 14th.

Dear Sir,—We will give you 14 cents for all the fresh eggs you can ship this week.

How does that compare with 8 cents a dozen in the old Conservative days ? I think that the farmers realize that they are living under a different administration, and will give credit to whom credit is due. Now, I wish to say a word with reference to the fattening of chickens.

Mr. POPE. What do you pay for eggs ?

Mr. WRIGHT. We pay 15 cents a dozen, and cannot get enough of them at that. Now, let me read an extract from the Renfrew 'Mercury' of February 14th, 1902—this date being just a short time after the chicken fattening station had been established in Renfrew. And let me call your attention to the fact, and to ask you to bear it in mind, that the person who gives the information to the Renfrew 'Mercury' is Mr. David Muirhead, a leading Conservative in our town, and president of the Farmers' Institute :

An Admaston farmer resolved to make a test—to see if in farm practice there was really any profit in fattening chickens on the plan followed at the government's experimental station here a short time ago. So he took 30 ordinary chickens—not at all large ones—and fed them on oats and barley, mixed with low grade flour—for five weeks, and then sent 24 of them off to a Montreal commission merchant whose name was one of several which had been furnished him by Mr. F. C. Hare, the government's demonstrator. He received answer that the 24 fowl had weighed 158 pounds, and remittance was made for them at the rate of 11 cents (eleven) cents a pound in Montreal. The expressage cost the Admaston farmer 80 cents per 100 pounds, so that he received $10.20 per 100 pounds net for his fowl. The fowl were kept confined in coops, were fed twice a day, and in the five weeks the thirty ate 8 bushels of oats, 2 bushels of barley, and 100 pounds of low-grade (unsaleable) flour with just enough skim-milk added to make the food moist. Water to drink and gravel to peck were supplied. The farmer was so well pleased with the result of his experiment, that he will fatten more chickens next year. He knows nothing that pays better for the amount of labour involved. The merchant to whom he sold rather took his breath away by writing that if he could supply broilers weighing 1½ or 2 pounds in April or May, he would get 45 cents a pound for them.

I wish to place before the House account sales of the eggs that were shipped from my town last winter. I have here an invoice of eggs which were sold to Bate & Co., in Ottawa :

February 10, 12 dozen fresh eggs at 40 cents, $4.80.

How does that compare with your eight cents under the Conservative rule ?

February 17, 12 dozen fresh eggs at 40 cents, $4.80.
February 19, 12 dozen fresh eggs at 40 cents, $4.80.
February 26, 24 dozen fresh eggs at 40 cents, $9.60.
March 4, 24 dozen fresh eggs at 35 cents, $8.40.
March 11, 24 dozen fresh eggs at 35 cents, $8.40.
a total of $40.80.

This will show you whether there is money in raising eggs if you do it properly.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask what change has been brought about by this government to cause the price of eggs to go up ?

Mr. COCHRANE. They have got a lot of suckers around.

Mr. WRIGHT. They are teaching the people how to raise the eggs, and to have them for market at a proper time. They also have helped to obtain a market for them. We are getting a home market now and we are also getting more for anything sent abroad than we got before. I have here some invoices of eggs sent to Walter Paul, of Montreal. Here is one :

January 25, 9 dozen eggs at 40 cents, $3.60.
January 25, 3 dozen eggs, small, at 30 cents, 90 cents.

This shows you the discrimination there is now. In the old days there was not this discrimination.

I have here also an invoice for eggs shipped to Mr. Henry Gatehouse, of Montreal :

January 12, 24 dozen eggs at 30 cents, $7.20.

I have others which show about the same rates.

I have here also invoices of chickens sent to Mr. Gatehouse.

Here is one :

October 1, 2 coops chickens, 60 — 66=126 at 12 cents, $15.12.

That certainly is better that the 5 cents a pound which we got in the old days.

Here is another :

March, 30, 50 pounds fowl at 9 cents a pound, $4.50.

There were 6 fowls in this and they netted him 75 cents each.

Here is another one :

October 30, 139 pounds chickens at 10 cents a pound, $13.90.

There were 20 chickens in this lot so that they netted him 70 cents each. Surely this

ought to prove that the lessons which have been given to the farmers in our section of the country have been productive of much good. If any other evidence is necessary to prove that the farmers are doing better than they did we can find it in the export of farm produce which is now being made. In 1896 we exported only $50,000,000 worth of farm products whereas last year we exported no less than $114,000,000. In 1896 we sent in round numbers only $14,000,000 worth of cheese, whereas last year we sent out $25,000,000 worth. Surely this shows that this country is progressing and that the farmers are moving onward.

A good deal of fault has been found with regard to the Minister of Agriculture himself, the statement being made that he is not a proper man to fill that position. I would like to show you how an outsider regards the present Minister of Agriculture. Here is a letter which was published in the Renfrew 'Mercury.' The letter was written from Riverside, California, on March 31, 1904. I need not read the first part of the letter but I shall quote this portion which refers to the Minister of Agriculture :

> In an agricultural way you have gained enormously over this country. Speaking recently with one of the ablest men who are taking care of our agricultural and horticultural interests at Washington I was really pleased to have him say that the Department of Agriculture in Canada was far in advance of that in this country.

Surely this does not look much as if we had inefficient men at the head of affairs here. I am proud to say, I am proud to know that the farmers of this country are progressing and when the day comes for the farmers to give their verdict I have no doubt in my own mind that the verdict will be that the present government shall be returned and that the Minister of Agriculture will be maintained in his position. Then the farmers will go on progressing at the same rate as they have done for the last six or seven years.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I would not have taken any part in this discussion were it not that a remark made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) caused me to look at the record of that chicken fattening station of which he seems to feel so proud, and criticism of which he seems to think would be of no assistance to his opponents in his own riding. I think it is a function of the government to make experiments and we do not expect the result of the experiments in each case to be a profit, but in this experimental station at Holmesville—and I believe the same thing is true of all the chicken fattening stations—the proceeds of the sales do not pay for the feed and the cost of the chickens bought, and surely the feed cannot be charged up to experimenting. Surely if they are feeding these chickens on new improved scientific principles they should be able to sell the chickens for the amount which the feed cost and the cost of the purchased chickens, especially when we are informed that they are sold at an advanced price, at a price 2 to 4 cents more than the ordinary price. In connection with this Holmesville fattening station the only item outside of feed and purchased fowls which I will take into account are $13.40 for coal oil and $28.40 for plucking the chickens. There are $9.85 for cold storage and all the rest is for feed and the cost of the chickens, making the total cost $902.85. In this not a single dollar is taken into account for labour, but no farmer or any one else could fatten chickens without some labour.

Mr. HOLMES. In the Auditor General's Report for last year, the hon. member will find that there is an expenditure of over $1,000 for buildings.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am not taking one single cent of that into account. If the hon. gentleman had listened he would have heard me state that I did not take into account a single cent except the cost of chickens and the feed. I did not count in a cent for labour or for sundries although there is an item of $100 charged for sundries. The total cost for feed, chickens bought and the three small items mentioned about which there can be do difference of opinion as to the propriety of the charge is $902.85 and the receipts from the sales last year were $564.57 leaving a deficit of $338.28, although we are counting nothing but the cost of the feed and the chickens themselves and the minor items before mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR. What did the chickens sell for ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am not so much surprised at the loss when we think of the sale price. I find in the Auditor General's Report at page D—112 the statement that 730 chickens weighing 2,617 pounds sold for $97.92, an average of 3¾ cents a pound though the minister and the member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) both stated these government fattened chickens sell at very high prices—about 10 cents per pound. If the hon. member for West Huron told his constituents the whole truth I am afaid he might not find them so well pleased with the chicken fattening stations. I turn to another sale of poultry from the Bienville chicken fattening station and I find that eleven cases containing 550 pounds sold for $40.26 or 7¼ cents per pound so that all the government fattened chickens do not bring 10 cents a pound. I have no word to say in condemnation of experimental stations. I do not expect them to pay but I do say there is no reason why the amount brought for these chickens should not pay for the cost of the food and the cost of the chickens originally if the thing is conducted properly.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor) negatived on division.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Dominion lands—amount required to pay accounts in connection with the late J. E. Mailhoit's survey, $245.66.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). This surveyor died while the survey was in progress and there were certain accounts to be paid.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he has ever considered the idea of buying out the lands of the Hudson's Bay Company and those of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. SIFTON. The question has never been considered.

Mr. WILSON. I notice that the cost of surveying lands in the Northwest Territories is charged to capital account. What is done with the money that you receive for the lands ? I do not understand why the surveying of this country should be charged to capital account when, as I presume, you take the revenue and use it for ordinary expenses.

Mr. SIFTON. These surveys have always been charged to capital account.

Mr. WILSON. That is no reason. We want the reason why they should be charged to capital account. It does not follow that because other people did so it is a good reason. If you are using the money that you get for these lands for ordinary expenses I do not see why you should not pay for the surveying out of ordinary revenue ?

Mr. SIFTON. The former government charged the surveys to capital account on the principle that they added to the value of the land. I do not think my hon. friend would expect that at this hour of the evening we should debate this question exhaustively. We have continued the practice of the former government. A very proper question was raised by the member for West Toronto when he pointed out that the cost of surveys was charged to capital account, and when this money was refunded by the railway companies the refund was placed to the account of ordinary consolidated revenue. I will call the attention of the Minister of Finance to that and he will probably deal with it at a later date.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the Blood reserve south of Calgary been thrown open for grazing lease purpose ? If so, who has secured the lease ?

Mr. SIFTON. This is connected with the Indian Department, but I have no objection to answer the question now so far as I can from memory. The land has not been thrown open in the ordinary sense of the word but the Indians surrendered the Blood reserve for leasing purposes on the application of Donald McEwan and Company. The proposition of this firm was submitted to the Indians who held a meeting and accepted it, and it was agreed to by the department. The lease is very complicated in its character, and I will lay a copy on the table when the supplementary estimates for the Indian Department come up. For many years the Blood Indians have been in the habit of allowing leasing privileges upon the reserve, and that terminates when they agreed to a lease of the whole reserve.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have the Indians assigned to the government the leasing privileges, and does the revenue go to the Indians ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is not exactly that, but perhaps that may be the substance of it. The company made a proposition to the Indians in presence of officers of the government, setting out all the terms upon which a lease should be granted. The Indian band in accordance with the law met and agreed to it, and the lease was then ratified by the department. The revenue goes to the Indians.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have the lessees the privilege of releasing it ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. My information is that they have released these lands. I have heard that one large firm of cattle exporters have bought a bunch of 8,000 extra cattle to put on this reserve.

Mr. SIFTON. They have no right to release.

Mr. CLANCY. Last year we got from the sale of Dominion lands $1,695,000 which went into revenue and we chargd to capital account for surveys $449,000, so that more than $1,000,000 goes to the credit of the Minister of Finance in this way to make up his surpluses. What we get for the sale of our land, which in itself is capital, we put into the revenue, and at the same time we charge the cost of surveys to capital. I am sure the good business sense of the Minister of Customs will revolt against that system of book-keeping, although he seems to like surpluses. It is no excuse to say that the former government did this, because the revenue from the sale of our lands is now a very considerable amount, and whether the former government did or did not, the system is deceiving and misleading. Perhaps the Minister of the Interior with our assistance can induce the Minister of the Interior to amend his book-keeping.

Mr. SIFTON. This revenue includes the payment of dues and mining fees, and it is not all received from Dominion lands.

Mr. CLANCY. The greater portion of that revenue comes from the sale of Dominion lands.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Reverting again to the leasing of the Blood reserve, can the minister

state approximately what number of acres it contains ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is a very large reserve, but I cannot state the number of acres.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the minister think that reserve should be leased in the ordinary manner ?

Mr. SIFTON. It could not be leased in the ordinary manner.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Ordinary Dominion lands, as I understand it are leased at the rate of two cents an acre for a period of twenty-one years, but does not the minister think that when such a large acreage of Indian lands is to be leased it should be advertised, public competition invited, and the lease given to the highest bidder ?

Mr. SIFTON. When the hon. gentleman sees the lease, I think he will find that the terms are more advantageous than the terms in the ordinary lease of Dominion lands. It would be impossible to deal with this matter in the way he suggests, because the Indians would not agree to it. The agreement of the Indians to the lease would have to be secured by the persons who made the proposition, and by these persons giving to them a variety of things which the Indians insist on. If we put it up for tender it would not answer the purpose of the Indians at all.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If it is advantageous to the Indians to get 2 cents an acre, under the ordinary system, it would be doubly advantageous for them to get 4 cents an acre ; and if the leases were thrown open to competition, they might have secured a greater revenue from the lands than they do by leasing them to one individual. If the minister makes an investigation, I think he will find that the party to whom this land was leased, released it to some other parties in part or in whole, and that it has been stocked with Mexican cattle, which have been brought to that country in thousands.

Department of the Geological Survey—salaries, including J. F. Lyons at $800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $59,475.

Mr. SPROULE. What work are you doing on the survey this year ?

Mr. SIFTON. Mr. Faribault with two assistant geologists is working in the more westerly of the gold districts of Nova Scotia. Mr. Fletcher with two assistant geologists is engaged in King's, Annapolis and Cumberland counties. Dr. Henry S. Poole is to complete the work necessary to construct a geological map of the district around Lake Ainslie in Cape Breton. Dr. Ells, assisted by Mr. Robert Johnston, has been at work in Charlotte county, New Brunswick, and has since gone to work in British Columbia. Professor L. W. Bailey is defining the boundaries of the rock formations in the counties of York and Carleton, New Brunswick. Dr. J. A. Dresser is continuing the work of previous years in defining the copper-bearing belts in the eastern townships. Dr. Robert Chalmers is investigating the surface geology of the county of Gaspé and of the country along the south side of the lower St. Lawrence. Professor Ernest Haycock and Mr. Frank Johnston are to complete a geological map of the southwestern part of the county of Ottawa. Mr. C. W. Willimott is collecting supplies of minerals for educational institutions and for the new museum. The work will lie principally in the province of Quebec, but he will also collect in Ontario and Nova Scotia. Professor W. A. Parks, assisted by Mr. H. L. Kerr is at work on the western side of Lake Temiskaming. Dr. A. E. Barlow, is to continue work in the Timigami lake region. Mr. E. D. Ingall and Mr. Theo. Dennis are working in the neighbourhood of Bruce Mines. Messrs. Wilson and Collins are working in the country lying northward of Long Lake. Mr. Charles Camsell is working in eastern Manitoba and those parts of the country between Lake Winnipeg and the Severn river. Mr. O'Sullivan is engaged on the southern and western coasts of James Bay. Mr. McInnes is following up work which was begun last year in the region lying to the south of Hudson Bay. Mr. Lawrence Lambe is making a collection of fossil remains found in the Cypress Hills in the Northwest Territories. Professor John Macoun is working in the botanist park in the Rocky Mountains, as botanist and zoologist. Mr. D. B. Dowling is working in the coal fields of the Rocky Mountain region. Mr. A. P. Low is engaged in the Hudson Bay expedition, accompanied by Mr. C. L. King. Mr. R. W. Brock is engaged in the Lardeau mining district of British Columbia. Dr. R. A. Daly is engaged in a survey along the boundary line in British Columbia. Mr. McConnell is engaged in the Yukon Territory. Mr. Joseph Keele is investigating discoveries of gold on the Stewart river in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. INGRAM. Are these all the names of the parties connected with the Geological Survey Department ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have not given them all, because they are not all at work in the field. If my hon. friend would like to have the list, with the salaries paid, I will give it : The acting director, Dr. Bell, $3,500 ; Dr. Whiteaves, $2,600 ; Dr. Hoffmann, $2,600 ; Professor Macoun, $2,450 ; Dr. Ells, $2,350 ; Hugh Fletcher, $2,350 ; R. G. McConnell, $2,350 ; E. D. Ingall, $2,100 ; A. B. Low, $2,050 ; L. N. Lambe, $1,900 ; Robert Chalmers, $1,900 ; William McInnes, $1,900 ; H. M. Ami, $1,900 ; E. R. Faribault, $1,900 ; A. E. Barlow, $1,850 ; J. M. Macoun, $1,800 ; F. G. Wait, $1,750 ; D. B. Dowling, $1,700 ; C. O. Senecal, $1,700 ; R. A. A. Johnston,

$1,600 ; R. W. Brock, $1,400 ; W. J. Wilson, $1,250 ; Theophile Dennis, $1,250 ; Joseph Keele, $1,550 ; two vacancies, one at $1,150 and the other at $1,100 ; John Marshall, $2,000 ; C. W. Willimott, $1,500 ; R. L. Broadbent, $1,500 ; L. N. Richard, $1,250 ; A. T. McKinnon, $850 ; J. A. McGee, $825 ; John Thorburn, $800 ; and J. F. Lyons, $800.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman any control over these men ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, the same control as we have over government officers generally.

Mr. INGRAM. What do you do with men who are incompetent in this department ?

Mr. SIFTON. If incompetency is brought home to any one, the usual practice is to remove him from office.

Mr. INGRAM. One of these gentlemen by the name of Macoun has made a report which has caused a great deal of strife. He has been accused of incompetency, and an hon. gentleman was to have made a charge against him but so far has not done so. If he is incompetent, why is he continued in the service ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not know that any body has said that Mr. Macoun is incompetent. I have certainly never endorsed any such statement. I think that in the line of the scientific work in which he is engaged, he is perfectly competent. I hope the hon. gentleman will not reopen the discussion which took place in the Agricultural Committee. All that I have to say is this, that the conclusion I arrived at with regard to Mr. Macoun was that while perfectly competent, so far as scientific attainments are concerned, he drew sweeping conclusions from rather insufficient data. My hon. friend will perhaps understand that in the case of the reports of the officers of the Geological Survey, no minister can pretend to revise them. They are under the direction of the head of the service, who decides what should and what should not be published. It will be admitted by members on both sides that Mr. Macoun was imprudent in issuing his report without consulting his superior officer, but that is far from saying that he is incompetent.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that it was by Mr. Macoun's instructions that the report was published or printed ? As I understand, he went out to the Peace River district and made his report. When he did that, his duty ceased, and if the head of the department saw fit to have it printed, I cannot see how Mr. Macoun can be blamed.

Mr. SIFTON. All the officers submit their reports to the director and he sends them to the Printing Bureau to be printed. The director uses his judgment in supervising each report before it is printed.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that the hon. gentleman has withdrawn the report or censured Mr. Macoun for having made a sweeping statement ?

Mr. SIFTON. No, I cannot withdraw a report. When a report is issued, that is the end of it. But I have given instructions that it is not to be circulated any further.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are the gentlemen who go out on these geological surveys directed by the department to any special locality, or is that left to their own officers ?

Mr. SIFTON. Each year the director of surveys submits to me a recommendation suggesting what work should be done and giving the names of the men he recommends to be sent out in each particular case. I discuss the matter with him and he gives the necessary information.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the director the power of overruling the directions of the minister ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister says he has given orders to stop the circulation of Mr. Macoun's report. Is he aware that a committee of this House has ordered that the evidence be printed and that a large portion of Mr. Macoun's report, which the hon. gentleman has ordered to be suppressed, is to be embodied in the report of the committee ?

Mr. SIFTON. I am aware that the committee adopted a report, but I have not seen it and do not know what it is. As regards the circulation of the report, I acted on my own judgment before the committee had reached a conclusion. The committee had serious difficulty in reaching a unanimous conclusion, and before they had finished their deliberations, I gave orders that the circulation of Mr. Macoun's report should cease.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the report already printed, but I am drawing attention to the fact that large portions of that same report are to be embodied in the report submitted by the committee. Now, does the hon. gentleman approve of sending out in another form, large portions of the suppressed report ?

Mr. SIFTON. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will admit that I ought to have the right to read the committee's report before I approve of it. As to the circulation of the report of the committee, the hon. member will understand that that does not rest with me as head of the geological survey, but with the House.

Mr. INGRAM. But I am drawing attention to the fact that large portions of the report the circulation of which is discontinued is to appear in this report of the committee. The hon. gentleman is the head

of the department, and if he suppresses or withholds Mr. Macoun's report from circulation, what position is he putting his department in by approving—if he does approve—the circulation of large portions of it in another report ? May I suggest to the hon. gentleman another course ? Here is a report which the hon. gentleman says contains wide and sweeping statements in connection with the Peace river district. He is withholding that report on account of those wide and sweeping statements. But large portions of that report will be embodied in the report of the committee to be printed and circulated. Now, would he not be doing better if he allowed the other report to go in with that of the committee. Then the other report would be circulated along with the evidence given before the committee, and those interested would be able to judge of the truth or falsity of the statements made.

Mr. SIFTON. When the contents of the officer's report were brought to my attention, I considered it and thought the circulation of it should be suspended, and it was suspended. But we have not burnt the copies. Those that were not put in circulation are in the office of the Geological Survey. The committee of the House considered that report. When the report of the committee is before it, the House will decide what to do, but we can hardly decide what to do until the report of the committee is made known.

Mr. SPROULE. That suggests the awkward position we are in. We are discussing a report of a committee that is not before the House—in fact a report that has not been made. The government is responsible for these reports not coming down——

Mr. SIFTON. How ?

Mr. SPROULE. Because the government controls all the committees, and controls the estimates as well. The government has no right to ask the House to consider estimates where the merits cannot be discussed without considering the effect of reports that are not before the House.

Mr. SIFTON. The question of the report of the committee has nothing to do with the voting of supplies for the geological survey for the year now beginning.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly it has.

Mr. SIFTON. As to the statement that the government controls the committees, my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is too old a parliamentarian to make a statement of that kind. He knows that the government does not control the committees. The Committee on Agriculture meets when it sees fit. I was not at any of its meetings, and did not exercise the slightest supervision or control over its deliberations. I understood from the reports of the daily press that they were sitting and considering the report.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) makes a statement that he knows is not borne out by the facts—the statement that the government does not control the committees. Does not the government have its majority on every committee that majority being sent there to carry resolutions when necessary ? We cannot carry a resolution——

Mr. SIFTON. But the hon. gentleman can make a great fight.

Mr. SPROULE. But the government's friends are drummed up and, if necessary, the committee is held up until a majority are present to carry any resolution that may be desired. That has been done time and again this session. But that is not the main question. The minister says that the report of the committee has nothing to do with this report. Why, what is this vote ? It is a vote of the salaries of the Geological Survey Department. Is or is not Mr. Macoun an officer of that department ? If he is we are voting his salary. Is he a discredited employee, or does he still enjoy the confidence of the government ? Do they still regard him as a good man ? The minister says that professionally Mr. Macoun is a good man. But is he reliable ?

Mr. SIFTON. I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) thinks he is.

Mr. SPROULE. I frankly confess I do.

Mr. PATERSON. Then vote his salary.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to voting his salary. But other members of that committee, especially supporters of the government, have said that this officer is not a competent man or reliable man, that his report should not go out but should be recalled. Are these statements justified by the facts? We do not wish to embarrass the government, but we want to know what they are going to do about this matter in view of what occurred in committee of this House.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a serious matter though members of the government assume to treat it so lightly. Let me draw the attention of the government to the fact that this officer has been charged with deliberately making a false report in connection with a new section of the Dominion. This is an exceedingly serious matter for the men who are interested in that section of the west. It does not matter how long or how short a man has been in the service of the government if he has taken advantage of his position to deliberately make a bad report upon a portion of the country without justification for it, he must have some unworthy motive. And that is what this officer is charged with. And, if that charge is true, the question that must meet the government

is whether they will continue to employ this officer. If he is innocent, the government should make it clear that he has not been guilty of deliberately making a false report, which is the charge against him by the supporters of the government. There are men who have their interests in the far west and their country should not be run down unjustifiably. If it is a good country for the settler to go into it should not be misrepresented.

Mr. SCOTT. Did Mr. Macoun run down the Peace river country ?

Mr. INGRAM. He is charged with deliberately making a bad report. I do not say he did, but my hon. friend's (Mr. Scott's) friend from the west has said he did. I hope he does not deny it, because it is on record.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend does not complain that Mr. Macoun deliberately made a false report ?

Mr. INGRAM. I have not been there and cannot say.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But does he believe it ?

Mr. INGRAM. What I say is that government supporters have charged this government official with deliberately making a bad report. I want to know, before we vote his salary whether he is a good man or not. He has been in the service of the government for many years—for a longer time than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has been at the head of it. But, if he is the kind of man that he is stated to be by supporters of the government, he should not be in the employ of the government. Personally, I have a better opinion of the gentleman and do not believe the statements made against him. I have no reason to dispute anything he has stated in his report. I have not the knowledge to enable me to form an opinion as to the facts. But I should judge, from the man's appearance and conduct and all that I can learn about him, that the minister is correct when he leads the committee to believe that he is competent as a professional man in a work of this kind——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) ought to be satisfied.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not satisfied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have some personal knowledge of Mr. Macoun. I have seen him in the service and have always thought he was a competent officer. But my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will agree with me on one point. As to the report of Mr. Macoun I am not prepared to say whether it was right or wrong, but even a good man will make mistakes sometimes. And we shall see whether Mr. Macoun in making his report gave a proper character to the country or not—that is a matter to be investigated. This is a matter to be investigated—but even if Mr. Macoun had made a mistake, as all men are liable to make mistakes, I would not refuse to vote his salary. If it should turn out afterwards that the report of Mr. Macoun was inaccurate it would perhaps detract from his professional reputation but for all that I would not deprive the country of his services. I see no reason why his salary should not be voted even if it turns out that in this matter he is in the wrong.

Mr. INGRAM. If it should prove that the statement of a government supporter is correct that Mr. Macoun made a deliberate misreport what would the Prime Minister have to say ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the statement has been made that Mr. Macoun made a deliberate false report this may be an issue as to which Mr. Macoun has not been tried. Every one may have his opinion on that. If it were proved, and if it should turn out to be true that he has made a false report he would not be worthy of credit but for my part I would give him the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. It should be understood that we are not objecting to voting his salary, but we think that his character should be vindicated and the department should state whether he is regarded as a competent man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the Minister of the Interior has given him that character.

Mr. SIFTON. The evidence of that is that we are asking for his salary.

Mr. SPROULE. He said that professionally Mr. Macoun is all right but he talked in a general way. Now if he is competent professionally and is reliable, then in my judgment that is all that could be expected of him and if the department and the government are prepared to retain him I take it for granted that they must regard him as a competent man or otherwise they would not ask us to vote his salary.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to raise a solemn protest against the manner in which information of this character is brought before any committee of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is hardly to the point.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a point. The Geological Survey Department have in their employment what they call competent men, men whom they send into a new section of country to ascertain the nature of its climate and soil and all its good and bad qualities. That is the duty of the Geological Survey Department. They send these men in, get the information and publish it. The moment you undertake to do what the Agricultural Committee has done this year you do what is not

in the interests of the people of the country. Why ? Because the very moment such a thing is brought to the attention of the Agricultural Committee and the officer is brought there there seems to be more in the question of party politics or in some personal or selfish influence on the part of members of the committee than in the question at issue. No member of that committee seems to have any personal knowledge worth speaking of in connection with the Peace river district yet they were disputing the evidence of that man who had been there for months.

Mr. SCOTT. What was the point.

Mr. INGRAM. My point is that if you are sending competent men out upon a geological survey and these men make their report, then the Geological Survey Department is responsible for the report they make and to get that information before the Agricultural Committee is not a wise or proper course.

Mr. SCOTT. Then what is the complaint against ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Against the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. INGRAM. I say so in this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend says that he has a complaint against the method pursued this year in the Agricultural Committee in discussing an official of this government. He may be right or he may be wrong, but I suggest, and I think that on reflection he will agree with me, that this is not the moment or the occasion to make that complaint against the Agricultural Committee. The report of that Committee will, I believe, come up in a few days and that will be the best time to discuss that matter. Mr. Macoun's report was a surprise to everybody, certainly it was a great surprise to me when I read the character he gave to the Peace River Valley, and every one else, probably including my hon. friend, was surprised. I would be chagrined and sorry if the report of Mr. Macoun turns out to be correct ; he may be right, and if so all the worse for the country. He may be wrong, as I hope, and if he is wrong, every one will be glad. In the meantime I do not believe that he made an incorrect report with intention. I think perhaps he acted with some levity, was not careful enough, but even if he acted without sufficient accuracy, and acted too hastily in placing before the Canadian public a report in contradiction to all the accepted doctrines, even believing all that, I would not dispense with Mr. Macoun's services. I think he is a good man ; every man is liable to commit errors and I hope he has made one on this occasion. Even if he has I would be sorry to part with his services.

Mr. INGRAM. The right. hon. gentleman has said we should discuss this when the report is brought down. But we are voting the salary now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And nobody objects.

Mr. INGRAM. Only to this extent that I disapprove of calling any gentleman from the Geological Survey Department before the Agricultural Committee as was done in this case to obtain information of this kind or to repudiate a report issued by the Geological Survey Department. If the Agricultural Committee did not like that report then it might be quite in order for them to pass a resolution disapproving of the report and drawing the attention of the minister in whose department this man is employed, but to bring the official before the committee for that purpose is something of which I disapprove entirely. I am sure that no good will be attained by circulating the evidence or the report of that committee.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not object to the voting of Mr. Macoun's salary ; in fact I would favour increasing it, as I hope the minister has done. I think he is a very excellent official, but I do not agree with his conclusions in relation to part of the Peace River Valley. There is a great deal of misapprehension in regard to that country. It is a tract of country some hundreds of miles in extent, and the part to which objection is taken is not the Peace River Valley proper but the foothills of the mountains, 50 to 70 miles in width. I want to point out here that, as the hon. member for Alberta knows, the country immediately west from Edmonton and from 50 miles east of the Yellowhead Pass is similar to the part which would be covered by Mr. Macoun's report. You cannot find in the foothills of the mountains in any part of the west, land anything like as suitable for settlement at present as the country more remote.

Mr. OLIVER. In climate or in what respect ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Climate, nature of the soil, &c. We know that that district is much more subject to frosts.

Mr. OLIVER. My opinion is that near the mountains it will be found that the climate is more favourable than farther east.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the question but as far as the country near the mountains is concerned any person who knows anything about the Northwest Territories, as my hon friend does, will know that when you get into those parts of the country in which there are so many muskegs and wet areas you get into a climate not as favourable as that to be found farther east where it is burnt over and cleared. In discussing Professor Macoun's report let us remember

that he does not condemn the whole Peace river valley but he simply speaks unkindly of a portion that is, say seventy-five miles from the Rocky mountains. If you examine Professor Macoun's report you will find that the only part of the country that he refers to is within seventy-five miles of the foothills. He does not condemn the part extending farther down for some hundreds of miles. While I do not agree with Professor Macoun's conclusions yet I have every reason to believe in the truth and accuracy of his statements. Although I do not know whether I shall have an opportunity of seeing him, I did purpose taking the opportunity of pointing out to him that in taking temperatures in the Northwest a great many officers of the Geological Survey simply put the thermometer close to the ground. I want to tell the officers of the Geological Survey, through you, Mr. Chairman, that if they put one thermometer a few inches from the ground, another thermometer three or four feet from the ground, which is the height of a nice stalk of wheat, and another thermometer higher up there is not a night in the year, especially in the summer time, in which the thermometers will vary several degrees. I would suggest to Professor Macoun and others not to attach too much importance to what they learn from farmers in that district. There are a great many farmers who in the early days were semi-missionaries, traders, and men who knew nothing of farming in the country that they came from, and who will take years to acquire a thorough knowledge of farming in the country in which they have settled. I knew Professor Macoun well, I knew his father and as I told Professor Macoun in the committee I was surprised that he differed from the report upon the foothills that his father had given. I am satisfied that Professor Macoun's conclusions will, when the country gets cleared up be found to be more or less erroneous, However, I think an officer who has the energy, pluck and manhood that Professor Macoun has should be continued in the department and that he should receive a good increase in salary.

Mr. BLAIN. What instructions were given to Professor Macoun when he was sent out to that country to make a report upon it ?

Mr. SIFTON. I asked the director when the report was brought to my attention for a copy of his instructions. It turned out, when the director came to look into the matter, that Professor Macoun's instructions were verbal, that they had not been reduced to writing and that he was to make a general report on the character of the country.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister when he gave instructions for the report to be withheld from the public ?

Mr. SIFTON. It was some time after the discussion arose in connection with it. I cannot just say when. It was about the time that the discussion commenced in the newspapers, probably a week or two after it was discussed in the newspapers I do not remember the exact date ; it is probably two months ago now.

Mr. BLAIN. I may draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that this is not the report that was given to the committee. The information given to the committee was that the hon. minister gave instructions to withhold the report from the public long before the House met at all.

Mr. SIFTON. I am afraid my hon. friend must be mistaken

Mr. BLAIN Are we to understand that the hon minister allowed the circulation of the report until after the House met and the Agricultural Committee had the report brought before them for examination ?

Mr. SIFTON. I tell my hon. friend I cannot remember the exact date when the order was given. It was about the time the discussion started in the press in regard to this report. It was at that time that I sent for a copy of it myself, examined it and discussed it with the acting director. In the course of a few days I came to the conclusion that the circulation of the report should be suspended and I gave the order. I do not remember at this moment the exact date when that took place. Without looking at the written instructions that were given I could not say.

Mr. SCOTT. The report was not printed or in circulation before the House met.

Mr. BLAIN Is the hon gentleman sure of that ?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give the date at which the report was printed and circulated ?

Mr. SCOTT. No, I am not able to give the precise date but I am perfectly satisfied that at the time the House met early in March the report was not in circulation ?

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend say that the instructions to withhold the report from the public were given after the committee on agriculture met ?

Mr. SCOTT. I have no information upon that point at all.

Mr. BLAIN If the hon. gentleman has no information it is useless for him to undertake to correct the statement we are making. May I ask the hon. minister if it is the custom of his department when sending an officer to a country like the Peace River district to report upon it to send him out without any written instructions.

Mr. SIFTON. That is what took place.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that the policy of the department ?

Mr SIFTON. No, I was under the impression the instructions had been in writing. Dr. Bell was under the impression the instructions were in writing and when I spoke to him he said he would send me a copy of the instructions. It would be his duty to prepare the instructions and to see that they were properly given. When he came to look into it he found the instructions were not given in writing. I gave a specific direction that in future all officers when sent out should be furnished with instructions in writing.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman not think that this item should stand until the Agricultural Committee bring down their report so that the committee will have a chance to discuss the whole matter ?

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman can discuss the report of the committee when the report comes down. There is no reason why the item should not pass.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon gentleman will remember that a great deal of discussion took place upon this report of Professor Macoun's and that the House will be very much interested in this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will all come up on the report.

Mr. BLAIN It will all come up on the report but the committee will not have as good an opportunity on the report as it will on the item before us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot see that. No one desires to withhold the salary of Professor Macoun. We are all agreed that he should be retained in the service and paid his salary.

Mr. BLAIN. But, it is the government that have discredited Professor Macoun if he is discredited. It is the hon. Minister of the Interior who has taken it upon himself without a proper examination to say that Professor Macoun's report is not a correct report and therefore it should not go out to the public. I think we have a right to discuss that.

Mr. SIFTON. There is no reason why the hon gentleman should not discuss it if he sees fit.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not objecting to it, but I would suggest that this would be the proper place and time to discuss the whole question.

Mr. SIFTON. You can discuss the report of the committee when it comes down. As to my action in suspending the report the hon gentleman can discuss it now if he sees fit.

Mr. BLAIN. Probably the hon. gentleman will tell the committee what items in the report he objected to, and if it was upon these items that he decided that the report should be withheld from the public. The minister selected one of the most competent officers in his department to make a report on that country, and that report having been published, it was rather an important thing for the minister to take upon himself to withhold the report. Notwithstanding the action of the minister, if the report of the Agricultural Committee is adopted, a considerable part of this report will be sent broadcast throughout the country.

Mr. SIFTON. I suspended the publication of the report because I thought that Mr. Macoun's conclusions as to the character of the country were too sweeping. I doubted that his conclusions as to the unsuitability of the Peace River district for farming purposes were justified by the facts, and until that is settled I suspended the publication of the report. I did what any member of the House would do in my position, if he were attending to his business. Among men of common sense there cannot be any difference of opinion about it.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is now asking for salaries, and when he condemns this report and forbids its circulation, it is his duty to point out to us the page of the report to which he objects. On account of certain rumours that this report was to be suppressed, I read it long before Mr. Macoun was called upon to give evidence. It is our right to know what page of that report the minister objects to.

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman cannot be serious. The report draws general conclusions unfavourable to the agricultural capabilities of a large section of this country and pending the result of the investigation of that question, I suspended the circulation of the report. I do not take exception to any particular page of the report ; I take exception to the general conclusions of an unfavourable character which it contains, and until the Agricultural Committee reports I am not prepared to modify my conclusion or to express a further opinion about it. I am afraid that is all the information the hon gentleman can get from me.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister intend that for a threat ? I do not know that the minister knows any more about that country than we do ; but, at all events, he should tell us what part of that report he objects to.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to give my impression of Mr. Macoun, and the reason why the committee felt that perhaps his report or his evidence should not be published. Mr. Macoun was in that very extensive country for only about three months, and the committee felt that he might not have had sufficient time to ascertain the general

character of the country. The minister will find that the committee recommends that other parties be sent out to explore that country and make a report. For that reason I was opposed to publishing Mr. Macoun's evidence, and I was in favour of the minister withholding the report that had already been published. I hope the minister will give us an intimation as to what he intends to do with reference to sending out sufficient exploring parties to cover the whole Peace River territory. How many copies of the report were circulated ?

Mr. SIFTON. A large number of inquiries had been made in the department about this country before the report was printed, and a considerable number of copies were sent out. As to further explorations, we will consider that when we get the committee's report.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that these geological reports are for sale at booksellers throughout Canada ; and, if so, how could the minister recall them ?

Mr. SIFTON. I believe all the members of the House and members of the Senate should receive these geological reports, and if there is any such desire I will endeavour to get a change in the Order in Council governing their distribution.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we now receive them ; but, as I understand it, these reports are for sale at the booksellers in the different cities, and, if that be the case, how could the minister recall their circulation ?

Mr. SIFTON. That only applies to the fully bound copies of the report of the surveys for the year. The separate reports are not dealt with in that way unless there is some special demand for them.

Mr. SPROULE. My information from the department a few years ago was the very reverse. I was endeavouring to get some of these reports for certain parties, and I was told that they could be purchased at certain bookstores, either the volume containing all the reports, or the reports of the separate branches, and that the maps accompanying these separate reports could be got at the same time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the minister whether Dr. Bell is not entitled to the statutory increase ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, I have not any doubt that he is.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand he has not had the increase for a number of years?

Mr. SIFTON. He has not, because he has been an applicant for the position of director. The question of an increase has not been considered. If he applies for it, I will recommend it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With reference to the reports, I had occasion to purchase a number for my constituents, and I inquired how much money was collected for the reports sold, and I understand that there was not sufficient collected to pay the salary of the man who collects the money.

Mr. SIFTON. Quite likely.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it not be wise after spending $153,000, which the department expects to spend this year, to have the reports circulated free ? It would be much better to spend a few hundred dollars in that way, I should think, than to spend a lot of money gathering information and then practically lock it up.

Mr. SIFTON. I discussed the question of the circulation of the reports with the late Dr. Dawson, who was the director at the time the Order in Council was passed providing for the method by which they are disposed of ; and the reason he gave me why the government at that time had decided to charge a fee for the reports was that otherwise people would get into the habit of writing for them without making any use of them. The small charge put upon them is not sufficient to deter anybody who wants the reports of the Geological Survey from getting them.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister stated that if Dr. Bell applied for the statutory increase, he would be likely to get it. Why does he not grant it to him ?

Mr. SIFTON. Dr. Bell made up the estimate himself, and if he had put it in, I would have recommended it. My attention has never been called to the matter before.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister not grant the statutory increase to any one who does not ask for it ?

Mr. SIFTON. The rule is that the deputy reports to the minister recommending the officers whose salaries are to be increased. If Dr. Bell had put in his own statutory increase, I would have recommended it.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that while he could recommend it for others, he might feel a little delicate about recommending it for himself.

Mr. SIFTON. We follow the ordinary rule.

Mr. SPROULE. How many in this branch are receiving the statutory increase this year, and how many received it last year ?

Mr. SIFTON. Twenty-two technical officers are receiving it this year. I have not the number for last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is Mr. Macoun one of them ?

Mr. SIFTON. His name is on the list for this year, and I have not any doubt that he got the increase last year.

Geological Survey—exploration and surveys, printing and publication reports, maps, &c., wages of assistant explorers, draughtsmen, clerks and others, purchase of specimens, books, instruments, stationery, mapping materials, maintenance of Museum, laboratory apparatus, chemicals, miscellaneous expenses, &c., advances to explorers, $60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be more intelligible if we had the amount to be expended on each of these items instead of lumping them all together. We should know, for instance, how much is spent on printing and publishing the report and have some idea whether it is better to sell them or give them away. The hon. minister made a statement, with which few will agree, that people ask for reports they have no use for. I do not think anybody would ask for a report, which he did not intend making use of.

Mr. SIFTON. These items are voted in this way every year.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the minister intend spending on explorations and surveys this year ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have been putting geological estimates through the House the last eight years and that question was never asked before. The Auditor General's Report shows how every dollar is expended. The only way I could obtain the details of each for this year would be to put a clerk at work, separating the items in the Auditor General's Report, to total them up, and I could then read them to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely before the council decided on the amount to be expended, it must have the details of each item. It must know how much is required for exploration and surveys and so on.

Mr. SIFTON. The usual practice has been to vote a lump sum. The director then knows what amount of money he has to go on with the work, and he divides that amount among the several branches of work required to be done.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is any of this to be used for the purpose of exploring for gas and oil ? For a few years previous to 1898, several thousand dollars were spent in this direction. Is any of this amount to be used for that purpose this year ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is going to be done with the machinery which has been stored for a number of years at Edmonton, tubing and casing. Is it to be allowed to rust and get rotten ?

Mr. SIFTON. We voted a certain amount for the purpose of putting down certain test wells. They were searching not for gas but for oil. The test wells were put down, but the officers were not successful in finding oil and the project was abandoned.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not reasonable to ask that a certain amount should be voted for that purpose ?

Mr. SIFTON. It might be, and I am quite prepared to hear my hon. friend's views on the subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It would be of great interest to the industry at large to have certain explorations carried on as they were previous to 1898. The money would be well spent in carrying on explorations of that nature, and these explorations would be of great benefit to the geological department provided the money was expended judiciously.

Mr. SIFTON. The work which was done did not result in any benefit at all because the tests were not successful in locating any oil in paying quantities. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) is familiar, no doubt, with the oil business, and he will probably agree with me that the oil prospector is the man who is going to find the oil—the man who makes a business of prospecting is more likely to find it than the scientific officer of the geological survey. The work of the survey, so far as that is concerned, is more properly done by giving information as to the locality in which the geological deposits are of such a character that oil may be looked for there with some probability of finding it. But as to putting down test holes and carrying on the practical work of prospecting for oil, experience shows that we had better leave that to the prospector. As I said, we were not successful in the test holes put down though these experiments cost a good deal of money. Under our Northwest land regulations we encourage the making of tests for oil, and a number of commercial companies are carrying on testing operations at the present time, some of them with a degree of success. In one or two locations there are wells which, though not very productive, yield oil in paying quantities.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is an easy matter to engage men of experience in the business. The reports of the Geological Survey show that there are sections in the Northwest in which some oil has been found and in which the officers think it desirable to explore. Would it not be wise to engage men qualified for the business and expend a few thousand dollars in well directed efforts to develop that industry ?

Mr. SIFTON. That is a fair question for consideration. I would not be inclined to say finally that that would not be a good plan.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. minister has not explained the increase of $10,000 in this item.

Mr. SIFTON. The ordinary vote is $60,000. In the endeavour to practise that economy which is such a distinguished characteristic of the present government we reduced the vote last year very much against the will of the director. This year, I take a step in the other direction and have increased it again to $60,000, besides voting $19,000 for special explorations.

Mr. BLAIN. Referring to the question of exploring for oil, as I understand it, the department has expended some thousands of dollars for the purchase of a plant which is now stored at Edmonton. This is a matter which should receive the attention of the minister. He knows that the consumption of oil is a large item of expense to the people, and that new discoveries of oil will probably be of great benefit to the people. It does not seem to be in the public interest that the hon. gentleman should spend some thousands of dollars in the purchase of a plant and then allow it to be stored away out of use. On the contrary, I should think it would be wise to place a few thousand dollars at the disposal of the department to put that plant in operation. It is not a satisfactory answer to say that experiments were made for a year or two, but that as they were unsuccessful the efforts were abandoned. It is well known that in several parts of the Dominion oil has been found where, in the earlier days, it was thought it could not be found. I would strongly favour the suggestion of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that some money should be spent in examination and experiment for the purpose of discovering oil.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for East Lambton, (Mr. Armstrong) as I happen to represent the part of the country to which he refers, I may be allowed a word or two. I do not wish to take the position of asking or demanding special expenditures in that part of the country. At the same time, if it should be the will of parliament to authorize an expenditure for boring for oil in that part of the country, certainly the project would have my most hearty approval. As to the experiments that have been made, I have a little crow to pick with the geological survey in that matter, and will take this opportunity of placing the facts before the committee. It is a number of years now since the late government thought fit to institute explorations for oil in that part of the country. They put down a well at Athabasca Landing, 100 miles north of Edmonton, where there was no sign of oil. They found none. They put down another well at Victoria, 80 miles northeast, where there is not and never was—never was reported to be—any sign of oil. They did not find any. They also put down a well at Pelican Rapids, down the Athabasca about 120 miles below the landing where there has always been a flow of natural gas. They struck a very heavy flow of natural gas, but so far as I am aware no oil, and they suspended operations. The machinery having been transported 120 miles down the river by flatboat, I take it that the government believed that it would cost more to take care of machinery there than it was worth, and that if they undertook to bring it out it would cost more than it would be worth when brought out. My quarrel with the Geological Department is this—that they bored three wells where there was no sign of oil and where nobody suggested that there was a sign of oil. They arrived at the conclusion that they should bore there because of some theory of the director of the survey. They refused to bore for oil where there were surface indications of oil—they could not be induced to bore there. What I want to suggest to the minister is that if, the House being in generous mood as it seems to be, provides the money for further oil boring operations and the government undertake the work, the boring should be done where there are indications of oil, and not where there are no such indications.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is that?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that there is oil, but I can say that there is evidence of oil, in a location about 25 miles slightly of north from Edmonton. That has been known for many years. It was brought to the attention of different representatives of the geological survey, but they would not bore there. I would respectfully suggest that if there is to be more boring for oil in that country the boring should be done where there are indications that oil will be found.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. member say that the late government refused to have their officers bore for oil where there were indications of oil and had them bore where there were no indications.

Mr. OLIVER. It was not the government but the Geological Survey who bored where there was no oil. I am suggesting to the minister that if he takes the money he should bore where common sense would indicate borings should be made.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that officers in the Geological Survey instructed their men to bore where there were no indications of oil whatever?

Mr. OLIVER. I assert most positively that the late director of the Geological Survey, Dr. Dawson, directed that the boring should be carried on at two certain places, at which neither Dr. Dawson nor any one else ever suggested that there was any evidence of oil.

Mr. BLAIN. That is rather a reflection on the late Dr. Dawson.

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Dawson had reasons of his own. He had the borings made upon a geological theory which in that particular case did not happen to be correct.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend think it will be worth while for the government to set aside a certain amount of money for the purpose of making further tests in that section of the country ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not sufficiently expert to give an authoritative opinion and of course it is not my responsibility, but as the minister said to the man on his death bed who asked as to the utility of making a large bequest to the church, 'there will be no harm in his trying it.'

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the hon. gentleman's constituency will not be much interested in that statement.

Mr. OLIVER. In the southern part of my large constituency private individuals are boring successfully. I was speaking more of the north ; I would say it it much more to the advantage of Canada that private enterprise should bore where oil is likely to be found than that public enterprise should bore where oil is not likely to be found.

Mr. BLAIN. You have more faith in the government than that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have very little faith in our Geological Survey Department. This is only one instance from which I have formed that opinion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am surprised to hear the words of the hon. member for Alberta. I do not think he would use them if he realized the importance of developing an oil industry such as we hear is likely to be developed in that country. His constituents I think, will be anything but pleased at the half hearted manner in which he asked support from the Geological Survey Department in this matter.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not ask them and I do not intend to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is a good thing for the hon. gentleman's constituents to know. I believe that we do not spend sufficient money on the Geological Survey. The opening of even one mine would more than bring back to the country the amount of money expended in this way.

Mr. INGRAM. 'Purchasing specimens,' what does that mean ?

Mr. SIFTON. That refers to some small purchases from time to time of some small specimens of rocks which may be in the possession of private individuals. The department may require them for examination or may not have a sample of that particular variety. The amounts paid are very trifling.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought this was to purchase specimens for exhibition. You usually use a portion of your vote every year for the purpose of supplying specimens to schools and collegiate institutes.

Mr. SIFTON. I should have added that in some cases where very fine geological specimens are in the hands of private individuals and the officers of the survey think they would be of value for the permanent museum they are purchased. Of course, the amounts that are paid are comparatively small. As to the cabinets of minerals that are sent to the schools they are not purchased. They are collected by the field officers. They make these collections for school purposes out of the surplus collection that they make in the course of their work in the field.

Mr. BLAIN. I see an item of $260.03 for postage paid to the Ottawa post office. I understood that the reports were sent out free of postage. Perhaps I am wrong on that point.

Mr. SIFTON. I presume that that is for postage for letters sent to foreign countries that have to be paid for.

Geological Survey—for special explorations and surveys in British Columbia and the Yukon and the publication of reports and maps thereon, $19,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a new item.

Mr. SIFTON. I gave the hon. gentleman the particulars as to that work.

Mr. SPROULE. When ?

Mr. SIFTON. That is in the list I read.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman gave them, I have no remembrance of it. He gave a statement of the general work that was to be done in the different localities.

Mr. SIFTON. That included the work in British Columbia. There is no special reason why this should have been put in a special item.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you put it in a separate item ?

Mr. SIFTON. The ordinary vote is $60,000 but the director, after the first list had been made up, obtained my sanction for doing additional work in British Columbia and for the submission of the amount of money that was required to do that additional work. The amount is $19,000 and a further item is put in for it.

Geological Survey—to provide for plotting and compiling of surveys, plans, maps, and utilizing field notes, &c., $5,566.25.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holmes). The hon. Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton) moves to amend the item by adding the following :—

Salaries, greater than $500 per annum may be paid from this vote, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of that? There is nothing about salaries in this item.

Mr. SIFTON. If the director requires to call in an expert for a short period he will have to pay him whatever his services are worth, or whatever the person who is employed demands and the director thinks a fair amount. These services are only of a temporary character and it amounts to very little, but the terms of the Civil Service Act are such that he could not pay a man under such circumstances more than $500. He would have to go in as a clerk at $500 a year, and in order to enable the director to employ persons of special capabilities for a short time this is put in. As an illustration, I may say that one of the officers lately was making a special investigation into the question of nickel, and there was some metallurgical work that was required. As they did not have an officer in the survey to do it, they had to employ somebody temporarily, and they secured the services of a gentleman from McGill College, who was paid, I think, $100 a month.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether there is anything in this item, No. 198, for any further explorations in the Peace River district?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask if it is the intention to have an item of that character placed in the estimates?

Mr. SIFTON. I cannot say till I see the report of the committee.

To pay for assay apparatus and chemicals, metallurgical, petrographical, library and clerical assistance (salaries greater than $500 per annum may be paid from this vote, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $6,300.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that you have to put salaries in here again?

Mr. SIFTON. The remarks I made a short time ago apply to that.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know if Mr. J. B. Lindsay has any land leased in townships 8 and 9 and ranges 5 and 6, west of the 4th meridian. I shall be glad to furnish the hon. minister with a short note I have here if he would be good enough to furnish the information. What I want to know is how many acres of grazing lands, with the date and price, have been leased to Mr. J. B. Lindsay, in townships 8 and 9, range 6, west of 4th meridian, or in township 8, range 5, west of 4th meridian, and what homestead entries have been made in township 8, range 5, west of 4th meridian.

Mr. SIFTON. Will the hon. gentleman send the memorandum down?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has brought down that report that he promised in regard to Mr. Stewart?

Mr. SIFTON. I will bring it down to-morrow.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. There may be some Bills at the earlier stage, and in supply the estimates of the Prime Minister, the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, and in the afternoon the estimates of the Minister of the Interior will probably be resumed.

Mr. SPROULE. What Bills?

Mr. FIELDING The Prime Minister did not state.

Mr. WILSON. I had an understanding with the Minister of the Interior that he would go on with the immigration estimates immediately after the Bills. If we get into the other estimates we cannot tell when they will be reached.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of the Interior tells me that he will be ready to go on with his estimates immediately upon supply being moved, so that the Interior estimates will have priority.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 21, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 160) to amend the Bank Act. He said: This is a measure of which mention was made some days ago in connection with the programme of business for the remainder of the session. While I propose to repeal a statute passed in 1899 and reenact it in amended form, this is only done for convenience of drafting, and the actual change which is made is very slight indeed. Some of our banks are doing business in British colonies other than Canada, notably in the case of the British West Indies, and it is found to be convenient in the way of business to per-

mit those banks to issue notes expressed in the currency of the colony in which they are doing business. We have provided for that in our Bank Act by allowing them to issue notes in pounds sterling as well as in dollars and cents, which is the form of our own currency. A case has arisen, however, in one of the West Indian Islands which it is found is not quite covered by the terms of the Bank Act. In the island of Trinidad, one of the largest and most important of the British West Indian colonies, they use dollars and cents as we do, but while their currency corresponds in form to ours it does not correspond in actual value. The West Indian dollar is worth a little more actually than the Canadian dollar, therefore a note circulated in the Island of Trinidad redeemable in Canadian currency would be a cause of confusion. The bank in question proposed to overcome the difficulty by making a deposit of securities with the colonial government equal to the difference between the Canadian dollar and the West Indian dollar, to the extent of the whole issue of the notes in that colony. But the British government which has a supervision over the Island of Trinidad—for it has not quite the same system of government that we have—the British government thought that it was an undesirable way of dealing with the matter, and the Colonial Office suggested that the Canadian government should be asked to make such an amendment to the Bank Act as would recognize the issue of notes expressed in the currency of the colony itself, that is in the West Indian dollar instead of the Canadian dollar. It is wholly a technical matter, and does not depart in any way from the spirit of the Act already laid down. As the imperial government think this is the best way of dealing with it, I propose such an amendment to the Act as will make it clear that our banks can issue their notes in the currency of any particular colony in which they are doing business. We have already done that in relation to pounds sterling, and we simply adapt ourselves to the peculiarity of the West Indian dollar as distinct from the Canadian dollar.

Mr. SPROULE. Will those notes be a sufficient legal tender here ?

Mr. FIELDING. The notes will be redeemable only in the office of issue, provided that if at any time they cease to do business in that colony, they must then redeem them at any office or bank in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. But they would not be legal tender here ?

Mr. HAGGART. Do the assets of their business in the West India islands appear in their balance sheets here ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, they have to make a return, and are subject in all respects to the conditions of the Bank Act.

Mr. FIELDING.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

EXPENDITURE ON CENSUS, 1901.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What is the total expenditure to date for taking the census of 1901 ?
2. What further amount will be required to complete the work ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The total expenditure to date for taking the census of 1901 is $1,183,729.48.
2. So far as the census work is concerned it is practically done. There may be a small amount required for the binding, from time to time, of certain further compilations to be made in the statistical work of the department.

PAYMENT OF CREW OF THE 'LADY LAURIER.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has there been any delay in paying the wages of the crew of the 'Lady Laurier' or other vessels owned or employed by the government ?
2. To what extent, if any, are the wages of the men in arrears ?
3. What has occasioned the delay ?
4. What action is the government taking in the matter ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes.
2. For the month of June.
3. The main vote being exhausted.
4. The amount has been placed in the supplementary estimates for 1903-1904, and the wages will be paid when the money is available.

COMMISSION TO UNITED STATES RE CULTIVATION OF TOBACCO.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What persons have been sent to the United States to seek information in connection with the cultivation of tobacco ?
2. What instructions were given to such persons, and have they made a written report to the government ?
3. What amounts have been paid to such persons (a) for expenses ; (b) for their work?
4. Have any reports or bulletins in connection with the cultivation of tobacco in Canada been printed and circulated ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Messrs. Pierre Denis and J. B. Dugas.
2. They were instructed to investigate the methods practised in the State of Wisconsin of cultivating, curing and preparing for the market the tobacco grown in Wisconsin, and to report on the same to the Minister of

Agriculture. Yes, they have made such a report.

3. (a) to Mr. Pierre Denis for expenses, $227.75, and to Mr. J. B. Dugas for expenses, $231.27; (b) to Mr. Denis $218.34 for his work, and to Mr. Dugas, $197.33 for his work.

4. Not in connection with the investigations made in the United States. The reports only came in a few weeks ago.

LIGHTKEEPERS AT POINTE AUX ANGLAIS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who was the light-keeper at Pointe aux Anglais, on the Ottawa river, before September, 1897 ?
2. Did he always fulfil his duties to the satisfaction of his department ?
3. If not, what blame did he deserve ?
4. Was he replaced ?
5. By whom ?
6. And why ?
7. Does his successor fulfil all the conditions of his contract and of his employment ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Calixte Labrosse, dit Raymond.
2. No.
3. Dismissal.
4. Yes.
5. Lucas H. Masson.
6. To fill the vacancy.
7. Not entirely ; and as the department proposes to make the light an automatic one, his services will be dispensed with when that is done.

SUBSIDY TO TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. In what year was the subsidy granted to the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway ?
2. In what year was such subsidy paid, and what was the total amount so paid ?

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

1. Subsidies were granted to the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway in the following years, viz. :—

(a) In 1894, chapter 4—Port Burwell to Tilsonburg, not exceeding 16 miles.

(b) In 1897, chapter 4—From present terminus through Tilsonburg to the Michigan Central Railway, not exceeding 3½ miles.

(c) In 1899, chapter 7—For an extension from Tilsonburg to Ingersoll or Woodstock, not exceeding 35 miles.

(d) In 1903, chapter 57—Woodstock or Ingersoll to Grand Trunk Railway, at Berlin, not exceeding 35 miles.

2. The following amounts of subsidies have been paid, viz. :—

1. For 16 miles in April, 1896..		$ 51,200 00
2. For 3·41 miles—		
In Feby., 1899, part.. ..	$10,912 00	
In June, 1900, balance..	7,159 48	
		18,071 48
3. For 15·05 miles—		
In July, 1903, part.. ..	$44,160 00	
In May, 1904, balance...	4,000 00	
		48,160 00
Total amount of subsidy paid..		$ 117,431 48

SECURITY BONDS FOR PUBLIC OFFICERS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the government taken any action yet on the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Finance, on the 19th of May last, respecting the placing of its guarantee business with British and Canadian guarantee companies exclusively ?
2. Has notice been given yet, and if so, when, to foreign guarantee companies of the intention of the givernment to place no more of its business with them ?
3. After what date does the government intend to do its guarantee business exclusively with British and Canadian companies ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Instructions have been given the various departments that so soon as the existing policies in foreign companies expire they will not be renewed, but the business will then be given to British and Canadian companies. No special date has been fixed, because the policies will not expire upon an even date, but whenever the policies do expire that will be the method adopted.

TWENTY-FIFTH BATTALION CLUB ROOMS, ST. THOMAS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. When were the 25th Battalion club rooms established in St. Thomas ?
2. What amount of rent was paid for same from date of establishment up to June 30, 1896 ?
3. What amount of rent was paid per month for rent of club rooms so established ?

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

1. No record in the department.
2. $263.32.
3. $20 per month.

MILITARY CAMP, DISTRICT NO. 1.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. In what year was the military camp for district No. 1 held at St. Thomas ?
2. How many corps attend the same ?
3. What was the total expenditure in connection therewith ?

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

1. 1891.
2. Eight..
3. $19,316.68.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to trespass upon the attention of the House for a very few minutes in connection with a mat-

ter that is personal to myself. In the 'Mail and Empire' of Tuesday, July 19, 1904, there appears an article under the heading 'The Rush for the Stuff,' from which I take the following extract:

But noteworthy as the departures will be, that which will attract the largest share of attention will be the acceptance by Mr. Fitzpatrick of the valuable solicitorship of the company.

I may say that the company here is the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Certainly the company ought to be willing to pay Mr. Fitzpatrick handsomely. He has secured for it a splendid contract. But what do you think of the morals of Ottawa when a lawyer sits in the cabinet and makes a bargain for the country with a railway company—a bargain under which an immense obligation is thrown upon the people, and a small obligation is cast upon the company? What do you think when that same lawyer, after having occupied, or having appeared to occupy, the position of representative of the people, becomes, immediately after the contract has been put through, the paid legal representative of the company with which as a minister he has been bargaining? Look at the danger involved in a transaction of this kind. A man may sit in parliament, he may occupy a position in the cabinet, and while bargaining, apparently for the country, he may really be the representative of the company with which, as a minister, he is transacting public business. A bargain may be devised, the minister may know that if it goes through he will get a very highly paid position. He sees to it that the interests of his employers or clients of the near future are duly attended to. He takes care to push the thing through in as good a shape as may be for the company, for he wants the position, and the money attached to it. Is this right?

This statement constitutes the most serious charge that could possibly be made against a professional man. I quite realize that in so far as certain elements in this country are concerned a man who happens to be connected with public life can be charged with every crime short of murder, but in so far as our professional reputations are concerned it seems to me that we ought to some extent to be protected by the ordinary rules of decency. I need not say that there is not a word of truth in this statement. No such offer was ever made to me or ever contemplated or would have been entertained, and the gentlemen connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway know better than to make any such offer or entertain the hope that an offer of that description would be entertained for a single moment. I think that this statement is absolutely——

An hon. MEMBER. Malicious.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will not say malicious, but it is absolutely unjustifiable in view of the fact that when this ridiculous story was first spread I took the pains to deny it, and I think that in the very same number of the 'Mail and Empire' as that in which this article appeared my denial is to be found; at all events, the Ottawa 'Citizen' of July 19 contained a denial of the statement. It does seem to me that under these circumstances, I am justified in expecting that the same publicity will be given to this denial as was given to the charge contained in this article. That is all I ask for and that is what I mean to have.

NATURALIZATION AND ALIENS—AMENDMENT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 147) to amend the Acts relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). When this Bill was up for consideration some days ago my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) suggested with respect to the amendment I introduced providing for the naturalization of aliens in Manitoba that some alterations should be made so as to provide that an alien should be obliged to apply to the county court nearest to the place where he resided. In view of that I have prepared this amendment, which I have submitted to my hon. friend, and which, I believe, he found to his satisfaction. I therefore move:

That section 11 be further amended by striking out the lines from 20 to 26 thereof and substituting the following; In Manitoba to the county court, which has jurisdiction where the alien resides or if there be no county court in that jurisdiction, then to the county court nearest to his residence or the county court the place of holding of which is nearest to such residence.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 148) to amend the Dominion Elections Act of 1900—Mr. Fitzpatrick—read second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not notice the House going into committee, but I may say that the leader of the opposition is away, and he would like to be here when this Bill is going through.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Very well.

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Are you ready to go on with Bill (No. 149) to amend the Representation Act of 1903?

Mr. HAGGART. That had better stand too.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Can we take Bill (No. 152) respecting the arbitration with the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

Mr. BARKER. I think there will be some discussion on that. I would like the hon. gentleman to let it stand.

Orders allowed to stand.

SEED-GROWERS' ASSOCIATIONS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill (No. 151) respecting the incorporation of seed-growers' associations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FISHER. This Bill is founded on the lines of a law which was passed by this parliament a few years ago to authorize the incorporation of live stock associations. Gentlemen who have followed recent events are aware that a good deal of discussion has occurred in the country in regard to the seeds that are used by our farmers for sowing purposes. A number of persons interested in seed-growing and anxious to bring about a better quality of seed which should be true to name have formed themselves into an association, but there is no law under which this association or subsidiary associations can be legally constituted. I have been asked to introduce this Bill, which would make those associations legally incorporated bodies. The real reason for this is to provide machinery by which a certificate of the purity of the seed can be given. The Bill authorizes the formation of these associations and the confirmation of the by-laws. The association was formed only a couple of months ago at a general meeting, which was held at Ottawa, and the reason of the late introduction of this Bill is because of the but recent action of those interested. I think the measure is in the interests of the farmers of this country, and I hope there will be no opposition to it, and that it will become law even though introduced at this late period of the session.

Mr. LENNOX. The association will be capable of contracting debts ?

Mr. FISHER. The Bill would indicate that.

Mr. LENNOX. Section 9 provides that the liability of each member shall be limited to the amount of his membership dues. If this association can contract debts, there would seem to be no adequate provision for meeting these liabilities.

Mr. FISHER. Would it not be better to discuss the details in committee ?

Mr. LENNOX. This is a question of principle. When we incorporate companies with limited liability that is set out on the face of the Bill, and they are so advertised. This association may be necessary, or it may not be necessary, but anyway the proposition on the face of the Bill is that the liability of the members shall be limited to the fees they happen to owe. Can the minister guarantee to the House that this is satisfactory ?

Mr. FISHER. The by-laws of the association will have to be approved before the association can become incorporated, and these by-laws would be known to any one who is connected with the association. There are a large number of associations in this country, agricultural societies and live stock societies, which are incorporated in the same way. The members of these associations are not liable for the debts of the association beyond their membership fee ; and yet the association, being a body corporate, has power to deal with the subjects within its control, and all its property would be liable to that extent, but no further. I think that would be a sufficient safeguard to the public dealing with it.

Mr. LENNOX. What the minister says is certainly true to some extent, in regard to agricultural associations and other associations of a similar kind. But I cannot see that his reference to the question of by-laws can help him, because by-laws are subordinate to the Act, which determines the liability and the status of the association and the remedy which any person can have against it. I do not want to offer any unfair opposition to the Bill. I merely want to draw attention to these points. If the minister, having looked into the matter, is of opinion that this association can be incorporated without danger to the public, I do not propose to say any more about it at the present stage.

Mr. FISHER. The provision discussed by the hon. gentleman is exactly the same as the provision incorporating live stock associations.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the annual fee would provide a fund from which all ordinary accounts would be paid. It is not likely that this association would be disposed to engage in anything like commercial transactions. The only expenses incurred would be the carrying out of the objects of the association, such as keeping a record and publishing that record.

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

Mr. CLANCY. While the hon. Minister of Agriculture has stated that this Bill is on the same principle as an Act already on the statute-book relating to live stock associations, he clearly perceives, I am sure, that the conditions are not quite the same. Without offering any very decided objections to the Bill, I wish to point out that we are incorporating an association, which may be started by five persons, and on which the hon. gentleman proposes to confer very wide powers in the shape of by-laws which are not before this House, and which may be changed from time to time. That may be a menace to persons who are not members of the association. It is said by the minister that they may become

members ; but there is no reason why any man should have to become a member of such an association in order to escape difficulties adverse to his interests that might arise from its operations. The first thing we ought to have from the minister is a copy of the by-laws, which might be made a schedule of this Bill ; otherwise we do not know what powers this association may exercise. The hon. gentleman may answer by saying that the by-laws must be subject to the approval of the minister ; but that is not a sufficient safeguard. I think we ought to know at the beginning just what we are doing. Let me point out further that all such legislation as this is asked for in the name of the people. I have not quite as much confidence as some may have in that being the real object that impels men to seek extraordinary powers from this parliament. I am not denying that the public receive great advantages from these associations ; but I have always viewed with some suspicion those who seek legislation of this kind in the name of the public interest. There will be to some extent a close corporation, which means that those in the association will have the seal of approval from the Department of Agriculture, and, after following the experiments, may be able to control the sale at very much increased prices of seeds which are the products of these experiments. I would like the hon. minister to consider the point I raise, that we ought to know just what powers are to be given by this parliament to the association, by way of making by-laws to govern it afterwards.

On section 1—application for incorporation,

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be impossible for us to put in a schedule of this Act the details of all the by-laws of this association. My hon. friend will notice that in section 5 there is an outline of what these by-laws and rules shall provide for :

(*a.*) the registration of the history of selected seeds for use in the production of one or more kinds of field or garden crops ;
(*b.*) the admission, suspension and expulsion of members ;
(*c.*) the election of officers and their duties ;
(*d.*) the mode of convening annual, general and special meetings ;
(*e.*) the audit of accounts ;
(*f.*) the location of the head office and the branch offices, if any.

Mr. CLANCY. The two first ones would be the objectionable ones, if any.

Mr. FISHER. The general association which was formed here this winter passed what I might call preliminary or tentative by-laws. I have just sent to my department to get those and they will be here in a few minutes, but I hardly think it would be advisable to incorporate them in the Bill. The regulations and by-laws might be very different in each association. This Bill does not contemplate the formation of one association only for the whole Dominion, but according to section 4, it provides :

Not more than one association for keeping the records of selected seeds for each different kind of seed or garden crop, shall be incorporated under this Act.

There might be an association for the growth of seed corn, another for the growth of seed wheat, and so on, and each of these would have different by-laws and regulations. In the Act incorporating live stock record associations, on which this Bill is modelled, there are no such by-laws or rules, nor are they to be found in the Acts incorporating various other agricultural organizations.

Mr. CLANCY. Under this Bill you can only have one distinct association for each kind of seed. But take localities where different classes of cereals are grown and where different associations may be formed, will you have one set of by-laws and rules for all ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it would be possible for more than one association to be formed to deal with any one particular class of seed. The seed growing oats in the province of Ontario, for instance, would have to be under one association, but that association might have its local branches. Otherwise you would have a clash of authority between the different associations in the issuing of certificates. We would then experience the same difficulty which has arisen to a certain extent in the live stock business, and there would be one class of pedigree or certificates which would be valuable and another of no great value.

Mr. HAGGART. The objection to legislation of this kind is simply this. Although these corporate powers are given for a most laudable purpose, the danger is that they may result in the forming of corporations for speculative purposes without the usual liability attaching to the parties connected with them. That might be remedied by giving power to any one upon certain conditions, such as the payment of fees and agreeing to certain by-laws, the right of becoming a part of the corporation. The danger of a Bill of this kind is that three or four parties may form themselves into an association and become a close corporation.

Mr. FISHER. The by-laws must be approved by the Department of Agriculture, and certainly no Department of Agriculture would think of allowing a by-law to be passed which would prevent anybody interested in the business becoming a member of the association. Sections 1, 2 and 6 guard against the danger my hon. friend anticipates.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that probably, so far as that point is concerned it would work

out under sections 1 and 2, in connection with the schedule. But what that brings us to is this—we are doing what we are frequently invited to do, we are framing skeleton legislation and leaving it to the minister to fill it in according to his judgment. We are putting into the hands of the minister not only powers that are frequently asked by the ministers, but we are going a good deal further than we usually go. We are asked to give the minister indefinite power in a new field, in an experimental matter where we have, so far as I know, nothing definite in the way of knowledge or experience. It would be right for the minister—and I presume he will do it when called upon—to give us a distinct statement of exactly what this association, when formed, is intended to do, and what their powers are to be, and to outline—as he has thought the matter out—what will be the effect of their action assuming that they carry out his intentions. Now, here we have under section 4:

> Not more than one association for keeping records of selected seeds of each distinct kind of field or garden crop shall be incorporated under this Act.

Now, suppose that one association is made for keeping the records of selected seeds of wheat, another for barley, and so on with the various kinds of grain. But it is not confined to grain for it covers garden products as well. Suppose, that five persons, as provided under this Bill, form a society to keep the records of seed wheat for Canada. (By what particular method this is to be done I do not know; no doubt that will be explained to us.) But, suppose that all these five people live in the Klondike. We shall thus have in the most extremely distant portion of the Dominion the association that will have control of the records of seed wheat for Canada. And another association in a section distant from the centre of the Dominion may have control with reference to seed oats, and so on. Then, we have it in the Act that no other association can be formed. How that can be beneficial, or how it can work out satisfactorily, I am at a loss to know. The minister says—though the Bill does not say it—that there may be branch associations. I submit to the minister that that will not be found satisfactory. It is bad enough to have the parent association consisting of five members controlling the whole matter in regard to one kind of produce, but it would be infinitely worse if that association could farm out the business all over the Dominion. I submit that that will not be satisfactory. As I said, this may be a good Bill or a bad one, but it is certainly the duty of the members of the committee to have such facts placed before them as will enable them to judge that the Act will probably result in good. This is an experiment, and, until it is shown beyond all reasonable question that there is necessity for it, that there is a difficulty to be overcome and that this measure is likely to overcome it, we should not move in the direction proposed—we should not make a plunge in the dark. The first thing is to have the minister define clearly the object of this association, and to state how it is to accomplish that object, what power it will have when in operation and what control we shall have over these powers as exercised from time to time.

Mr. FISHER. I think that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) examines the Bill, he will see that section 5 answers most of the points he has brought up. From the experience of other agricultural associations, I infer that no by-laws will be proposed by the association—and certainly, if proposed they will not be approved by the department—which will not authorize anybody interested in the business to join. Taking the instance given by hon. gentleman that five people in the Klondike form into an association for the selection of seeds for the growing of wheat, let us see how it would work out. If they submitted by-laws which were accepted, then anybody in Ontario or any other province might join the association, and the people in the Klondike would be immediately swamped by the majority against them if they attempted to do what was not in the interest of the production of this kind of seed throughout the whole of Canada. There is no possibility under the provisions of this Bill that any group of people can seize the association and manage it for their own gain, for every association must be open for people in any part of Canada to join it.

Mr. HAGGART. There ought to be a clause to that effect. Otherwise there is danger of it becoming a close corporation.

Mr. FISHER. To provide that anybody engaged in the business for which the association was formed might join? I think that section 5 which provides for the admission, suspension and expulsion of members could be added to or we could put in a special section to provide that any person in the business would be eligible for membership.

Mr. HAGGART. Not eligible merely, for that leaves it in the power of the corporation. They should have the right to join.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there would be any objection to that. I will frame a clause for that purpose.

Mr. HAGGART. Let the Minister of Justice draw up a clause.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that this will be the same as the live stock associations. Any one who pays his $2 is eligible to all the advantages of the association. When he wishes to register anything, all he has to do is to make out the papers according to the

prescribed form of the association and send his fee.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to seem petty or small, but there is a point of order which it seems to me worth while to call attention to. A number of gentlemen on the other side, entering the chamber, deliberately walk by this side, and do not even do the gentleman who happens to be speaking the courtesy of bowing as they pass. I noticed that last night the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) deliberately walked by the gentleman who was speaking, and did not even deign to bow as he passed between that hon. gentleman and the chair. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) has just walked by on this side of the House past the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and has not done him the courtesy of bowing, although this is not the side by which he has to pass. Now, the rule is clear that no member shall pass between the member who is speaking and the chair. Yet, the hon. member for West Huron has done it five or six times, while gentlemen on this side were speaking, yet he did not even extend the courtesy of bowing his head as he passed. I do not like to bring these matters up, but I insist upon the rights and dignity of hon. gentlemen on this side being respected.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand the Minister of Agriculture to say that a largely attended meeting was held in the city of Ottawa during the winter for the purpose of giving some opinion respecting the formation of a society of this kind. I would like the minister to give the committee some explanation as to the number of representative men that assembled themselves together. Perhaps at the same time he would give some information as to the resolutions they passed, and what general demand for the formation of an association of this kind has come from the people of Canada. Perhaps the minister would say as to whether there were representatives from all the provinces of Canada, whether the introduction of a Bill of this kind has the approval of the Minister of Agriculture of the local governments, and of the officers of the experimental farms. What I fear is the danger that we are going to spread out this kind of thing until the average farmer will not know just where he stands. It would bother the Minister of Agriculture himself to know whether he is controlling the whole of the agricultural interests of Canada or not. It seems all these organizations should come within the scope and control of either the Dominion government or of the local government; and I rather see in this some indication that a certain number of men may form themselves together for the purpose of registering seeds of different kinds, and then they will lead the farmers to believe that it will not be possible for them to grow any other kind of seeds than those registered. It may be that in certain sections of Canada people may be growing a class of seeds which it may not be possible to have registered under this association. I think it is a measure that requires mature consideration on the part of the minister. I fear he is rather hasty in this legislation. I think it would be interesting to the committee if the minister would give us full information regarding these gentlemen who assembled together in Ottawa recently, what was their object, and whether they made any very extended recommendations to the minister for the introduction of a Bill of this kind.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for. In regard to the provincial governments their Departments of Agriculture were all communicated with, and a good many of them were represented at the meeting which took place here about three or four weeks ago. They expressed their sympathy with this work.

Mr. BLAIN. How many?

Mr. FISHER. Three departments were represented by officials, and two by letters which were written to the officer of my department who had charge of this meeting—that makes five provincial departments. There are to-day about 140 gentlemen scattered all over the Dominion who have given in their names to form the Dominion Seed Growers Association.

Mr. BLAIN. Are those farmers chiefly or business men?

Mr. FISHER. Farmers; I do not think there are business men concerned in it at all. They are men who are interested in the growing of seeds. The work of growing seeds has been gradually increasing in this country, and there has been correspondence with the officers of my department for about four years, until it has culminated in this gathering which took place at Ottawa. It was in consequence of a general interest which has been felt in the country at large and resulting in a request for a gathering of all those who were interested to organize themselves for the purpose in view. They formed themselves into an organization and passed by-laws, a copy of which I have under my hand. I will read to the committee the one which indicates the objects of the association:

The object of this association is to advance the interests of seed growers and other farmers by,

(a) Making regulations respecting the growing, selecting and preserving of seeds of various kinds of farm crops for the guidance of its members;

(b) Causing records to be kept of the history of seeds produced by members;

(c) Fixing standards for seeds that may be eligible for registration;

(d) Publishing information as to standards;
(e) Issuing certificates of registration to members by which hand selected seed or the product therefrom may be known from other seeds;
(f) Such other means as may be expedient from time to time.

Then they went on to adopt certain rules and regulations :

The general officers of this association shall consist of a president, three vice-presidents, a secretary and ten directors, elected each year at the annual meeting, which body shall have power to add five directors to its number.

Then it goes on to define the duties of these officers in the usual way under incorporation.

Membership. The association may admit as operating members the persons now enrolled as members of the Macdonald, Robertson Seed Growers' Association, any person resident in Canada who may choose to make seed-growing a special branch of their farm operations, and who agree to conform to bylaws and regulations of the association.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be better to change that word 'may' into 'shall.' 'May' leaves it optional.

Mr. FISHER. There is no objection to that change. This is the other section relating to membership. The association may admit as honorary members persons who may be directly or indirectly interested in agriculture in Canada, but who may not be producers of seed, and such honorary members shall be eligible to hold office or otherwise enjoy all of the privileges provided for the members of the association.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that honorary members will be entitled to vote in making the by-laws ?

Mr. FISHER. They would here.

Mr. CLANCY. That is a very extraordinary privilege to give honorary members.

Mr. OSLER. I think the minister said this Bill was based upon the Live Stock Associations Law. On the face of it, this looks like a monopoly. An important clause of the Live Stock Bill is to be left out, clause 8 which reads :

The association may consist of annual subscribers and life members, and the annual and life membership fees shall be fixed by the members at the annual meeting or at a meeting of the association called for that purpose.
2. Any person who has not been expelled from the association may become a member thereof by giving or sending his name and address to the secretary, together with the annual or life membership fee ; and such person shall thereupon be entitled to the rights and privileges, and subject to the liabilities of a member as fully as if he had signed the application for the incorporation of the association.

That covers all the points that appear to be left out in this Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there is any objection to that. It was left out because, for the present at any rate, there was no intention of charging fees for giving certificates. It is not intended to charge for registration. That is the only reason it is left out.

Mr. OSLER. In time these certificates may become valuable, and the association would naturally charge a fee for them, and that would create a serious monopoly.

Mr. FISHER. There is not only no intention or desire to create a monopoly, but there is every intention and desire to prevent the creation of a monopoly by this Bill. The suggestion of my hon. friend is well worthy of consideration and it will obviate the difficulty that has been referred to.

Mr. SPROULE. There may be a condition adopted in regard to the payment of fees. The association could include in its regulations a provision that a member who pays his annual fee is entitled to such a certificate free just the same as a member who would be in a live stock association, although if a pedigree is got out there is a charge.

Mr. CLANCY. I thought the hon. minister would conclude reading the proposed by-laws of the association.

Mr. FISHER. These by-laws are rather voluminous. There is a number of them that are the ordinary by-laws of any association and which deal with the duties of the office. I hardly think it is worth while to go over them all in detail.

Mr. GOURLEY. Read the by-law about membership.

Mr. FISHER. I have just read that. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) suggested that the word 'shall' be substituted for 'may.' I think that is wise. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) asks whether honorary members have the power of voting and controlling the organization. I think that power ought not to be given to honorary members. Any person who does not wish to join the association and pay his fee I do not think should have the power of voting and perhaps controlling the association. I would suggest that a change should be made in these by-laws.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman under his hand the by-law which relates to the issue of certificates of registration ? That is a very important matter.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, as regards registration of seeds it says :

There will be three distinct classes of registration for seed :
1. In the hand-selected class there will be registered as 'hand-selected registered seed,'

only seed obtained from heads selected by hand from the plants relatively the most vigorous and productive on a registered hand-selected seed plot of at least the third year. The registration certificate 'hand-selected registered seed' will show the number of years of antecedent selection, as for instance, 'hand-selected registered seed of the fourth year' or the tenth year as the case may be. Such seed will be suitable for use on hand-selected seed plots to produce 'improved registered seed.'

2. In the improved class there will be registered as 'improved registered seed' only grain obtained from a crop produced from hand-selected registered seed. The registration certificate of improved registered seed will show the number of years of antecedent selection of the crop from which it was obtained, as for instance, 'improved registered seed from a crop of the third year' or of the tenth year as the case may be. Such seed will be suitable for use on improved seed plots to produce 'general crop registered seed.'

3. In the general crop class there will be registered as 'general crop registered seed' only seed obtained from a crop produced from improved registered seed. Such seed will be suitable for use for the general crop of the farm, and the product from it will not be eligible for registration.

That is the rule in regard to the registration of seed as proposed. I may say that the gentlemen who drew up these rules have been engaged in the production of selected seeds for three or four years. About four years ago Sir William Macdonald, of Montreal, offered a certain sum to be distributed in prizes amongst people who would select seed, hand packing it, selecting it and growing it under certain rules and regulations. These people have more or less multiplied and the seed that has been produced from their hand selected seed has been sold as such seed. It is partly out of that that the Seed Growers' Association has grown. The work has been carried on very largely under the direction of Prof. Robertson, who has been entrusted by Sir William Macdonald with the administration of the fund offered for prizes.

Mr. CLANCY. How is the certificate perpetuated or transferred from one holder of the seed to another ? For instance the seed may undergo a change by passing through three or four hands and yet it is the same seed. I have heard no provision or rules so far by which that certificate will pass from one person to another. It is the same seed, but how will you preserve its identity until it is finally disposed of for sowing purposes ?

Mr. FISHER. It would have to be accompanied by a ticket or certificate, the grower having just so many tickets for so many bushels. In the event of a man raising fifty bushels of a certain seed he would get fifty tickets. Each one of them would accompany a bushel of seed and if the seed passed through two or three hands more it would be accompanied by a ticket in the same way as when an animal is sold it is accompanied by a certificate.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the certificate issued to the grower be a sufficient warrant in the hands of the second holder or in the hands of the next person to establish the identity of the seed ?

Mr. FISHER. Fraud might occur in the substitution of ordinary seed for selected seed by one or other of the persons through whose hands it passes, but there is in the Act a clause providing penalties for a fraud of this kind just in the same way as the law operates in regard to animals. A man may buy a registered animal, the animal may die and he may substitute another animal and pass it on, but if he does so he will be committing a fraud in which case he will be liable to penalties. I do not think there would be any more danger in regard to this than there is in regard to live stock. Any safeguard that it is possible to invent will be invented to prevent such fraud. That will have to be a detail of the regulations of the association.

Mr. BRUCE. How is such a certificate obtained in the first place ? Is there any government supervision over the grower or do you take his word for it ?

Mr. FISHER. The association would have to send an inspector before issuing the registration certificate. The association by-laws would provide machinery by which under certain conditions the association could issue the registration certificate.

Mr. BRUCE. Is it the intention that the seed of 140 growers shall be accumulated in one place and distributed from there, or is it intended to allow the grower to sell it as he pleases ?

Mr. FISHER. It will not be accumulated in one place. The grower distributes his own seed under the rules of the association.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand the hon. minister to say that the plan upon which this Bill is based has been in operation for some years. What has been the result in connection with this seed that has been hand-picked ? Has the result been such as would warrant any outlay in regard to this subject ? Have the crops been more productive ?

Mr. FISHER. The observation of the Macdonald Seed Growers' Association is that the increase has been 19 per cent. The result of selection of seed for three years has been 19 per cent in regard to the number of seeds per head, and 27 per cent in the actual increase of production per year.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has that been ascertained by actual measurement or weight ; or is it imagination ?

Mr. FISHER. Actual test.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me that you are incorporating a body of men who might perpetrate a good deal of fraud on the unsuspecting public.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose there is possibility of fraud in almost anything.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there not a probability there would be ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so. For six years there has been a corn growers' association in the United States, and the result is an increase of 50 per cent in the production from those seeds which were selected and registered.

Mr. COCHRANE. I hope the Bill may result in good, but there is a good deal of nonsense in this paternalism as if you were dealing with a class of men who did not know how to conduct their business. From my earliest recollection I knew that you could increase productiveness by changing your seed and by selecting it so as to get larger kernels. The farmers know all that without any paternalism from an association that is given power to defraud the public and that very likely will, unless human nature changes.

Mr. FISHER. That may be true, but the organization will enable them to do their work successfully.

Mr. COCHRANE. Farmers know their business as well as most people and they do not want any organization to tell them. This society cannot give them any better seed than they themselves could get if they took care.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have had a letter since I came here asking me what kind of punishment could be inflicted on a merchant who sold seed oats which was mixed with seed of every imaginable kind of trash. In Nova Scotia we have to depend on the people of Ontario for our seed, and I am very anxious that this Bill shall go through, if it will bring about the result hoped for. Most people are not good judges of seed and they have to trust to the seed dealer, and we know that bad seed is sold all over the country. The hon. member (Mr. Cochrane) is quite correct that there may be fraud but if the Bill will help in any way to give us good seed, I shall be glad to see it passed.

Mr. LENNOX. The committee is liable to be misled by what is read from these proposed rules as distinguished from what the Bill actually says. The minister told us that any person who was engaged in the growing of seed would be eligible for membership in this association, but the Bill says: 'Any person' and does not restrict it to seed-growers. Five dishonest men or five exceptionally honest men, as, for instance, five lawyers, could form themselves into a seed-growers association so far as the Bill goes. Any men who want to get control of this matter and exact for themselves undue profits from the farmers, can associate themselves together under this Bill. We may not always have the happiness and blessing of having the present Minister of Agriculture ; we may have some other Minister of Agriculture, and he has power to give these associations what they ask. Again, although the Bill is said to be mainly for seed-growers' associations, and although that is in the title of the Bill, there is not one word in the Bill itself to show that it has any connection with seed-growing. The men who associate themselves together need not grow one pound of seed. They are simply an association for the purpose of keeping records—not a seed-growers' association or an association of farmers, but simply a speculative monopoly of persons not necessarily connected with production of any kind. The minister said I had overlooked the 5th section. I did not overlook it ; but there is not one word in that section about the growing of seeds. The association may be controlled solely by a monopoly, and the only safeguard we have against that is the control of the minister. I say again that I am distinctly and positively opposed to this skeleton legislation and to giving the minister the power, not simply of framing one set of rules, but of framing a new set of rules for every association that may want to be incorporated. I am casting no reflection on the present Minister of Agriculture; I am speaking of the matter in the abstract. It is too much power to give to any one man. It is the equivalent of delegating to a minister of the Crown power to say what shall be the laws of the country. As representing a rural constituency, I particularly object, on behalf of the farmers, to allowing any Minister of Agriculture to say what shall be the rules in regard to the main basis of the success of the farmer, namely, the seed which he shall put into his ground from year to year, and the price which he shall pay for that seed. I am not in harmony with this everlasting evidence of paternalism. I have faith in the intelligence of the farmers. I believe they have got along very well in the past. They are one of the main elements which have gone to make this country what it is, and there is no need of our everlastingly legislating for them and keeping them in leading strings, as the minister seems to want to do from time to time. A perusal of the Bill is sufficient to convince me that it does not express the ideas that are set forth in the by-laws which have been submitted to the committee or the ideas that have been enunciated by the minister himself. It is loose, careless and indefinite. I do not say this for the purpose of being offensive, I say it because I am bound to say what I believe to be the truth in

regard to this Bill. In a new matter of this kind some excuse may reasonably be urged; but the main objection to the Bill is that it places too much power in the hands of the minister, and takes away entirely from parliament that control which parliament should have and is bound to exercise on all occasions in regard to the rights of the people.

Mr. FISHER. Far be it from me to wish to arrogate to myself or to any minister or to the department any powers which are not proper or for which there is not a sufficient precedent. The form of this Bill is the form which has been adopted in regard to agricultural associations of all kinds. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the various Acts dealing with agriculture and live stock societies, he will find that the principles embodied in this Bill are practically the same as those which have already been crystallized in legislation, not only of this but of local parliaments dealing with similar work. There is no new proposal in arrogating authority to the minister of the department in this Bill. Various suggestions have been made which are of considerable value. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Osler) have made suggestions which can be incorporated in the Bill, and I would ask that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again in order that I may prepare one or two amendments suggested and which it will be desirable to insert in the Bill.

Mr. GILMOUR. Is this Bill merely for the purpose of registration, or does it go further ? Will it give power for the sale of seeds ?

Mr. FISHER. No, it is merely for the purpose of legislation.

Mr. LENNOX. Will there be any fee for the certificates ?

Mr. FISHER. That will be decided by the association itself just as is done in the case of registration of live stock.

Mr. GILMOUR. How can you compare the two ? Live stock continues, the animals registered are continued, but the seed must perish before being reproduced. We should know the conditions under which registration shall be continued. They ought to be set out in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. It would make the Act very cumbersome indeed to embody in it all the by-laws and regulations under which certificates can be issued.

Mr. GILMOUR. I think it absolutely necessary. This gives very wide powers, and we do not know where we are going to begin or end.

Progress reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that we were to have the supplementary estimates today. Will the hon. Finance Minister tell us when he is going to lay them on the table ?

Mr. FIELDING. In the preparation of the estimates there is always the possibility of delay, and I doubt if they will be down until to-morrow. I cannot promise definitely, but I hope to lay them on the table to-night or to-morrow.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY—WEIGHING OF DAIRY PRODUCTS IN MONTREAL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. RUFUS H. POPE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to call the attention of the House to a subject of great importance to the farming community, especially to that portion of the farming community that is engaged in dairying. And I shall conclude my remarks with a motion. For many years there has been a great grievance with regard to the manner of weighing dairy products shipped from the port of Montreal. This grievance is felt especially by the eastern townships and by the eastern portion of the province of Ontario. The urgency of the case was made apparent to the government some three years ago, when they issued a royal commission, addressed to W. G. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, for the investigation of this matter. At the beginning of the session I endeavoured to get some information in connection with the matter. Over two years have elapsed since Mr. Parmelee held this commission. It was felt—and rightly felt—by the farming community who are interested in the sale of dairy products that their affairs are handled in a neglectful way, not at all in keeping with their importance. For two years this matter has been hanging fire since Mr. Parmelee was appointed. Early in the session I took the opportunity to put the following questions :.

1. Was there a commission appointed to investigate the weighing of butter and cheese ?
2. If so, when was this commission appointed, and what was the name of the person or persons who constituted the commission ?
3. At what places, if any, did the commission hold sittings ?
4. Did they take evidence, and were reporters and newspaper representatives admitted ?
5. Has the commission reported ? If not, why not ?
6. At whose request was the commission appointed ?

This question was answered as follows :

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce) :

1. Yes.
2. The commission was dated the 7th December, 1901. Mr. W. G. Parmelee, Deputy

Minister of Trade and Commerce, was the person appointed.

3. Sittings were held at Montreal, St. Hyacinthe, Victoriaville, Brockville, and Cowansville.

4. Evidence was taken. Reporters and newspaper representatives were present during the sittings at Montreal. None appeared at any of the other sittings.

5. Yes.

6. The commission was appointed in consequence of numerous complaints having reached the government re the weighing of butter and cheese.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated that reporters and newspaper representatives were present at the sittings in Montreal. I had heard that that was not the case, that they were not permitted to be present. And so when I received this answer from the Minister of Trade and Commerce I took the opportunity of communicating with two newspaper men in Montreal, the first was the reporter of the 'Gazette' on that occasion. I received his answer as follows :

Reporters were not admitted, but were handed a prepared statement by Parmelee after the examination was over each day.

I also applied to Mr. Paul, of the 'Star,' and received the same answer in the shape of an affidavit. So it is evident that the answer given me by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in accordance with the facts. As the right hon. gentleman told me that the report had been made by Mr. Parmelee, I wrote to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) and asked him if he would be good enough to send me a copy. The right hon. gentleman replied that he would be very pleased to do so, but that the report was not in his hands ; it was in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, and I would have to apply to that hon. gentleman. At that time it was rather surprising. But since then we have been afforded an opportunity to learn how the departments are being run in couples, so we are not at all surprised when we are sent from one department to another for information. So I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture. And, on the 27th May, eleven days after my letter to him, I received the following answer :

Department of Agriculture,
Minister's Office,
Ottawa, May 27th, 1904.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 16th instant would have been replied to earlier but that the report for which you asked was one in the Trade and Commerce Department. I have obtained it and have had a copy made so as to afford you the courtesy of receiving it before the order of the House is passed as by your motion. I may add that I shall be very glad to facilitate the passage of the motion when it is reached.

Yours truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

R H. Pope, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

The motion referred to was one calling for all the documents in connection with this matter. The only thing I have received in answer to that motion is a copy of that report. However, we on this side are accustomed to treatment of that kind from the government. Of course, the government is necessarily the custodian of documents relating to public matters. When we, as an opposition, seek to perform our duties in criticising the acts of the government, and those for whom they are responsible, we can only do so on the information contained in documents in the charge of the government. It is evident that in the public interest that information should be furnished promptly. But that is not the treatment that has been accorded to the opposition by the government of the day since they came into power. On many occasions we have had to piece out the information as best we could, or wait until the government was pleased to furnish it. I presume that I will have to wait until next year for full information with regard to that matter to be forthcoming. However, there is sufficient in the report of Mr. Parmelee to warant me in the conclusion that the government have been neglectful of the best interests of the farming community. This matter was very earnestly brought before the government and the people of Canada by Mr. Bull, a gentleman with whom the Minister of Agriculture was acquainted, for I found that that hon. gentleman gave Mr. Bull a certificate of character. So far as I am concerned, I have practically no acquaintance with Mr. Bull. I met him here once when he called attention to this matter, and he furnished me with certain information he had received from the Minister of Agriculture and others, as well as with many letters to him congratulating him on making the move in the matter five or six years ago. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said of Mr. Bull in 1902 :

Having known Mr. Bull for a long time personally, although not connected with him in any business way, I gave him that letter of introduction. Mr. Bull appears to have presented the letter to the High Commissioner's office and to have received a letter from Mr. Colmer, secretary to the High Commissioner, introducing him to certain people with whom he wished to open business relations.

He also said :

He has been a produce dealer there, and has done a good deal of buying and selling of butter and cheese in Montreal. He informed me that he wished to open direct communication with the old country and it was for that purpose that he asked from me a letter of introduction to the High Commissioner, so that when he went to England he might have somebody to whom to refer. Mr. Aaron Bull, whose name is mentioned there, is one of the most respectable and substantial farmers of my county, a gentleman whom I could trust and rely on in every shape and way ; an old Quaker, if I may use the term, whose

name is noted for integrity and substantial standing in the community in which he lives. Mr. Charles A. Bull is his son, and he is a young man who, as I say, went to Montreal some years ago to enter business, and who, as far as I know, has conducted himself in a proper and trustworthy way.

So I take it for granted that Mr. Bull, being a trustworthy person, according to the Minister of Agriculture, I may have confidence in statements he may have made to me. It is not necessary for me to put on record all the letters and copies of letters from the various parts of the dairying sections of Quebec and eastern Ontario in order to show the absolute need of this investigation and of some change in the law. That would take a long time and would serve no good purpose. Sufficient to say that they are here in any number. The existence of them is known, no doubt, to the Minister of Agriculture and those who take an interest in this question. I find that the Minister of Agriculture, in 1900, in replying to the letter of Mr. Bull, said :

About the city weighers. I am not sure I could appoint a man to weigh the butter. I could, however, perhaps authorize somebody like Ruddick to be a referee in cases of dispute. If you or anybody else will work up a case such as you describe in general terms there is no doubt we could make such a row about it that either the local government or I would have to appoint a weigher. Instances such as you give me, if in detail as to dates, &c., and accompanied by such certificates carefully prepared and tabulated, would present such a case before the dairy associations or before the Butter and Cheese Board that they could not help acting.

That was the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture in 1900. He felt that he was corresponding with a man of some consequence and worthy of his confidence. This is further shown by the fact that it was since then that the minister gave Mr. Bull the certificate of character to which I have referred. Now, we find that, on 27th March, 1901, he says :

I have yours of 25th March. It is of the utmost importance that you should send me at once all the papers on the short weight matter.

So, back in 1901, three years ago, this was a matter of urgency in the best interest of the farmers of this country, and deserved immediate attention. And when I read this report, although the evidence upon which it was based was taken behind closed doors, without any of the frankness about the investigation that ought to have been manifested, it becomes clear that enough was known to warrant the commissioner in making this report, and to warrant the government in seeking to make a change in the system of weighing. However, after three years there does not seem to be the same urgency about the matter. The minister says in another letter to Mr. Bull :

Department of Agriculture,
Ministers's Office,
Ottawa, April 20th, 1901.

Charles A. Bull, Esq.,
441 St. Paul Street,
Montreal.

My dear Bull,—I have yours of the 16th. I find your statement and the papers you sent me so utterly inadequate that I will have to try and work it out with you personally if I can in any way succeed in getting a definite or clear statement from you. I have not had a moment's time in which I could do it this week. As soon as I have it I will send for you, but there is no use of your coming up here when I can't see you. In the meantime, I have written to the Board of Trade asking for a list of those authorized to weigh. I have looked up the law and found just who is empowered and authorized to appoint all weighers in Montreal. I find that McLeod is not so authorized. I have written to him asking on what authority he puts his advertisement in the paper and weighs butter and cheese. I am moving in the matter as fast as I possibly can, and the reason of any delay that there is, is because you have not been able to give a clear and definite statement which would be of any use in a public discussion in a matter of this kind.

Yours sincerely,
SYDNEY FISHER.

Consequently he still feels on the 20th of April, 1901, that there is reason for immediate action. We find again in April of the same year :

I am now in a position, after correspondence with the various authorities to state that Mr. John McLeod has no official status.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that this man has no official standing and has no right from a legal standpoint to do so, he is allowed to continue to weigh butter and cheese from that time to this ; and when this parliament is just closing, and without action on the part of this government, that man who has no status, that gentleman who is paid—so I understand it, by the men who are actually buying butter and cheese, the man who has no reason to favour the farmer and has every reason to favour the gentlemen who are handling that product at the expense of the farmer—that gentleman still keeps on weighing. The correspondence will show, as I proceed, the unfairness of the system under which this product is handled, and I shall convince every hon. gentleman in this House that it is a shame that this parliament closes without giving some relief, and some better assurance that the farmers will be treated honestly. I find this report is dated the 22nd of October, and it gives a list of the names of all those men who are entitled to be weighers, and it does not include Mr. McLeod. Then on May 11, the minister writes to Mr. Bull :

I have yours of the 10th in regard to the meeting at Brockville. I have really nothing to add to what I have already stated. My statements are categorical and I defy anybody to challenge their accuracy. I have

written to Mr. Hodgson on exactly the same lines as I wrote yourself and Benham, with the exception that in my letter to him I replied to his letter to me and consequently may have used some words slightly different, but the sense is the same as I wrote you. I have already said that the only legal and official weighers are Mr. Cameron and his assistants and that nobody else has any official or legal standing. The law authorizes nobody but the Board of Trade to make these appointments. I therefore cannot make an appointment without a change of the law.

He recognized on May 11, 1901, that we should have a change in the law. Of course this correspondence is very unsatisfactory, as you can understand, because I have not the letters that Mr. Bull wrote, I have not the arguments he advanced, I am not in possession of the information that warranted Mr. Bull in writing as he did to the Minister of Agriculture. But as I proceed you will see an estrangement taking place between him and the Minister of Agriculture. This is very near the beginning of it, when he writes him this peremptory letter. But he admits here that there should be a change in the law. Then on October 5, the minister writes to Mr. Bull :

I have yours of the 1st October. I have not been able as yet to see my colleagues about this matter, consequently cannot give you any information.

And that was previous to his taking charge of the Department of Militia. You can imagine how busy he has been, when he has the care not only of his own department, but the management and superintendence of the Department of Militia. Then his private secretary writes under date of October 19 :

Referring to your letter of the 18th, I write to inform you that Mr. Fisher left yesterday for Knowlton to return here only on Wednesday next. If the matter of short weights is of immediate importance to you, you had better address him there, although I doubt whether he could attend to it before he returns.

Perhaps he is too busy selecting officers down at Knowlton. The minister writes on October 30 to Mr. Bull :

I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 18th October. I expect to see Sir Richard Cartwright in connection with subject-matter of your communication in a few days——

This was on October 30, 1901, and it has taken him a year to go across and see Sir Richard Cartwright, although he recognized in the very beginning that this was a matter of importance, a matter of urgency that should be attended to immediately.

——when I will write you the result of our interview.

Then his secretary writes on November 22, to Mr. Bull :

Mr. Fisher left here this morning for his home to return probably on Tuesday, when your letter of the 21st will be laid before him. I fear you are acting too hastily, if you are espousing the best interests of the farmers concerned. Mr. Fisher is at the present time actively engaged upon the very matter which you wish to give prematurely to the public. Communications of the greatest importance are actually passing between him and the Department of Trade and Commerce——

Think of that.

——with a view to finding some substantial solution.

Two ministers putting their heads together, working determinedly on November 22, 1901, and we are talking now in July, 1904, and nothing done yet. This is the friend of the farmer, the practical farmer advertised by his leader throughout the country, working industriously as a farmer knows how to work, coupled with the ability of the Minister of Trade and Commerce—two great departments working yoke in yoke ; and still at the end of four years we are precisely where we were when we began, excepting that Mr. Parmelee has made a report. He reports on the number of pounds of cheese that this system is cheating them out of, and has been for several years :

Mr. Fisher expects to have before him upon his return to Ottawa a reply from Sir Richard Cartwright——

Sir Richard is going to write him. Is'nt it funny ?

—in answer to his own letter of the 18th.

Is'nt that splendid ?

It would indeed be a pity to have his well directed efforts marred even ever so little by such an ill-timed communication as you seem prepared to give to the press.

This gentleman, after working two or three years, is getting uneasy when he realizes the farmers' loss through the delay. He knew of the complaints against the system by which the farmers were being cheated out of their money. He was aware of it, no man in a better position to know, no man, according to the certificate of character and integrity given by the Minister of Agriculture, had any better right. Then on December 4 :

I have yours of December 3rd. You will have to learn patience. Royal commissions are not issued in a day, in a week or in a month, very often.

Think of the little minister writing that.

The government has a good deal else to do. This is a matter I have been trying to bring before the government and have it arranged for. As it happens, I think it is now completed, but until it is completed I am not going to tell you or anybody else what is being done——

Secret.

—nor can I, as that is a matter which is confidential and cannot be talked about.

Cannot be talked about. Silence. The farmer can be beaten all this time, no trouble about that, and it was not a secret.

As soon as anything can be told I will tell you.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

This is lovely. Now December 16, 1901 :

C. A. Bull, Esq., Gould Cold Storage Building, Montreal.

He has got frozen by waiting, December is a cold month.

In order to prepare for the work of the commission when it sits, Mr. Fisher would like you to be good enough to supply him with a list of those who have made complaints in regard to the weighing of butter and cheese, together with their addresses. When Mr. Fisher returns from a trip which he is just undertaking to the maritime provinces he will probably address a circular letter to those complainants and probably to others.

That is if he has time, if he is not too severely pressed, if he does not have to attend to military matters, if he does not have to conduct correspondence with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if he has not anything else to do he may address a circular in the interests of the farmers of this country, to somebody.

Perhaps you can have this ready before the return of the minister to Ottawa, say next Thursday or Friday. In making out the list of complainants you might give separately the names of corporate bodies, as a different circular letter will probably have to be written to them.

Then on December 16, the minister writes to Mr. C. A. Bull, Esq., Gould Cold Storage building, Montreal.

My dear Bull,—An Order in Council of December 7 appoints Mr. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, a commissioner for the purpose of investigating the matter of weighing butter and cheese in Montreal and elsewhere. Mr. Parmelee will not be able to take the matter up until the month of January some time. In the meantime you and those interested must prepare yourselves to come before him where the advertisement of his sitting as commissioner is made. I need not insist upon it to you that you must be prepared with a good case or else things will go against you.

All right.

You will have to move your people to prepare themselves to give their evidence concisely and clearly. As a matter of friendly advice you yourself ought to write out every word you wish to say. You cannot speak clearly when you come to speak to other people. You get excited and are liable to be misunderstood. I therefore would strongly urge you to prepare what you want to say, write it over and work it over, correct it and condense it, and then read it when you come before Mr. Parmelee. If you do not do this, knowing you as I do, I know you will get into a mess and make a very bad appearance before the commissioner. I hope that you will take care about this.

An hon. MEMBER. Who says that ?

Mr. POPE. This is signed by 'Sydney Fisher' writing to his friend. Well, he did not make any mess of it because I have a letter from Mr. Parmelee the member for Shefford in which he says :

Your evidence is splendid and I am going to publish it. I got Cleary to go in. Others have promised to go into Cowansville. I fancy we will be able to make out a case strong enough to justify remedial legislation.

Evidently this poor man, thanks to the kindly advice of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, got through with the ordeal with credit to himself. Then, on January 4, we find the following :

Ottawa, January 4, 1902.

My dear Bull,—I have yours of the 3rd instant and thank you for the information contained therein.

The chief reason our eastern township's beef is worth so much less on the market is that it is from dairy stock and only half fed. The western beef is nearly all from the beef breeds and consequently is more suited for that object. This we can hardly help, as our live stock work is chiefly dairy work, but dairymen might feed their animals better and get them into better shape.

As to Mr. Parmelee's investigations—I hope to see him within a few days and let you know just what he is going to do. Be sure and be ready for him when the time comes. I got your letters all right.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

Mr. C. A. Bull,
Gould Cold Storage Building,
Montreal, P.Q.

That was in 1902. Time moves on. From one year to another we go and this correspondence is the only means of relief. I think I shall have to send this bundle to the farmers of Canada to show them the measure of relief which they have obtained within the last few years.

Ottawa, January 8th, 1902.

My dear Bull,—I have your letter December 26th inclosing list of complainants, for which accept my thanks. I will see Mr. Parmelee as soon as possible and find out when he will be able to hold the meeting.

I am sorry to hear of your illness, but trust you are all right again.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

Charles A. Bull, Esq.,
Gould Cold Storage Building,
Montreal, Que.

Then, this is the circular that is spoken of in these letters.

Ottawa, January 16th, 1902.

Dear Sir,—Some time ago a number of complaints were laid before me in which statements were made as to the weighing of butter and cheese in the city of Montreal. These complaints

appeared to be of such a serious nature that I, as Minister of Agriculture, felt it my duty to look into the subject.

I found that the question at issue seemed to be more nearly in the domain of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who in a general way has charge of the inspection of goods in Canada.

He never thought of that in the beginning.

I therefore consulted with Sir Richard Cartwright and with others of my colleagues. Various things contributed to delay action, but a short time ago an Order in Council was passed appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the whole subject, with a view to ascertaining the exact facts, and if necessary making a recommendation based on these facts which would guide the government and parliament in future action.

Mr. W. G. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, has been named Royal Commissioner. He has arranged to sit for the purpose of investigation in the city of Montreal in the office of Mr. Craig, chief grain inspector, Room 42, Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Building, corner of St. Francois-Xavier and Hospital streets, opening his investigation at ten o'clock on the morning of Tuesday, January 28th, continuing, if necessary, on Wednesday the 29th. He will also sit at St. Hyacinthe on Thursday the 30th and at Victoriaville on Friday the 31st, at Brockville on Tuesday, 4th February, and at Cowansville on Tuesday the 11th February; commencing at nine o'clock in the forenoon in all these smaller places.

As you have submitted some views on this matter I must request you to take pains to appear before the commissioner and give expression to your views and any facts which bear upon the subject, and if amongst your acquaintances and friends or neighbours there are any who can give information of value bearing upon this subject, I must ask you to urge their attendance, so that the fullest possible information may be obtained in an accurate and trustworthy form.

The subject is one of great consequence to the producers of dairy products and all those engaged in these goods. It is, therefore, of the utmost national importance that the whole truth in regard to this matter should be obtained, as otherwise some mistake might be made in future legislation or departmental action. Relying on your interest in the matter and public spirit to induce you to appear and give what information is at your command.

Mr. Speaker, that information was given away back in 1902 and we are now going on towards the close of 1904. The question that was of national importance as the hon. Minister of Agriculture said in his circular to these people has been neglected to this hour. We are at the closing of this session. Yet no legislation has been proposed and these wrongs that have been perpetrated upon the farming community for all these years are to continue for another year and indefinitely so far as the farmers of this country are aware. Then, the next letter is as follows:

Ottawa, Jan. 18, 1902.

My dear Bull,—In reply to yours of yesterday, if Mr. Parmelee requires more days to appear in Montreal he will take them later on, but he will judge of that himself when he goes there. Do not go into too many details in the evidence, although of course you must take steps to show anything that is wrong for which there is fair complaint.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

Chas. A. Bull, Esq.,
Room 8, 17 St. John St.,
Montreal, P.Q.

He says to Mr. Bull that if you know anything wrong which is a subject of fair complaint why tell it, but be careful and not tell too much. To show you the character of this investigation I will now read a statement signed by Mr. A. C. Cross as follows:

WHITEWASHING.

To the editor of the 'Witness.'

Sir,—In to-day's issue of a morning paper it is announced that the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce is to proceed this morning with an inquiry into that long-standing controversy about the system of weighing cheese.

Those who do the weighing will see the notice, and, by taking a few steps, can appear before the commissioner. The farmers whose cheese is to be weighed, will probably know nothing about the inquiry until it is over. Under such circumstances, what else can be expected but the time honoured whitewash of the Butter and Cheese Association, followed by lots of cheap denunciation in parliament of those who assail the honour of reputable Montreal citizens.

Perhaps we shall hear some support of these reputable Montreal citizens to-day.

I now learn that the commissioner has just announced that newspaper reporters are not to be admitted to the sittings because the apartment in Mr. E. F. Craig's office is not large enough.

When I asked the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if such was the case he said that they were there but when I asked the gentleman who represented the papers, they said that they were not allowed in, that they were only furnished with a prepared report. Well, there is evidence in that of a want of veracity in this country.

This is not the way to satisfy farmers that when they sell a hundred pounds of cheese they will be paid for a hundred pounds instead of for the number of pounds which the purchaser chooses to say that there are according to a rule of his own making.

Mr. Parmelee says to Mr. Bull:

Ottawa, Feb. 26, 1902.

Chas. A. Bull, Esq.,
17 St. John St., Montreal.

Sir,—I have yours of yesterday's date asking to send you the report of the Butter and Cheese Association.

I do not find it in my possession—I presume it is among Mr. Broderick's papers which I cannot get at present. When it turns up I will send it to you.

Yes, I am going back to Montreal but I cannot state at what date.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. G. PARMELEE,
Deputy Minister.

Mr. Broderick seems to have disappeared with his papers. I do not know whether Mr. Parmelee ever got them back or not. There was some difficulty, I believe, in connection with the secretary of that commission. He took occasion to disappear.

Ottawa, March 7th, 1902.

Dear Mr. Bull,—Mr. Fisher has handed me your letter of March 5th, requesting me to send you the pamphlets on the food products of Canada, as you request. This I have done.

In regard to the transmitting of the notes of the Royal Commission, not much progress has yet been made, but the matter is receiving Mr. Fisher's daily attention.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) KEVILLE DOHERTY,
Private secretary.

C. A. Bull, Esq.,
Room 8, 17 St. John St.,
Montreal, P.Q.

This letter was written on March 7th, 1902. We are now in July, 1904. The hon. Minister of Agriculture was, as far back as 1902, giving his daily attention to the transcribing of these notes and still the report of that commission is not yet printed or published for the benefit of the farmers of Canada. He must be working over time. Then there is another letter :

Ottawa, 27th March, 1903.

Chas. A. Bull, Esq.,
117 King St., Montreal.

Sir,—In answer to yours of yesterday's date, I beg to state that I am in hopes to be able to make up a report on the investigation in question at an early date.

It is true Mr. Fisher, before leaving, requested me to have a report ready as soon as possible after the meeting of the House ; but so far it has been an utter impossibility for me to devote the time to it necessary. Every moment has been taken up. The parties so anxious for a report will have to abide with patience——

Patience began away back in 1900, it is continuing on the 27th March, 1903, it still continues and the farmers of this country must abide in patience while these people dock their cheese and butter to an extent that no other country would tolerate.

The parties so anxious for a report will have to abide with patience until an opportunity presents itself when I can get a day or two to spare which will be used in going through the papers again and making up the report, which really should have been made up some time ago.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. G. PARMELEE,
Deputy Minister.

I should think it ought.

Ottawa, July 8th, 1903.

My dear Bull :—I have just received your letter of the 7th July, and I must say that I am very much surprised at the tone of it.

I would just like to see that letter ; I suppose it is one of those patient letters that the minister had been asking him to write.

I have done all I possibly could, both for you and for the cause which you have worked in.

Think of that, and he did not do anything.

I count upon you to do everything you can to prevent any party capital being made from it.

Eh ? Cute ; see him smiling.

The matter of the report is such that I cannot force it on, although I am trying my best to get Mr. Parmelee to bring it to a close. You can do a good deal no doubt to allay any difficulties which may arise and it would be very unfortunate if you were to try to raise any.

Yes ; he kept these farmers waiting while they were beaten on every box of cheese and butter, and he advised them to be patient, resting calmly in the serene satisfaction that they had him for their representative and it would be all right.

What you say in regard to Mr. Parmelee I am sure is quite unjustified, as he is a true friend to farmers and the dairymen. I am sure that you have misjudged him in what you say in regard to him.

This is not a personal matter as between you and anybody else, but is a matter of consequence to all farmers, and must be dealt with in a broad and proper way.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

What a shame for the Minister of Agriculture to sit there, who has no right to be there except as a farmer, and yet dabbling in many things he has no business to stick his nose into. I am now reading a letter dated July 8th, 1903, two years after the investigation and three years after the Minister of Agriculture himself acknowledged that it was an urgent matter of national importance. You can see by the letters I have been reading, that if we had the whole of this correspondence it would be more interesting. Mr. Bull, who lives down there, and can appreciate things that we do not know of, knows that it is rumored in our section of the country that the great exporters of this produce brought a strong influence to bear, to suppress the report, and Mr. Bull goes so far as to say that it was an improper influence. I am not in a position to say that it was an improper influence, but I know that some extraordinary influence was brought to bear of a political character in order to prevent this report coming out as it ought to in the interests of the farmers of this country.

Ottawa, July 23rd, 1903.

My dear Bull,—I just have yours of the 22nd instant in regard to your business matters.

The fact is I am very ignorant in regard to banking and the necessary commercial security to give for accommodation at banks. I do not know any bank manager in a business way——

He was awfully lucky.

—and I cannot make a suggestion to you in regard to the matter.

Answering the last paragraph of your paper. Certainly do not try to trap people in the way you suggest. It would only make trouble for yourself in the future, and I do not think it would do any good to anybody, besides being a business I would not advise you to have anything to do with.

I will try to give you the names of some fruit men with whom you can communicate.

I am still trying to get Mr. Parmelee to make his report, but he is an old man, and it seems difficult to get him to move. He has a good deal to do during the session in his departmental work, and I suppose is putting that off.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

What next ?

Dear Mr. Bull,—I have yours of July 28th.

I do not understand your reference to what you lost, as it is not at all clearly stated. I do not see from your statement that it has anything to do with the report of the government. I do not think it is possible for that report to be out in a week. You undertake in this letter to practically hold me up, as we commonly say, on such a matter. If this is the case I have nothing further to add.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

Here we have evidence of that warlike disposition that has induced the Minister of Agriculture to dabble in militia matters. He is brave behind his own pen in his own office, and he cannot understand that this gentleman, not a farmer, but representing the interests of the farmers, should say that a loss has been caused to the farmers by the action of the government. Talk about Mr. Bull holding him up ; it was the Minister of Agriculture who was holding the farmers up.

Ottawa, Aug. 7th, 1903.

Dear Mr. Bull,—I have just received your letter of the 5th August, and am making inquiry in regard to what you say in regard to Mr. Woodard.

In regard to the second paragraph of your letter, in which you seem to imply that the Ottawa authorities have been holding back the report on the weighing because of money having been paid to them—this is unworthy of you or anybody else. You ought to know that there is nothing of the kind in it. As to what you did in the matter, you know perfectly well that you did it of your own free will and of yourself. I tried to advise you as to what to do, but in many instances you did not follow my advice, and I cannot hold myself in any way responsible for what you did. Certainly at the time you did it I thought a great many of the things you did were ill-advised and not likely to accomplish any good.

Mr. Bull was only reporting what was current in Montreal. How much direct evidence he had it is not for me to say, but he is a trustworthy man, as can be shown by the pedigree given him years ago by the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Bull comes of a trustworthy family ; he can be trusted beyond all question of doubt, and he writes thus to the Minister of Agriculture, and the minister is indignant :

Ottawa, Sept. 23rd, 1903.

Dear Sir,—I have yours of the 31st of August. I note that you did not speak to me the other day because you understood that I had hard feelings against you, and have expressed such in confidential letters to people.

No hard feelings ; I don't believe the Minister of Agriculture ever had hard feelings against anybody.

I must say that this is not in any way true. I do not know what your authority is, but on the contrary I am very glad to do anything I possibly can within reason to help you. Many requests you have made to me are unreasonable and I cannot undertake to meet them.

In regard to your threat of the 'hotter time' that I will have in the next election, I can tell you frankly it has no effect on me. I am not accustomed to submitting to such threats. I can assure you they have no weight with me in any way whatever.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

No matter how much the farmers would suffer ; no matter how long they are kept waiting, the Minister of Agriculture is above everything of that sort. He is above attending to his official duties as Minister of Agriculture, but he is not above sticking his nose in the departments of other ministers. Now, Sir we will come to the report itself, and there is a letter to the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, G.C.M.G.—I don't see anything of the farmer in that title.

Sir, the undersigned having been, under authority of the Royal Commission, bearing date the 7th of December, 1901——

And we are now speaking in 1904.

—appointed a commissioner 'to investigate, inquire into and report upon complaints and difficulties in connection with the weighing of butter and cheese,' has the honour to hand you for the information of His Excellency the Governor General, this his report upon the result of such investigation ; the conclusions arrived at and his recommendations in connection therewith ; together with a copy of the evidence taken under oath or affirmation in the course of such investigation ; all as required under the terms of the said commission.

Of course we have not a copy of the evidence, as the documents were not brought down which I asked for. However, we are accustomed to that sort of treatment, and just as long as the people will put up with this treatment of their representatives, will that practice continue of debarring members from getting the information to which they are entitled and which they require in order to make their arguments conclusive.

Regular sittings were held at Montreal on the 28th and 29th days of January, at St. Hyacinthe on the 30th, at Victoriaville on the 31st of the said month, at Brockville on the 4th, and at

Cowansville on the 11th days of February, 1902, at which places some forty-eight witnesses were duly sworn and examined touching the complaints referred to, and of their knowledge of the practices in vogue in connection with the weighing of butter and cheese at time of marketing the same.

Other written, as well as oral, information was sought and obtained, which, not being under oath, was not therefore transcribed or embodied in the evidence herewith submitted.

It does not say where that evidence comes from or on which side of the question it was.

It was at the time the intention of the undersigned to hold other sittings and investigations with a view to obtaining further evidence corroborative or otherwise of the sworn statements made and correspondence upon the subject, but circumstances prevented until too late in the season and such action was eventually abandoned as not being strictly necessary.

If it was necessary, there is no reason why it should have been abandoned because he had over a year in which to obtain evidence before making this report.

The complaints as set forth in the copy of the Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council alluded to as accompanying the Royal Commission are to effect that difficulties have frequently arisen and continue to arise in connection with the weighing of butter and cheese ; that the Butter and Cheese Association at Montreal has in its employ as a weigher a man not duly authorized under the statutes to act as such, and insist that his weights must be taken as correct and payments accepted on the basis thereof ; that his weights are not always correct and that therefore the vendors being forced to accept such weights are at the mercy of the association and are compelled to accept less than their proper due were the weighing correctly done.

It is a well known fact that an old weighing beam was in use there for years. Whether it is in use now or not I cannot say, but it was in use for years, and it is well known that it was incorrect. The weigher had a new one made, but they thought it cost too much and they would not take the trouble of putting in a new beam, so that they may still be continuing the old imperfect system.

The man referred to is Mr. John McLeod, who, it appears from the evidence submitted, styles and advertises himself a ' public weigher '——

But he is not legally a public weigher, as shown by the letters of the Minister of Agriculture produced in his inquiry two of three years ago.

—and states that he was appointed as such by the Montreal Butter and Cheese Association in January, 1894, and who produced a notice of such appointment signed by the president, vice-president and the secretary of the association.

These men who are handling that butter and cheese , because forsooth they chose to select this man to do the work for their personal benefit, styled him a public weigher. Would you, Mr. Speaker, think of shipping butter and cheese from the interior to Montreal when you know there is no fair arbitrator between the producer and the shipper ? The lack of such a fair arbitrator is sufficient in itself to breed discontent, dissatisfaction and mischief, even were the weighing correct, and we have very good reason to know it was not. In fact the very system adopted of making calculations is bound to make the result unfair to the men who are producing butter and cheese.

The present officials of the association deny any knowledge of such appointment. The president of the association, when under examination, styles Mr. McLeod a ' licensed public weigher, licensed by the city ' (vide pages 55 and 56 of evidence).

Which of course we have not got.

In a letter of date the 27th February, 1901, from the secretary of the association he points out that the public weighers are not appointed by the association. The president of the Montreal Board of Trade, under date April 15th, 1901, states that Mr. Duncan Cameron is the official weigher appointed by the council of the board and gives a list of his sworn assistants, among which does not appear the name of Mr. McLeod.

He is not even an assistant to the man recognized there as the weigher for the trade. He is not, I believe, as he should be an official of this country above suspicion, an impartial arbitrator between the farmers and the purchasers. He is not even an assistant to the man who holds the position there of weighmaster. Still he goes on from year to year :

Under date of the 23rd April, 1901, Mr. McLeod states that he was appointed deputy weigher for Montreal in May, 1878, and in a letter from the then president of the association of date the 1st April, 1901, it is stated that Mr. McLeod was sworn as assistant to Mr. Muirhead, Mr. Cameron's predecessor, in 1878, and has acted as an independent weigher since Mr. Muirhead's death in 1882 ; and that on the formation of the association in 1893, it was deemed expedient to formally recognize both Mr. Cameron and Mr. McLeod as competent weighers, but their public position was not conferred on them by the association and it had not control over them.

It appears to the undersigned that notwithstanding the formal appointment of Mr. McLeod by the association in 1894, and the denials of such appointment subsequently made, the association has and does recognize Mr. McLeod as an official weigher——

That is what Mr. Parmelee said.

—of equal authority with Mr. Cameron, and that in point of fact the bulk of butter and cheese is weighed by Mr. McLeod and his assistants ; and while possibly the association or members thereof do not insist upon his being exclusively employed as a weigher, he is given the preference, and the impression has gone abroad that as the appointee or employee of the association, his weights must be accepted, while in point of fact since the death of Mr. Muirhead in 1882, he has had no legal status whatever, yet at the

same time the undersigned has no doubt that his work is as well and correctly done as is that of the legally appointed official weigher, Mr. Cameron.

Well, Mr. Parmelee comes to that conclusion not through any practical experience. I have shipped butter and cheese and had it weighed in Montreal and no one —I do not care who he is—who has not some pull with that association, is satisfied with the weights. For my own creamery I have had had three separate makers of butter in a single year, and I warned them to be very particular so that they might be able to take oath with regard to every box of butter I shipped forward. We shipped it and it was cut in Montreal. I made my objections, but the variations in those weights continued to the close of that season. After the difficulties of that season, I determined to get out of the hands of this association. This man may be a fair man, but he is not fair to those who manufacture butter and cheese. He is only fair to those who purchase. Consequently I shipped from that time on to parties not connected with the association, and I had no trouble. I put 56 pounds in a box if I wanted to. My weights were correct and paid for. After that I found my butter again coming under the hands of this man and again found it impossible to pack 56 pounds in a box. Under the circumstances I speak warmly because there are many farmers treated in this way but who cannot raise their voices in the House in this connection. They are the men who signed these petitions; who signed these letters; who put forth years of effort to right these wrongs; who brought pressure to bear upon this government and urged them to take hold of this matter and give the farmers some relief. And, after all their work of years, here, at this late day of the session, it is imposed upon me, a man without the responsibilities of government, to rise in this House and again bring this question forward. When you think of these things, I think you will say that it is a shame that I should be obliged to make a speech here to-day upon this subject. The report goes on:

> In the handling of the immense quantity of butter and cheese that passes through the port of Montreal annually, say between two and three million packages——

Think of that! Between two and three million packages. Imagine what a variation of a pound or two or even of a fraction of a pound means when you come to the handling of two or three million packages. No one can calculate the amount of money that has been lost to the farmers during the summer which is now in progress, though the government had this report dated 22nd of last October, showing the urgent need for a change. The recommendations of this report are not sufficiently strong. Still, they are in the right direction. And, although this report was before the government on the 22nd of last October, they allow these thousands upon thousands of packages of butter and cheese to go out of this country, weighed by a man who has no official standing, who is repudiated by the dairymen of the province of Quebec and eastern Ontario, a man whom we do not believe to be honest whether he is or not.

> In the handling of the immense quantity of butter and cheese that passes through the port of Montreal annually, say between two and three million packages, it is only natural to expect that mistakes will occasionally occur, aside from which in numerous instances the weighers are accused of giving short weights, when upon investigation it is shown that the fault was not theirs but rather of the makers and shippers from country points who are prone to regard a cut in weights given by the weigher as a discrimination against them in favour of the Montreal buyer or consignee, as the case may be.

We do not need this official report to make us appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. We all know that when cheese is shipped too green it will lose in weight. We know that if it is shipped in dry boxes the boxes will absorb the moisture. For all that allowance can be made. But, when I come to read a clause or two further on, you will see under what system they arrive at the average weight. When you speak of butter, however you speak of a commodity which loses weight but very little in such handling as it is necessary to give it. It is packed fresh, handled fresh and shipped fresh. No matter who the man may be who makes the statement that butter loses materially in weight the statement is not correct. Butter is shipped from the creamery this morning and weighed in Montreal to-morrow, and it should move the balance in Montreal about the same as in the creamery.

> The most prevalent cause of loss in weight is unquestionably that of the practice throughout the butter and cheese producing sections of the province of Quebec and the eastern portions of Ontario, of shipping their cheese too young or green. There is such competition between makers to show a 'record' that cheese is largely shipped before it is ten days old and in some instances direct from the hoop, and shrinkage en route to Montreal is, under such circumstances inevitable.

Everybody understands that.

> It appears in evidence that in so far as regards western Ontario the cheese is not shipped until from fifteen to thirty days old, that the shrinkage in weight is much less, and therefore has not been the subject of complaint.

The same reason holds good in a minor sense with regard to butter, where, in order to show a record of production, it is sometimes shipped, especially when in tubs, containing more moisture than the average, and consequently loses somewhat through evaporation and soakage.

Very little, when it is hermetically sealed.

There is a rule of the Montreal Butter and Cheese Association which the undersigned cannot but consider unfair to the factory men. and that is——

Now, here is the whole story.

—in connection with the manner in which cuts for short weight are made under rule 2 as adopted by the Board of Trade, July 10th, 1901. There is no objection to the first paragraph of the rule, but there is to the second which reads :—

Now, I would call your particular attention to this.

Actual weights must be shown on certificate, but no gain shall be applied against losses in the average ; gains of 2 pounds and over shall be governed by rule 3. A further rule provides that not less than five packages of cheese nor more than ten per cent of each particular lot shall be weighed.

Why, Mr. Speaker this shows that the butter and cheese are not weighed at all. It would not stand law for a minute. Say there are fifty packages of cheese and you weigh only five of them. You go before the court and the judge asks you, 'Did you weigh that cheese ?' and the answer is 'I weighed five packages and averaged the rest.' Why he would send you back with instructions to weigh forty-five more. And yet this kind of thing goes on for years and is still upheld. We have had an investigation, or rather we have had the mockery of an investigation with none of the benefits of it. All the benefits of the situation have been left to flow into the coffers of those who are handling our butter and cheese in the city of Montreal.

The effect of this is that, supposing that there is a lot of fifty packages, five of which would be weighed and, supposing the first package showed a loss of one pound, the second a gain of one pound, the third O.K., the fourth a loss of one pound and the fifth a gain of one pound, a cut is made of two pounds in every five packages of the whole lot, that is to say, of twenty pounds, whereas the average shows no loss whatever.

In other words you get no credit for your overweights, and you are cut when you are short ;—'Heads I win, tails you lose.'

Under the system of weighing in force and allowances insisted upon, it too often happens that at least one package in every lot is judged short weight. Therefore, all is cut accordingly. And it appears that frequently not sufficient care is taken to note the overs, it being claimed that the scales are set at the weight marked at the package and if the beam goes up sharp it is too often registered as O.K., and no particular pains taken to note the amount of overweight.

Now, is not that a nice state of affairs ? These deductions have been made in the handling of between two and three million packages. The results of the farmer's labour are handled in this fashion as they go through this great port, and, though the government, on the 22nd October had these facts before them, no action has been taken. And, though the investigation was held two years ago no report was submitted until last October. Sir, if ever there was a time when a resolution of want of confidence in the government and in one of its departments should be moved, I am justified in the motion I shall present to you in a few moments.

This practice is a source of great annoyance and is looked upon by the factorymen, to speak mildly, as fraudulent.

Well, they are kind.

This rule is insisted upon by the buyers for the purpose, as they explain——

Of course they would have an explanation. Can you imagine a set of men banded together in an association handling between two and three million packages of cheese and butter not being able to give an explanation why they cut the farmers for shortage and never give them credit for overweight ?

—of avoiding cuts for short weight at the point in Europe to which they ship.

Do they know how they will weigh out in Europe ? If they do and if there is a shortage why do not they provide for it in the price they pay the farmers for the cheese and not take this underhand, unfair, dishonest means of getting even—and better than even—with the farming community of this country. Why, they admit the whole thing. They say that they are guessing at what the goods are going to weigh out in Europe. They intend to cut the farmer enough to pay for the shrinkage that may take place not only between his factory and Montreal but between Montreal and Europe. They buy the goods and surely they should be willing to run their own risk, instead of transferring to the farmer that risk of handling between this country and Europe as well as the risk between the factory and Montreal. That is a safe way of doing business, but it is mighty hard on the man who milks the cows and makes the butter and cheese.

This the undersigned looks upon as entirely another transaction for which the country maker should not be held responsible.

Mr. Parmelee is quite right—but the farmers are suffering just the same. And these hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, by their neglect, by their indifference to the interests of the people, are permitting the farmers to be imposed upon by these men. And for what purpose ? The Minister of Agriculture told Mr. Bull to be careful to do nothing to disturb matters and create party capital, because that capital would be against his own party the one that he loves so much and serves so faithfully. This is the Minister of Agriculture, who is

so much beloved by his party. I could well understand his writing that letter to Mr. Bull, warning him to take no action that would hurt his party, but, on the other hand to let the farmers suffer, let them be hit, let them be bit. After he had warning, so much warning that he was obliged to take action, he went to work; but when these gentlemen said: Stop, we are Liberals; we belong to your party—Mr. Ayer and all those gentlemen who are supporters of this government in Montreal, nine-tenths of these exporters belong to that party, perhaps nineteen-twentieths of them—I say when these men interfered they received instructions to stop. The reports were slow, at last they came, and now they are pigeon-holed since the 22nd day of last October, and the farmers of this country continue to be cheated since that time.

The rule and the practice, the undersigned thinks, should be cancelled, and when a lot averages full weight the maker should get the benefit thereof, or should get credit for all over weights instead of being mulct on the whole when a portion only is under weight.

This is the report of the commissioner whom this gentleman appointed. This is the man who represents the farmers, the practical farmer of this government. He has had time to frame his legislation here, but to-day we heard him spending his time trying to make political capital, getting up nothing more than campaign literature out of an organization of seedsmen. He had better spend his time in framing legislation to protect these men, instead of trying to reconstruct the Militia Department of Canada. He should devote some more of his time to the farmers of Canada. There are many farmers in the counties of Missisquoi, Brome and Shefford who are suffering from the application of this tariff, who have suffered for years, and he knows it. He can spend time in interfering with the political part of a militia organization, but when it comes to the defence of the farmers' interests he has no time at his disposal, he is over-worked, he is too tired, he cannot get a move on. The farmers of this country must suffer from it.

Most of the butter and cheese is sold on Montreal weights, therefore the maker must rely on the integrity of the weigher, as he has usually no opportunity of seeing the packages weighed on their arrival, and for this reason there is a strong demand for the appointment of official weighers at the point of shipment. This in a general sense, the undersigned thinks impracticable as butter and cheese is shipped from nearly every railway station in Canada, and it is manifestly impracticable to maintain an army of official weighers to do the work.

The butter and cheese is usually sold at the various boards, but the delivery is not made at such boards except in so far as regards such as may have been manufactured in the immediate vicinity thereof, or nearer thereto than to any other station, so that even the appointment of official weighers at such boards would not afford the relief demanded.

The maker has the remedy in his own hands by declining to sell on Montreal weights and perhaps in some sections the competition between buyers is so great that they might come to terms and accept under certain conditions the factory weights, but the undersigned is of the opinion that such a course would only have the effect of creating dissatisfaction on the part of the buyer instead of the seller, and lead to as much friction, if not more, than at present obtains.

In conclusion the undersigned has the honour to suggest that the Act 28 Vic., chapter 6, be so amended as to provide for the appointment of weighers of butter and cheese by His Excellency the Governor in Council, instead of permitting such appointments to be made as at present, by boards of trade. This would give the weigher a status that he has not at present and would go far towards regaining the confidence of the factory men who now are aware that the weighing in Montreal is not in all cases done by an official weigher, but rather by an appointee of the butter and cheese association, which association is composed of buyers, some of whom might be, under the circumstances, regarded as exercising undue influence over a weigher when their own appointee.

Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd.) W. G. PARMELEE.

Sir, that is the conclusion of this report vindicating the appeal of all these people from time to time for relief from the distressing conditions under which they found themselves placed. Mr. Parmelee found he did not have to go very far; he did not have to make a second or third visit to Montreal, his first touch at these centres showed him that there was something wrong, that there was something unjust, that there was something unfair towards the farming communities who shipped to Montreal, and that they were being deprived of money they ought to receive as the result of their labour. Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough to satisfy every hon. member of this House that the government have been criminally neglectful, have been careless, and have been indifferent to the best interests of the dairymen who, in the eastern part of Canada at least, have been wronged; the report practically tells us so. It tells us that the system of taking all and giving nothing in return is not business, it is not law, it is not honest, it is not fair to those men who are working day after day and producing the dairy product of this country and shipping it to Montreal. It is not fair to them, and it is not creditable to this government that three years should have been taken up in getting out a report, and that when the report is out relief should not be given to these people, although recommended by that report, at the first meeting of parliament that takes place after the report is made. I say the Minister of Agriculture has been neglectful of his duty to the dairymen. He had enough evidence of this wrong before he ever appointed Mr. Parmelee, he had no need to appoint him. He did not need a royal commission to act, but the truth is that he was afraid of somebody, he

did not dare to act off his own bat, because he had been told by these gentlemen in Montreal more than once to be careful how he proceeded, his political friends warned him not to go too far. Consequently, when he really did appoint Mr. Parmelee, the latter only gave in his report last October. I say that it is unfair, it is discreditable on the part of this government, it is unjust to the farmers of eastern Ontario and of Quebec, who have been deprived of hundreds and thousands of dollars which they are entitled to, and would have received if their products had been fairly weighed in the city of Montreal. In view of all these facts, I beg to move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor :

In the opinion of this House the dairy farmers of Canada have wrongly suffered great loss for many years through the system allowed to prevail by the government in regard to the weighing of butter and cheese at the port of Montreal and for the government's neglect to provide any proper system for such weighing as shown by the investigation and report of Mr. W. G. Parmelee, Royal Commissioner, bearing date 22nd October, 1903 ; and this House regrets that since the date of such report no action has been taken by the government to remedy the state of affairs shown thereby.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can blame the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) very much, because, apparently, his speech was chiefly directed at my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), but I may just say that it was only at three o'clock that I was aware that the hon. gentleman was going to move in this particular question, and I have hardly had any opportunity, except from his own speech, of examining the facts in detail. I think it will have struck hon. members of this House that despite the very great zeal the hon. gentleman may have for the interest of the farmers of Canada, whether east or west, his desire if possible to cast discredit upon my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is evidently greater than his zeal for the interests of the farmers of Canada. A great many things that he said, I think might very well have been spared. I think that everybody from one end of Canada to the other who has paid the slightest attention to the operations of the Department of Agriculture since my hon. friend became the head of it, is aware that no Minister of Agriculture in the past has ever done a hundreth part as much for the welfare of the people of Canada and for the benefit of the farmers of Canada as the present Minister of Agriculture has done, and as between himself and the hon. member for Compton I do not believe that in the hon. gentleman's own constituency on a ballot vote he would find one man in ten to say that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture was not the zealous and firm friend of the farmers of Canada.

Mr. POPE. May I ask the right hon. gentleman if he was ever in my constituency ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a good while since, I am bound to say.

Mr. POPE. I thought so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A good while since, but I know something of the feeling of the farmers of Canada and I have the honour to represent a constituency which contains as many good farmers as are to be found in the county of Compton, and which is one of the very largest cheese exporters at this moment in the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. POPE. They are getting rid of you.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think, if the hon. gentleman chose to come up to the constituency of South Oxford and to encounter me there he would come to that conclusion. Others have tried that experiment and they have retreated in considerable discomfiture. In respect to some of the statements that the hon. gentleman has made, I wish to state, on the information given to me by my department, that reporters were allowed to be present at the meetings held by Mr. Parmelee. I took the trouble since this debate commenced to inquire of that gentleman whether this was the case and I am informed that the reporters were permitted to be present. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, nor do I suppose the hon. gentleman has, but I leave it at that. The statement of my deputy is that reporters were invited and were present.

Mr. POPE. According to the affidavit they were not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think Mr. Parmelee's word is quite as good as any statements put in the hands of the hon. gentleman whether supported on affidavit or unsupported on affidavit, and I for one would accept Mr. Parmelee's statement quite as freely as I would the sworn testimony of all the reporters the hon. gentleman can collect together from one end of the Dominion to the other.

Mr. SPROULE. That is hard on the reporters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know my deputy and I know perfectly well that he is incapable of making a misstatement of any kind. In respect to the delay in connection with this particular matter in regard to which the hon. gentleman addressed the House for an hour and a half I would point out that during the greater portion of the years 1902 and 1903 the De-

puty Minister of Trade and Commerce was incapacitated by a very severe and dangerous illness, involving his absence for many months from Ottawa, and this was the reason why the delay of which the hon. gentleman complains took place. As to the allegation which the hon. gentleman has made, on what evidence is best known to himself, that improper influence was brought to bear to prevent the production of this report or the laying of it before the House, I give it the most unqualified contradiction. No sort of improper influence was brought to bear on me or upon my deputy and so soon as Mr. Parmelee's health permitted, this report was brought forward. I am not aware that there have been any complaints recently. I think that these complaints, if my memory serves me, extended over a number of years and extended to the time of our predecessors as well as to that of ourselves. But, I may observe in reference to this matter that in the course of his report Mr. Parmelee points out, what is no doubt the case, that a great deal of the difficulty that has occurred, has arisen from the simple fact that in those portions of the country to which the hon. gentleman more particularly refers there is a habit of packing cheese and butter without giving the product sufficient time to dry and that in consequence there is a very considerable shrinkage from time to time which naturally results in disputes between the buyers and sellers. I was at pains to make inquiry in western Canada, as was also Mr. Parmelee, as to what the difficulties were which they experienced, and I found that in the western section of the country a sufficient space of time was allowed for the natural shrinkage to take place and that they had very little complaint to make as to the weighing of cheese or butter in Montreal. In the eastern section, I am informed, although I have no knowledge of the subject myself, that there is considerable difficulty owing, as I have said, to the fact that the cheese is hardly given a sufficient length of time to enable it to be properly dried out, or at least properly free from moisture before its submission to the weighers. Under such circumstances there will be considerable friction and difficulty. As for the recommendation of Mr. Parmelee, I have some doubts, although I cannot give expression to any positive opinion on the subject, as to whether it is desirable or wise that the government should take the matter entirely into the hands of the department and appoint official weighers themselves. That is a matter upon which my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Fisher) may desire to consult with his colleagues as it is his bounden duty to do. Mr. Parmelee pointed out also, and that was one result of his investigation which was worth something at any rate to the producers, that they were not in any way bound to accept Mr. McLeod's weighing and that the remedy was very largely in their own hands if they chose to exercise it. No doubt there was one point which the hon. gentleman made and which has been alluded to by Mr. Parmelee which I am free to say requires consideration and which perhaps calls for a remedy, and that is the practice of charging farmers for the loss and not crediting them with the gain in the case of special packages. I am free to say that that is a matter which deserves and should have due consideration. Since the report came out I fancy that these complaints are not as frequent as before, although the hon. gentleman may be better advised on that subject than I am. But the allegation he has made that reporters were excluded and the complaints that he has made as to the extraordinary time that has elapsed are really unfair and unfounded. The delay was not due to any improper influence, but to the fact that Mr. Parmelee was reduced almost to a condition of imminent danger for a period of many months during which I was obliged to give him leave of absence. That is the real cause of the delay that the hon. gentleman has spoken of and I think that when the facts are stated the House will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman's zeal has outrun his discretion in this special matter.

Mr. M. AVERY. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this country have been literally robbed by the system of weighing cheese in Montreal. I went down there myself to see what the trouble was and I found that the cheese were cut one pound per box and sometimes six or seven pounds on fine cheese. I thought that it might be possible that the cheese makers were not giving us proper weight and so I had the cheese weighed myself, but notwithstanding that I found that the weights were again cut in Montreal. I believe these men in Montreal club together to make something out of each farmer and that is the way we are robbed. It is time that the Minister of Agriculture and the government should look into this matter and protect the farmers of the country. He was informed of this grievance on the 13th of October last and yet he has done nothing up to this moment. I suppose if the opposition did not press this matter now, the Minister of Agriculture would still rest on his oars and do nothing. It would become him a great deal better to look after the interest of the farmers and not go around meddling with the appointment of officers to a militia regiment. He should leave the Pickels of Sweetsburg alone and try to get the farmers out of the pickle they are in. If this thing goes on it is time to change the Minister of Agriculture and put some one in

this place who will discharge the duties of the office.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Pope).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Ingram,
Armstrong,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Avery,	Kidd,
Barker,	Lancaster,
Bell,	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Lennox,
Birkett,	Léonard,
Blain,	McGowan,
Boyd,	Morin,
Broder,	Osler,
Bruce,	Pope,
Carscallen,	Porter,
Clancy,	Richardson,
Clare,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clarke,	Roche (Marquette),
Cochrane,	Rosamond,
Donnelly,	Smith (Wentworth),
Earle,	Sproule,
Fowler,	Thomson (Grey),
Ganong,	Tolton,
Gourley,	Vrooman,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Hughes (Victoria),	Wilson.—46.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Bazinet,	Lewis,
Béland,	Loy,
Blanchet,	Macdonald,
Bourbonnais,	Mackie,
Bruneau,	MacKinnon,
Bureau,	MacLaren
Carbonneau,	(Huntingdon),
Champagne,	Macpherson,
Christie,	McGugan,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	McLennan,
Davis.	Malouin,
Delisle,	Marcil (Bagot),
Demers (Lévis),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Matheson,
Emmerson,	Mayrand,
Erb,	Mignault,
Ethier,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fisher,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Parmelee,
Gervais,	Paterson,
Gibson,	Puttee,
Girard,	Riley,
Gould,	Roche (Halifax),
Grant,	Ross (Yukon),
Harwood,	Rousseau,
Holmes,	Russell,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)	Scott,
Hyman,	Sifton,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Sinclair,
Johnston (Lambton),	Smith (Vancouver),
Kendall,	Stewart,
Lapointe,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Thompson
Laurier	(Haldim'd & Monck),
(L'Assomption),	Tolmie,
Lavergne	Turgeon,
(Drum. & Artha.)	Wade.—75.
Lavergne (Montmagny),	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Lovell,	Kendry,
Tobin,	Ball,
Lang,	Hackett,
Gallery,	Kemp,
Beith,	Hale,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Brock,
Campbell,	Calvin,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Heyd,	Seagram,
McCool,	Northrup,
Préfontaine,	MacLaren (Perth),
Sutherland (Essex),	Culbert,
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wallace,	Tisdale,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Wright,	Lavell,
Haszard,	Daniel,
Gauvreau,	Monk,
Fielding,	Borden (Halifax),
Bickerdike,	Roddick,
Brodeur,	Gilmour,
Dugas,	Tarte,
Guthrie,	Maclean,
Law,	Kaulbach,
Morrison,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Ross (Rimouski).	Halliday.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Durham East and Nicolet have not voted.

Mr. WARD. I am paired with the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) or I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BALL. I am paired with the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $135,000.

Mr. WILSON. Before this vote is passed, I would like to make a few remarks in a general way about immigration. We have been increasing our vote from year to year until it has reached a very large amount. At the last session of parliament, we voted $595,114, which was covered by five items in the estimates. For some reason or other, the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who has charge of this department, does not see fit to divide up this vote as is done in other departments. This year we are asked to vote $150,000 more, which will make the total $745,014. In addition there has been spent on immigration buildings during the past year $41,764, which is a considerable item, and which makes the total expenditure for the year on immigration alone $786,-

993. I do not suppose that any one would particularly complain of the size of the vote when taking into consideration the fact that this is a new country and that its territory is almost boundless, provided we were getting value for our expenditure. But the difference of opinion between that side of the House and this is that we consider we are spending a very large amount of money and not getting an adequate return. It is true that we are getting a good many immigrants, but it is equally true that some of those are not desirable. The character of the population we are bringing into the country is a matter of very great importance. We consider that at present we have a population which will compare favourably with that of any other country in the world, and what we require to do above everything else is to keep that standard up, and that we can only do by being very particular as to the class of immigrants we bring in. While our laws in this respect have been improved quite considerably within the last few years, they are still not up to the mark, and it is in the recollection of every member of this House that a large number of Italians were stranded in Montreal a few months ago. Had our laws been what they ought to have been and had they been rigidly enforced, that could not have happened. We had 3,500 to 4,000 Italians landed in Montreal without any apparent means of support, and who were a great burden on the people. That was so noticeable that even the Toronto 'Globe' could not pass it by, and pointed out how our laws were inefficient both as regards immigration and alien labour, and insisted that they ought to be amended. On that occasion, the 'Globe' in its issue of the 16th of May, 1904, used these words :

> The stranding of a great force of Italian labourers in Montreal shows serious defects in our immigration and alien labour laws. It is stated that 5,000 more of the same class will be brought to Canada during the present season.

Well, Mr. Chairman, would you believe it, that in the annual report of the Minister of the Interior, there is not a single Italian mentioned as having come to this country. I called attention to this in the committee and pointed out to the deputy minister how we ought to have a true record in that report of the nationalities of all our immigrants, and I think I had his promise that in future that would be done. These things ought to be on record, so that we would know from time to time from what nationalities we draw our immigrants. In addition, I find that the Montreal 'Star' said last spring that the poor law guardians in the old country had pauper children to the number of 7,000 which they thought were good enough to pass inspection in this country and which they intended sending over. Whether they have come or not, I am not aware, but these are matters we should seriously look into, and if possible not allow any one to enter this country who would become a charge on the public as a pauper or who would be likely to swell our criminal classes. Then we had a steamer which came from the far east on board of which a man had died on the passage out and was buried at sea, and which our quarantine officers reported as all right. But one of the passengers landed in Vancouver had smallpox and died in a few days and the people of Vancouver gathered up the remaining passengers and quarantined them in that city. It will be recollected also that a railway train carrying passengers from that steamer, was quarantined at North Bay which caused a great deal of expense to the province of Ontario. And all this might have been avoided if the quarantine officers in charge at Vancouver had done their duty and discovered that there was a man on board suffering from small-pox.

We find that the city charities of Montreal during last year deported 113 people, some of whom were sent to the United States, some to England, and some to their homes in Canada. Then, I have a report from Mr. Macpherson, the agent of the Dominion Steamship Company at Quebec, in which he says that a large number of diseased persons have been allowed to land in this country. He says that one of the clerks in this own office, as a result of mingling with those people, took trachoma, and that in the country north of Quebec there are many people affected with the same disease. He says that on the authority of the doctor. He also says that out of 80,000 immigrants who landed at Quebec fully 10 per cent were diseased persons. I do not know whether this is true or not ; but it is reported in the Montreal 'Herald' of December 26, 1903, and that is a paper which is favourable to the government, and which would not make such report if it were not true. Then we have a report from Mr. Macdonald, an architect in the city of Winnipeg, who states that many of the immigrants who came out on the same ship that he did, came from sections in Scotland where there was small-pox, and that when they landed at Halifax and it was reported that there was no disease on the ship, they were allowed to go where they pleased without any examination, until they got tickets to travel by the railway to their destination in the west. He also says :

> Then there are a certain class of city street loafers from Glasgow, Edinburgh, London and Liverpool, who should never be encouraged to come to Canada. They are only a detriment to this country. On the boat that I came over on there was a large number of English not fit to settle here.

I do not know whether the law is strong enough to prevent such a class of people from landing on our shores. If it is not, it certainly ought to be made so, because we

have quite enough of that class of people in our cities and towns, even in a country so good as ours. No matter how scarce labourers and mechanics may be in the country, those men are always too busy to want a job ; and in the winter time their families have to be cared for, and they themselves have to be fed by people who are charitably disposed. We do not want to increase that class in our country. I have a letter here which was written by Mr. Parker, who was in the employ of this government during the whole of the fiscal year of 1903, and who reported up to the end of December of that year. The report which has been brought down to this House in a return which I moved for, says that Mr. J. H. M. Parker brought in 413 immigrants for whom he was paid $978 in the fiscal year 1902-3, and that from the 30th of June to the 31st of December 1903 he brought in 334 persons, for whom he got $761. Mr. Parker writes to the public press—I find this in the 'Mail and Empire' of the 30th of January—that there is three times as much money spent in the United Staes for immigrants as there should be, and that not half as many people are brought in as ought to be brought in for one-third of the money. He goes on to say that out of 17 immigrants who are there on salary, only five are at work ; the others simply get agents to work for them and they are paid by commission. He says there was an agent in Indianapolis for five years who sent only three men into this country. I do not know whether that is strictly true or not ; but I know that Mr. Scott, in his evidence before the committee this session, said that Mr. E. P. Holmes was appointed to Indianapolis on the 12th of January, 1900, that he was there until June, 1902, and that he did not report that he had sent any immigrants into this country from that place.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that Captain Holmes ?

Mr. WILSON. No. I know Captain Holmes, and if it had been he, he would have done something for his money. The other gentleman I do not know anything about. He was certainly there a good while, and if he did anything he did not report it, although it is usual for people who succeed to report their success to the department. There is another serious matter in connection with this. This man says in this letter that any one visiting the Northwest, by going to one of these commission agents, can get a certificate entitling him to a ticket for one-third fare. They say that commercial travellers take advantage of this. That certificate is sent to the head office of the railway company at Montreal, and is sent from there to the Interior Department ; and the officer who gave that certificate gets $3 if the party happens to be a male, $2 for a female and $1 for a child or any person under eighteen years of age. So that the railways are beaten out of two-thirds of their fare and the country pays from $2 to $3 for every one of these people who comes to the country as a visitor or a traveller. The reason given for this is that men are appointed not because of their fitness for the post, but because they have a political pull. Unfortunately that is true no matter what party is in power, but it seems to be particularly true of the present government. We know that defeated candidates have been appointed. Whether they have a special fitness to solicit immigrants or not I do not know. But if this work were attended to on a business basis, these things would not happen. There are in the United States 273 agents on commission ; but it appears from the return brought down to the House that only 75 of these did any work. The commissions paid to them amounted to $14,898, and they report having brought into this country 6,509 persons. You can easily understand how they could report that number if what Mr. Parker says is true—if the people who come in as visitors, speculators or persons doing business or persons who wanted a cheap fare into the country, are counted as immigrants.

Now, we have in Great Britain 13 agents under salary. We pay to these agents in salaries $19,163 ; we allow them living expenses of $3,246 and travelling expenses of $4,480. Altogether, we are paying our salaried agents in Great Britain $26,880. In addition to these, we have a whole army of officials in Great Britain. We have people who are agents for the steamship companies and who act also for the government. There are 273 of these in Great Britain and Ireland, according to the reports brought down. They are called booking agents. I see they receive all the way from 7 shillings to £147 17s, 6d. from the government. We have in the United States, on salary, 23 agents, to whom we pay in salaries $25,320 ; living expenses, $8,650, and travelling expenses, $10,859, or a total to these salaried agents in the United States of $44,830. As a matter of course, we have been getting many immigrants from the United States. I do not think that this is to be attributed entirely, or nearly entirely, to the agents of the government. As we all know, there is a great boom in the Northwest, and the agents are exploiting that country. They have agents all over the United States who are sending in immigrants.

Mr. SCOTT. What started them ?

Mr. HENDERSON. We did.

Mr. WILSON. At any rate, I do not think it was my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) who started them. Of course, if that hon. gentleman claims that the government made the good times, I can only say that I trust we shall have no more bad ones ; for, surely the government are not so wicked as to punish all the good people in the country merely to injure some wicked Tories. Surely we

shall have good times if it is in the power of the government to make them. However, I think that hon. gentlemen have too good sense to claim that they are the authors of the good times. The good times come from the increase of population in the Northwest, resulting from the good advertising that country has had. We have plenty of good land in that country, and when a man can get 160 acres of land for nothing, in a region where the crops have been splendid for a number of years, and reports of whose fertility have been spread broadcast all over the world, is it any wonder that people are coming to a country like ours? Is it any wonder that people take up land when they can begin ploughing the morning after they reach it? It is not as it was in Ontario, Quebec and the other provinces, where the forest had to be cleared before anything could be planted. That land is ready for the plough. Moreover, the opposition in this House is not decrying that country, as was the custom of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House.

Now, I desire to say a word—I do not wish to detain the House long at this late day of the session—as to the treatment of immigrants by the United States. The United States has many restrictions upon immigration. For instance, it is a penalty under the law for any one to land a person in the United States who is not entitled to be landed according to law. And agitation is being carried on with a view to making that law more stringent. I have before me a Bill which was introduced in the last session of Congress, under which the penalty for the offence I have referred to is made imprisonment for not less than three months and not more than two years, with a fine of $1,000. This shows the view that the people of the United States take of immigration. I understand, of course, that they are in a better position to refuse immigration than we are, having already a very large population. It is true they have lots of vacant land, but their population is multiplying very rapidly. They are spending more money, I think, in keeping immigrants out of their country than we are spending in bringing them in. Of course, they get a great part of that money back from the steamship companies or the immigrants, for every one has to pay $2 a head—man, woman or child—who goes into the United States as an immigrant. They have 116 officers along our southern border to prevent the entrance into the United States of undesirable immigrants. They rejected last year about 5,000—some for diseases and some for other causes. We deported, according to a report which covered about a year and a half, something over 400. What became of the rest? Are they still in our country? It seems to me that persons that the United States will not receive because they are diseased, or paupers, or likely to become paupers, should not be allowed to stay in our country. We may have all the feelings of sympathy that we like, but we must remember that we have a duty to ourselves and to the world, to make our country great and strong, and to do that we must protect our citizens against the contact of this kind of population.

Now, I wish to refer for a few minutes to the reports of the farm delegates who were sent to the old country. Some of these delegates, I dare say, were good men, while some were not so well adapted—I should judge from the reports—for the work required of them. I think it unfortunate that the minister should have selected all these men from one party. I do not say he should have selected a large number from the opposition, but, for the sake of the influence they would have in the old country, he should have chosen men all of whom were fairly well adapted to the business in hand, instead of choosing men to be sent to the old country merely to give them a trip and allow them to do pretty much as they like. There were 27 of these agents, and we find that they were pretty liberal with the public money so far as tips are concerned. They paid $450.86 of our money as tips. They paid out over $100 for accident insurance. Now, I would like to know why we should pay the accident insurance of any gentleman in this country. I have made a few extracts from the reports of these agents. I do not wish to weary the House, so I shall not read them all. The first one is that of Mr. P. Campbell. He concludes his report by saying:

> In conclusion I would advise the government not to be in a hurry to fill up this country with foreigners——

I do not know whether he means Scotchmen or not.

> —but to keep the land for our own people as there are thousands of British subjects who would be only too glad to come to this country.

That is about the most intelligent thing he says. And for that we paid $506.95. Mr. Campbell paid in tips $18; advertising, $121—he must have been pretty well advertised—besides $22 for printing; board and lodging, $172.85, and sundries, $34.65. So for sundries and tips he paid over $50. The next gentleman we have is Mr. A. L. Hall; he cost us $578. He says he had a good time. His board and lodging cost us $249 I will read a paragraph of his report:

> While in England I had a very pleasant although busy time. I was kept moving from one town to another and in that way saw a good deal of the country. Everywhere I went I was treated with the utmost courtesy and found people very anxious to come to Canada, a great many more would have come but did not have the means.

Now that is about as important as any part of the report. I think it should have been the duty of a gentleman representing the government to the people of England, to

make a full report of what he did. But a good many of these gentlemen did not think it their duty to do so. The next gentleman I come to is Mr. M. Watts. He cost us $319, and if you add the $150 that we paid to all of them but one—there was one the government seemed to favour beyond all others, for they gave him $250—but to this gentleman they gave $150, making $465. Here is the way he winds up his report :

The farmers there wanted the cattle embargo lifted as they want our cattle for stockers, and they want the privilege of getting our beef cattle upon arrival to feed them for three months. This would create a better price for our beef cattle.

I imagine this gentleman forgot that he was immigration agent, he thought he was representing the Department of Agriculture, and he was trying to make a place to send our cattle too, instead of getting people to come to this country. This gentleman cost this country $467 for his trip. Then we have a report from Mr. S. L. Head. He cost us $415. He says, making several recommendations :

First, that only men who have had a practical experience should be engaged as lecturers.

I do not know whether he meant that as a reflection on his colleagues. If you are going to send men, that is not the kind you ought to send.

Second, that the work should be done during the fall and winter.

Third, that a much greater effort should be made to induce the British farmers to come to Canada, and that the chief energies of the department be expended along that line.

In this matter he differs entirely with Mr. Preston's statement of a few years ago. Mr. Preston said it would not be prudent to advise farmers who were well situated in the old country, to come to Canada, because, he says, they would be generally disappointed, they would not be able to make a success in this country. He said he did not feel like encouraging that kind of immigration. As a matter of fact, I think we in Canada look upon that class of people as being the most desirable, because they are men of means who would develop the country in the right direction. Besides that, they would make good settlers, and exert the right kind of influence in the country. Therefore, I would differ materially with Mr. Preston in that matter. Next we have Mr. Robert Forke. This gentleman, while he spent $430, seems to have been economical in a good many things. But here is what he says :

In connection with my visit to the old country under the instructions of the Department of Immigration, I have the honour to report as follows :

The meetings of which there were seven were all well attended and very successful, receiving a good notice in the local papers at the different places visited. There was usually a pretty steady stream of callers seeking a personal interview, and I had the privilege of hearing many expressions of approval of the steps taken by the Dominion government to disseminate information about the country.

These seven lectures seem to have cost the country a good deal, each lecture cost $61. I do not know anything about this gentleman. He may be a very eloquent man or he may not ; he may be well fitted for his position, but certainly his report does not indicate it. I think the minister will agree with me that these reports ought to have pointed out more fully what these gentlemen did as servants of this country in Great Britain when they are sent over there to get immigrants. We ought to have a full detailed report of what they have done. Then we have Mr. John Kennedy. He lived pretty well while he was in that country, and seems to have spent $225 for board and lodgings. Here is what he says:

I inclose the account of my expenses of the trip to the old country, which is correct to the best of my knowledge, and I hope it will give satisfaction.

That certainly is a very important part of the report so far as he is concerned, and I presume his account has been settled. I will read the balance of his report :

I would say as far as I was concerned the trip was satisfactory, as I found the people eager to hear from Canada on immigration. I had eighteen meetings and stood the rest of the time in office at Belfast. I would have had more meetings, but I had to stay in the office on account of Mrs. Kelly going to Dublin. The time was too short, we ought to have been one month earlier.

Now that is the whole of that gentleman's report, for which we paid $456. I will refer to one more of these gentlemen, Mr. John Dougan :

As requested I forwarded a few of the impressions the trip made on me.

Advertising was not well done, owing to the friction amongst local shipping agents.

The work does not seem to have been well done because the agents in the old country were not agreed about it. I suppose the minister will dismiss those who made the trouble.

Some of the places selected for the delegates were unsuitable, two of my places were in barber shops with no accommodation for visitors. Where the speakers preceded the delegates, the delegate's quarters were crowded for several days from morning till night. On the whole I think good will come of the visit. Many people told me they would take the first opportunity to sell their belongings and sail for our country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to another matter here. There were two or three others, but I do not think they made any recommendations whatever. Then there was Mr. Arthur Kilburn who was allowed $250 for his fee. Would the

hon. minister tell us why Mr. Kilburn is paid $100 more for his services than any of the other delegates. It seems to me that he was simply like the other delegates yet the other delegates in that class only got $150. There were just a few of these delegates who spent any money in advertising. J. H. Medcalf spent $121.05, Rev. J. L. Brown, $6.93; James Dale, $24.33; John Cowan, $4.87; D. MacVicker, $26.07, and W. H. Bryce, $37.48, making a total of $221.43. We find that these gentlemen paid out in tips $448.29, for sundries, $315.61, and for accident insurance over $100. I do not think that these people should be allowed to insure their lives at the expense of the people; neither do I think that they should be allowed to spend money freely in sundries and tips. If they want to be generous they should be generous out of their own pockets. We sent over fifty-four delegates and we spent upon them $25,000. I think the deputy minister told us in the committee that he had heard from one of these delegates that he had been instrumental in bringing ten or twelve people to this country. He did not say that he had heard from any more of them. That one delegate brought in ten or twelve people, and we have paid a little over $25,000 for them. I presume that some other hon. gentlemen will have something to say, that the hon. minister will have something to say, and I expect to have something more to say on the items as they go through.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Before my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) sits down I would like him to explain whether the impression I have is correct that he has adduced as proof of the greater stringency in the regulations against immigration into the United States the fact that they charge $2 a head for admission to that country. If so I would like to ask him whether that is a novelty or not.

Mr. WILSON. It is not a novelty for the last two or three years. Before that it was only $1 a head but there has been an effort to make it more than it is now even as the hon. gentleman will know if he has paid any attention to what the United States people have been doing. There is a very strong feeling in the United States, if I can judge from what I read in the newspapers and from the report of the Immigrant Department at Washington, against allowing any but the very best class of settlers into the country.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I merely beg to say that this has been in force for forty years.

Mr. WILSON. What, the $2 tax ?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Yes, I paid it myself in 1867 while passing through Portland on my way to Ottawa.

Mr. SIFTON. I ought to be indebted to my hon. friend for giving the committee so much detailed information in regard to the affairs of the Department of Immigration and with a good many of his remarks I find no fault. I was glad to hear my hon. friend say that he is not disposed to quarrel with the amount of the expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to state that what I said was that we would not feel disposed to quarrel with the amount if we felt sure we were getting value for it. We have some doubt about that.

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend takes that position I am prepared to take the position that we do get value for it and I think there is no great difficulty in showing that. As to a number of points which my hon. friend mentioned, being mere statements of fact as to which there is no dispute, such as questions of expenditure, salaries and that sort of thing, they require no special intention on my part because they are matters of record. But, my hon. friend referred to the question of permitting immigration of such a character as is illustrated by the employment of the Italians, who came to Montreal a few months ago. I may say that such a movement is in no sense a result of the work of the immigration department, and that in the present state of the law the immigration department has no power whatever to deal with a case of that kind. In the case of persons who come into the country as they came, not by way of steamship, although a few came by steamship, but by rail as the majority of them did come, there is no power under the law at the present time to interfere with these people or to prevent them from coming into Canada. As to the extent to which we should exercise the principle of exclusion that is a matter for serious consideration. It is not a matter which particularly belongs to the discussion of the immigration question or one which is connected with the work of the immigration branch. When the facts in regard to that particular matter were brought to my attention I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock) to detail an officer of his department to make an investigation, not having an officer in my own department whom I thought particularly fitted for that kind of work. Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, was accordingly sent to make an investigation. He made a report and as a result of his report a further investigation was directed to be made.

Mr. WILSON. May I call the hon. minister's attention to the fact that the other day the hon. Minister of Labour said that he did not make a report, that he simply gave him a memorandum.

Mr. SIFTON. The memorandum was the report. I do not know why my hon. friend desires to draw a distinction between a

memorandum and a report. I do not know the difference between a memorandum and a report. Perhaps my hon. friend will explain what he means. I was not here when the statement was made. However, Mr. King was sent down for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, he communicated them to the minister and as a result a further investigation was directed. While I am on that point I may say that the whole subject as to the extent to which exclusion should be practised in connection with that class of people, that is to say persons who are not of criminal antecedents, persons who are not exactly in the ordinary sense of the word paupers, persons who cannot be excluded by medical examination, but persons who by reason of the fact that they may, on account of their condition and circumstances shortly after they arrive here, become a charge upon the public, is a subject that we have under consideration at the present time, and my hon. friend the Minister of Labour has a Bill upon the Order Paper—I think it has been introduced—with which it is proposed to deal with the subject.

The question of the appointment of inspectors to carry out such exclusion as may be decided upon by parliament, is one which will come rather under his supervision than under mine. I believe the system of medical inspection at the ocean ports at the present time is as strict as it is practicable to make it. Dr. Bryce, formerly of the Board of Health, Toronto, has been appointed chief medical inspector of the department and under his system the immigrants landing at ocean reports are put through a very careful and thorough examination. Under the Department of Agriculture we have the quarantine service in charge of Dr. Montizambert, and under that service persons are detained for what are called quarantinable diseases. After the ships pass quarantine as having a clean bill of health, the passengers are then permitted to land, but under certain restrictions, and each passenger is required to go into a room where he is submitted to a careful medical inspection by our medical inspectors. Each man, woman and child who lands in Canada, personally passes through the hands of the doctor and must be certified to as being free of disease of such character as would warrant us returning them. If persons are afflicted with disease of a somewhat trifling character, but still of such a nature as would not justify the physicians in letting them pass, we have erected a detention hospital where they are treated at the expense of the transportation companies, who pay that expense proportionately.

Mr. CLARKE. What proportion of the expense is borne by the steamship companies ?

Mr. SIFTON. At the end of a certain period an account is made up setting forth the proportion of the expenses chargeable against each transportation company.

Mr. CLARKE. How is that ascertained ?

Mr. SIFTON. By taking the total cost of treatment of all the passengers detained. I was about to say that the general expense of supervision, the salary of the chief inspector for instance, is not charged against the transportation companies. But the expense of the treatment is charged—

Mr. BOYD. Is the minister correct in saying that the expense of the detention of immigrants is paid by the transportation companies ?

Mr. SIFTON. The expense of treatment is.

Mr. BOYD. The expense of treatment and detention ?

Mr. SIFTON. The expense of treating a patient at the detention hospital while he is there is charged against the transportation company that brought him, and if he turns out to be incurable, the transportation company is required to take him back. My hon. friend will understand that there are defects in all human arrangements. We cannot calculate the expense of a matter of that kind to a copper, but that is the general system that is carried out as carefully as it can be. It is only within the last year it has been whipped into shape and no doubt it is still susceptible of improvement, but I doubt if it is open to very much improvement so far as the actual inspection is concerned. Whatever may have been the case in former years ; and while we had a fairly good system of inspection, since Dr. Bryce took charge and got his organization into shape, the medical examination at the ocean ports is now as complete and as satisfactory as we can make it. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) referred to some statement made by a man named Parker in a letter to a Toronto paper reflecting upon the immigration service in the United States of America. The explanation of that letter is the fact that Mr. Parker's services were found unsatisfactory and were dispensed with, and as is not uncommon under such circumstances he endeavoured to take satisfaction by rendering what he thought was an unfavourable account of the work of the department in which he was no longer an official.

Mr. CLARKE. How long had Parker been in the service of the department ?

Mr. SIFTON. Two or three years : he was a sub-agent paid by commission.

Mr. CLARKE. Where was he operating ?

Mr. SIFTON. In the neighbourhood of Duluth. My hon. friend will understand that in the case of these sub-agents who are paid on commission and who have the power of giving certificates to persons in-

tending to come to Canada, the department is in considerable danger of being defrauded, and notwithstanding the greatest possible care and closest inspection, we occasionally find we have an agent who is unsatisfactory, or who, even though we cannot prove it, we may suspect has defrauded us. We had one or two cases in which we suspected a sub-agent of giving fraudulent certificates, and while it was difficult to find absolute evidence of it, yet we did what a private individual would do if he strongly suspected that he had a dishonest employee, we got rid of him as quickly and as quietly as we could. As to the agent at Indianapolis, the particular results of the work in Indiana did not come to my special attention, with regard to this matter, but I may say that the work in Indiana for some time was not very successful. That is one of the states in which we found it extremely hard to encourage the movement. We sent a large number of sub-agents to the different states and carried on an active propoganda, but I am not prepared to say that they were all equally successful. In some cases the agents were successful ; in some places they were not, and in some places after they had been working for a considerable length of time success came all at once.

Mr. CLARKE. Did I understand the hon. minister to say that the system of inspection is so efficient now that every immigrant landing in Canada is inspected by our officers ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SIFTON. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was speaking of the medical inspection of immigrants at the different ports. I was saying that at the beginning of this season we had inaugurated a system of inspection which I have reason to believe is about as perfect as we can make it. Some difficulties have been experienced from the landing of very large numbers of immigrants on the same day. We had thought that we had abundant accommodation, but it has proved for this reason to be somewhat insufficient at Quebec and Halifax. There have been one or two cases in which it has been somewhat difficult for the officials to handle the numbers arriving; but I can safely say that during the present season the inspection has been pretty thorough and careful. I would be quite pleased to receive suggestions for improvement from any members of the committee who have given the matter any attention ; but the matter has received the most careful attention from the medical inspector and the deputy of the department, and the result of their efforts has been fairly satisfactory. We are making preparations for the purpose of securing further accommodation at Quebec, Halifax and St. John, and by next season I think we shall be amply equipped for any possible demand that may be made upon us. Some remarks were made by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) in regard to the immigration from the United States. My hon. friend expressed the opinion that the agents in the United States were not the cause of the very large and satisfactory movement of farmers from the western and northwestern states of Canada. I readily admit that if the country for which they had to work did not offer very great inducements, it would be quite impossible for any agents, however vigourous or active or faithful they might be in the discharge of their duties, to bring about such a movement of population as we have recently seen. But I do not think any person who has given close or careful attention to what has been going on during the last few years, will say that the movement would have taken place to any considerable extent if the work of acquainting the people of the western and northwestern states of the conditions in Canada had not been attended to. I need not repeat what I have said to the committee on former occasions in regard to the different methods adopted in carrying on that work. The lack of knowledge which formerly existed among the farmers of the western and northwestern states in regard to conditions in northwestern Canada was almost incredible. The most remarkable ideas on the subject prevailed amongst those people, although they were at a comparatively short distance from the boundary line. Systematic and determined efforts had to be made and were made for the purpose of acquainting them with the actual advantages of the Northwestern Canada. The people of the western states have now become fairly well informed as to our country ; but the natural result of the work that we have been doing has followed, and the American railways which are interested in preventing the movement of people to northwestern Canada, have inaugurated a very vigorous campaign, a campaign attended with the expenditure of considerable money and a great deal of energy on the part of their agents, for the purpose of checking as far as possible the movement which our people have inaugurated. We have no doubt received considerable assistance from land and colonization companies engaged in the work of selling lands in the Northwest ; but it must be remembered that most of these companies came there only two or three years ago, purchased their lands and interested themselves, because of the movement which had been inaugurated and the information which had been supplied in the western states. From the seed thus sown they expected to reap, and I have no

doubt have reaped, a very valuable reward. But I am quite clear that if we desire to maintain the movement of population from the United States to Canada, we will have to continue our organization there and make as vigourous efforts as in the past.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to know whether the immigration from the States is as large this year as last.

Mr. SIFTON. Not quite. Up to the present the difference is about 4,000 in favour of the last calendar year.

Mr. WILSON. Are any of the states or the Washington government interfering to prevent our agents doing their work there ?

Mr. SIFTON. I have no information except what I have seen in the press despatches indicating that the Washington government purpose calling the attention of the British government to the fact that we have an organization in their country for the purpose of attracting settlers to Canada. Until representations reach us, I cannot say how authentic the information is or not or what shape the representations will take. But up to the present we have received nothing but courtesy from any of the United States officials with whom we have come in contact. I took a trip to the United States a year ago last January, and found no disposition on the part of the municipal authorities or prominent people of the different localities where our agencies are stationed, to prevent the operations of our agents. In the last eight or nine months however, there have been some indications that efforts have been made to get the Washington government to take action in that direction. I am not aware of any law of the United States which would enable the Washington government to take any action at present, but the committee will understand that any representations from that government, even supposing there was no law on the statute books, would have to receive very careful consideration from us. For myself, I think that everybody who is familiar with affairs in the Northwest will agree that the movement of population from the western states to our Northwest has been of a most valuable character. Even should it fall off materially in the near future, still an enormous amount of benefit has been done to our Northwest by the settlement in that country of those industrious and progressive farmers, and the testimony of our people is universal to the effect that the class of settlers we have received from the western states is of the very highest quality. With regard to the general question, I may say that any movement of population is of more or less uncertain and varying character. We find that people in one of the states are on the move this year. Next year the people of the adjoining state will be more disposed to move; and we find that after we have been getting settlers from any particular locality for two or three years, the flow of settlement from that district is likely to decrease, because the supply of people who are disposed to move has been, to some extent, for the time being, exhausted. In England, for instance, last year the majority of immigrants came from the neighbourhood of London, and this year the larger portion came from the north of England and Scotland. The flow of immigration varies in that way, so that we have to keep continually working to have the movement kept up to its present dimensions. Respecting the work done by our farm delegates, to which reference was made by the hon. member for Lennox, the delegates were not sent to England for the purpose of making reports to us on the conditions there. Of course they did make such reports when they came back, but that was not the purpose for which they were sent. But the idea was rather, and it was well carried out, to furnish the agents we have there with men who could go into the country and talk with intending settlers, so that intending settlers might have an actual idea of what Canadian settlers were like and in what sort of way they carried on their operations. It was for that purpose they were sent over, and the testimony of our agents is that their work has been most valuable and that to it is due a great deal of the increase in the movement from the British Isles last year. Of course in work of this kind, we have to vary our operations just as in certain lines of business. What is effective one year may not be another, and different methods have to be adopted from time to time to suit changing circumstances. Up to the end of the fiscal year 1903-4, the number of immigrants from all sources exceeded the number of the previous year by something like 2,000, but I am under the impression that at the end of this calendar year the number will be slightly less. Our agents in the United States attribute the falling off in immigration from that country this year to the unfavourable season. The season when people move to a new country, the early spring, turned out to be unfavourable. The spring was late in the Northwest and the means of transportation in some places were congested, and there was difficulty in getting the transportation which intending settlers require, and the reports sent back by those resulted to a considerable extent in checking the movement in the early part of the season ; and once the movement is checked, it is very difficult to make up the falling off in the later months.

Mr. OSLER. Is any record kept by the officials on this side of the immigrants rejected by the United States authorities and turned back upon this country ?

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) means those rejected by the United

States inspectors along our boundary ? No. We have no way of checking that.

Mr. OSLER. I asked Mr. Sargent, the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States, whom I met a few months ago, as to the undesirable class of immigrants seeking entrance to the United States and the efforts of his department to prevent their entrance. I asked him if he would send me a statement of the number of immigrants rejected by his department as coming from Canada. On the 5th instant, I received a letter from Mr. John H. Clarke acting commissioner. This letter is addressed to Mr. Sargent and is forwarded to me. It says :

Number refused admission to the United States at various Canadian border stations from June, 1903, to 31st May, 1904 : total number rejected 2,441, causes for which such exclusions were made being as follows : likely to become public charges 961, contract labourers 305, afflicted with dangerous contageous diseases 663, temporarily detained and not appearing for re-examination 11, to prevent separation of families 61, aliens seeking admission minus certificates 442, idiots and insane 8—making the total of 2,441.

In view of the minister's statement just before we rose at 6 o'clock, that every immigrant coming into this country was medically inspected as to his fitness, this letter is a very serious one.

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) will permit me—I explained that I referred to this year, and that I was not prepared to make that statement with regard to past seasons.

Mr. OSLER. This statement is for the present season up to 31st May 1904. It does not include the last month or two, which probably would show a larger number of immigrants. Now, one or other of two things must be deduced from the statements made in this letter. Either this inspection is not being carried out as the minister thinks it is, or—very much more serious—we must have in Canada a class of people who are immigrating, or we must have among our own people an enormous number afflicted with contagious and dangerous diseases who are leaving our country for the United States. I hope that the former is the case, for that is something that may be remedied with comparative case. But, if it is the latter, and if we have among our population a sufficient percentage of people afflicted with dangerous contagious disease to supply an emigration of 653 in ten months, that is something that will require the most serious attention of the government and a very close investigation. I am always accused of speaking from a railway point of view. So, I suppose I cannot be accused of wishing to restrict immigration into this country. No one believes more strongly than I do the necessity of proper immigration into Canada. But I think that no one realizes more than I do the absolute necessity that that immigration shall be of the right class. In the United States, with one boundary on the southern ocean, they have all varieties of climate. They have the natural conditions which will enable them to assimilate with comparative ease Italians and other people from the southern parts of Europe. We cannot do that. We cannot gain any advantage by bringing to this country weaklings from the south of Europe. If the immigration is to be successful, we must have people from the northern countries, from the strong nations of Europe. The government, I think, owe it to the country and to themselves to take every possible precaution that, neither through their immigration agents nor—what is more dangerous as to this class of persons—through the various steamship companies, which receive a bonus for immigrants besides their passage money, are people of this class landed in this country. As I have said, we are very much more bound to discriminate as to the class of immigrants than is the United States. If they reject these diseased people, we ought to reject them with tenfold stringency. But, we do not seem to be doing that. We are not taking care to keep out of Canada the people who come from the southern parts of Europe, many of them afflicted with diseases which are not only dangerous to themselves but are dangerous to the people of this country by reason of their contagious character.

Mr. KENDALL. Before this item passes, I would like to say a word as a medical man. I have heard no more ridiculous criticism expressed in this House at any time than the criticism made in regard to the health of the immigrants brought into this country. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Osler), that if he would refer to his own distinguished brother, who is probably the greatest medical man that Canada has ever produced, he would find his opinion on this matter different from that which the hon. gentleman has just expressed. I wish to tell him that if this parliament had the courage it should have, it would at once take up certain questions of public health and deal with them. They are matters of momentous importance to this country, whereas the matters to which he refers are mere bagatelles.

Mr. CLARKE. I have not the advantage possessed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kendall), of being a medical man, and of being able therefore to speak with authority as to the seriousness of the charges that have been made by my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Osler), and as to the inadvisability of allowing diseased persons to become residents of this country after they have been pronounced

unfitted to become residents of the United States. The hon. gentleman probably knows more than the corps of expert medical men who have been appointed by the United States government to pay special attention to this very matter. I think I am justified in concluding, without meaning any disrespect to the hon. gentleman, that if the United States medical authorities entertained the same opinion that he does they would not go to the annual expense of maintaining along our border and in some of our principal cities groups of expert medical examiners to inquire into the physical condition of those who are seeking admission into the United States, and of rejecting them for reasons which, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, are a mere bagatelle. I have stated before in this House, and I repeat it, that the facts which have been disclosed show a disgraceful condition of things. I do not desire to throw the entire blame upon the Department of the Interior ; I rather commend the vigilance of the United States authorities. It is to me most regrettable that we have presented to us in the official reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States an annual statement showing the number of immigrants destined for the United States, who have been booked by our Canadian route, but who are not permitted to enter the United States because of physicial disability. I do not know how many dozen officials the United States have stationed along our borders. I believe 116 is the number. In addition to these they have their officials stationed at Montreal and elsewhere in our country ; and these gentlemen have it in their power to say whether immigrants who come thus far on their way to the United States shall be permitted to continue their journey and enter the United States, or whether they shall be debarred at Montreal or some other Canadian port, and be obliged to remain in this country. I appreciate the difficulties of the situation, and commend whatever the Minister of the Interior is doing to put a stop to this unsatisfactory condition of things. But I am afraid that the hon. gentleman was not speaking advisedly at six o'clock when he said that every immigrant landing in Canada was carefully examined by expert medical men.

Mr. SIFTON. I referred to people who come by seaports, we have no means of checking those who come in by rail.

Mr. CLARKE. I am speaking of those only who come across the ocean, the immigrant class who land at our ports. I understood the hon. gentleman at six o'clock to say that all these were carefully examined by our own medical men. Of course I am not in a position to dispute that statement. But I do make the assertion, that if the statistics which my colleague has presented to the House are reliable—and they are official documents bearing the approval of the United States government officials—then I say that the examination made by this government must be lax, or else the examination made by the United States medical officers must be much more rigid than that which our officials make when immigrants land at our Canadian Atlantic ports. I do not think the fact that immigrants are poor, are destitue, as long as they are mentally, physically and morally fit, should debar them ; I do not think their poverty should prevent them from getting a chance to make a living in Canada. But I do say that people who are rejected because they are suffering from loathsome diseases——

Mr. KENDALL. What diseases ?

Mr. CLARKE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman ; loathsome diseases, the classification is ; and are not fit to become citizens of the United States, ought certainly not be permitted to remain here and become a charge upon the people of this country. If they are permitted to land and proceed as far west as Montreal on their way to the United States, they certainly should not be permitted to remain in Canada if they are rejected by the United States authorities and not allowed to enter that country. I think that is a reasonable proposition and one that will commend itself to the Minister of the Interior. Two months ago I read a statement in the House from the last official report of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration, showing that some 4,000 immigrants were debarred from entering the United States at our various border ports. I asked the Minister of the Interior what became of these people, and he promised to make a statement, if my memory serves me, when these estimates were being considered. We have not had that statement from him to-night. I cannot understand by what machinery or method these people, whose destination is the United States, are permitted to come thus far on their journey, are then prevented from continuing their journey, and are left upon our hands, especially if they are suffering from loathsome and dangerous diseases. This matter ought to engage the attention of the minister and he ought to endeavour, if possible, to devise some means whereby these people will not be allowed to come so far on their journey. If they are not fit because of their physical and mental disabilities to enter the United States, they certainly ought not to be permitted to land in Canada ; but if they land in Canada they certainly ought not to be permitted to remain here if their condition is such as is stated by the United States officials. Now I have a report for several months of the present fiscal year, showing the number of immigrants debarred from entering the United States from Canada. The return is made by ports, and I would like to

draw the attention of the minister to these statements. If he wishes I will give them to him so that he can see for himself what is contained in them, and decide what remedy might be applied to put a stop to this state of things. In July of last year, the first month of the fiscal year 1903-1904, this report shows that there were landed at Quebec and St. John 3,241 immigrants, and of this number 77 were debarred, and of these 57 were suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases—these are the words used in the heading. I do not know what these diseases are, I do not know who the persons were; but these are official returns from the United States immigration department. Now what I am drawing to the attention of the minister is the fact that year after year there is published a statement showing the number of these immigrants from Europe wending their way to the United States through Canada, who are prohibited from continuing their journey and who are left stranded in Canada.

What is to be done with these people? Can there not be an improvement made in the medical examination? Can that medical examination not be made more rigid, so that they will not be allowed to land at Halifax, St. John or Quebec, or whatever the port is? I will not weary the committee by reading all these returns that I have from month to month up to the 1st of May, but I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that in these monthly statements there are figures showing the number rejected at Vancouver as well as at Quebec and St. John. The figures for the other ports are not given in these tables. In some of the months the number rejected at Vancouver is considerable. In the month of July the number rejected was 6, in August the number rejected was 18, in September the number rejected was 25, and I may tell my hon. friend from Cape Breton that of the 25, 11 are classified as suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases. In October the number rejected was 18, in November 28, and so on. These tables show that in the six or eight months for which I have returns hundreds of immigrants have been rejected, have been debarred from entering the United States because they have been physically unfit. I do not know whether the diseases from which they are suffering are loathsome and contagious—I hope they are not for the sake of this country, because these people are left here—but I repeat the statement that they are debarred because of their physical condition, because they are classified as suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, and it is not right that these unfortunate people should be maintained at the expense of the taxpayers of Canada, when they are immigrants destined for the United States, who are prevented from entering that country by the corps of United States officers who are doing duty at the ports of Canada and along our border. We have brought this matter to the attention of the hon. minister again and again, and while we recognize that he has been appointing some medical gentlemen to intercept the flow of these people, yet from the statement which my colleague has presented to the House, and from the figures contained in the statements which I have in my hand, there is certainly a great deal more to be done in this matter. I am sure the hon. minister will admit that if these figures are correct the situation is not a satisfactory one. We should be able to exercise as rigid a supervision over the immigration coming into Canada as is exercised by the United States officials over the immigration going into that country. People who are debarred because of their physical disabilities, and who are not fitted to become citizens of the United States—who are not good enough, if I may be permitted to use that expression without intending to use it in the offensive sense, to become citizens of the United States—are certainly not good enough for Canada. It is quality that we should aim at rather than quantity, but if we are to have quantity—and we have room for a great many immigrants in this country—we should certainly see to it that the necessary moneys are expended to enable us to make our medical examination of all immigrants as rigid as it is possible to make it. There is another phase of this matter, but probably I had better leave that until the discussion of this question is concluded. I shall be glad to place these statements in the possession of the hon. minister, and if I have misapprehended what their purport is, I shall be glad to be corrected; but in view of these statements, and in view of the statements which my colleague has presented, I think there is a screw loose yet, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see how urgent is the necessity that our system of inspection shall be equal to that which prevails along the border on the part of the immigration officials of the United States.

Mr. KENDALL. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I fully agree in all the arrangements that are made to provide necessary quarantine at the ports of debarcation, but I repeat that if the few scores or few hundreds of infected people who came into this country are really, from the point of danger, a bagatelle compared with the amount of contagious disease which we, as a parliament and as a civilization, permit to stalk broadcast through the land. I do not think there is any medical man in this House who will question that. I may say that it is a popular thing, perhaps, in the United States, as it is here, for hon. gentlemen in parliament to make a loud outcry against the possibility of the importation of disease from foreign countries. It is a very popular thing, but I submit that the medical associations of this country are probably the bodies best qualified to judge of what the

danger to Canada is from the importation of disease from outside, and I do not think that up to this time the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have had any very strong recommendations from the medical bodies of Canada on this point. I speak, of course, subject to correction, but I again assert that we permit year after year loathsome and contagious diseases to be propagated in this country, and we have not the courage to take measures to prevent it.

Mr. OSLER. The doctor has touched on a very delicate subject. He refers to the diseases which have been a curse to civilization as far back as civilization goes. He, as a member of the medical profession, and all of his brothers, are unable to suggest any remedy for these diseases, and although he makes the accusation that we in this parliament are making a loud outcry about a small number of contagious cases, whether they are from the outside or not, I do not think that he will take the responsibility of bringing a law into this House to check the evil to which he refers, bad enough as it is. But that does not prevent us from doing what we can to prevent an evil which is checkable. The other is not checkable, in so far as civilization has not been able to suggest a remedy, but we are dealing with something which is checkable ; and if he, as a physician, says that the fact that 680 persons suffering from dangerous and contagious diseases have been refused admission to the United States is something that does not affect Canada, I think he is making a mistake. That is a statement that laymen will not agree with, no matter how much doctors may endorse it.

Mr. KENDALL. I did not say that certain cases should not be kept out. I do not wish to be misunderstood in that.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. member said that this was simply a bagatelle, and that I was talking trash.

Mr. KENDALL. I said it was a bagatelle compared with the great evils that are stalking unchecked through the country.

Mr. OSLER. May I suggest to the hon. gentleman, as a member of the very honourable profession of medicine, that he take it up and bring in a measure to check the evil resulting from the diseases to which he refers ?

Mr. KENDALL. I admit that I have not the courage to deal with some of the evils to which he has referred, some that probably will not be mentioned, but take the case of consumption, of tuberculosis—we have not the courage to deal with it, and it is a disease which is a hundred times more important to the health of Canada than any of the ordinary contagious diseases that we refuse entrance to at the ports.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am not a member of the Agricultural Committee, and I understand that committee has been gathering a good deal of information regarding the immigration of the past year. As the report of that committee is not available to us, I will have to ask the minister for some information. I find in the report of the deputy minister the following short paragraphs :—

> In connection with the work of the department in the old country, it may be interesting to note that all booking agents represent the department and are paid seven shillings for each whole ticket and a half of that amount for half tickets on all agricultural settlers coming to Canada.
>
> In addition to this the department has a large number of local agents, most of whom are booking agents. They are paid at the rate of twelve shillings for each whole ticket, and half that amount for half tickets on all agricultural settlers.

From that statement it is evident that we pay to the agents a fee for every agricultural settler that leaves Britain for Canada. If that is the case I suppose there must be receipts for the payment and tabulated statements of the number we pay for, and consequently the number that come to settle in Canada. Can the minister give us that statement ?

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to refer to the statement of the member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) and more especially because he is a medical man who would be expected to appreciate at its full value what it means to import diseased individuals into Canada and scatter them throughout the country. The hon. gentleman stated that the number of diseased immigrants was a mere bagatelle compared with the total, but when we know that one diseased person may affect 125 or 175 persons, we ought to be able to appreciate what it means to import contagious or infectious disease. The report of the chief commissioner of immigration for the United States, tells us that in 1903 they deported at the Canadian line no less than 1,439 immigrants who were affected with contagious and infectious diseases.

Mr. KENDALL. What were they ?

Mr. SPROULE. It does not specify the disease, but it says they were dangerous and contagious diseases, and that is sufficient for a medical man to understand the danger. Now, as the Americans deported 1,439 to Canada, and as we sent back to Europe and the continent only 300, it stands to reason that over 1,100 are left in Canada suffering from dangerous contagious diseases. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) says that you do not hear the medical men complaining about this ; but he must have been in the House last year or the year before when an eminent medical man from Montreal drew attention to the fact that many of these diseased persons were drifting into the hospitals and into the thickly populated portions of the community, and that they were also found in the country places

amongst farmers. For three years in succession attention has been drawn to this in the House, and each year the government state that it is exercising every vigilance. This year the Minister of the Interior says he has commenced to take precautions, but last year and the year before he said the same thing. The minister has told us that in the present state of the law he cannot interfere with immigrants coming into Canada if they are not diseased, but who might be otherwise undesirable. Well, it is the minister and his supporters, and not the opposition, who have the power to change the law to make it effective, and why do they not do so? I believe there is great room for improvement in our quarantine regulations. I have noticed that in Ontario a very common disease is trachoma or granular eyelids, which is regarded as very contagious when chronic, and patients suffering from it have been admitted into the hospitals at Toronto and at Montreal. Does that not verify the statement made by the American Commissioner of Immigration, that whereas they have turned back 1,439 diseased persons to Canada, we have sent back only 300?

Mr. KENDALL. Were these all trachoma?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know and I do not care so long as the disease is dangerous and contagious.

Mr. KENDALL. Does the hon. gentleman not know that in a shipload of immigrants with a few cases of trachoma on board, the disease might spread and not show for some days after the immigrants were landed here. How could the medical inspector turn such people back?

Mr. SPROULE. There is no doubt the disease might spread on shipboard, but it would only be a few days until it would become evident, and any intelligent medical man could recognize it. If he found one case of trachoma he would know the others who associated with the sufferer and continuing in his inquiry any intelligent medical man could tell very readily what the nature of the disease was. That being so, caution should be exercised to prevent these people going through the country and mixing with other people. All who are brought here are not quarantined. Some are kept for a short time for treatment, and then allowed to go. But there is that undeniable fact, that many must be in the country somewhere, and to that extent the quarantine efforts of the department are a failure.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the hon. gentleman answer me this question? Is it within human power, unless a whole shipload of immigrants are quarantined for a certain length of time, for any medical man to say that a certain number will not develop the disease after they leave the ship?

Mr. SPROULE. That might happen.

Mr. KENDALL. It might not only happen, but it has happened again and again.

Mr. SPROULE. When are these people examined? They are all examined at once when they cross the line; and yet 1,400 have been sent back by the American quarantine officers. Surely our Canadian professional men are as intelligent and can detect the disease as readily as the Americans. There are undoubtedly many other cases in the incipient stages of the disease which are not detected by the American officers, and these would add to the number for the year. The fact that our inspectors did not send these cases back suggests to me that our Canadian regulations are not as strictly enforced as they should be. I want to say a word or two with regard to the other immigration that has been coming in of late; I notice that our country of late years has been overrun with a large number of people whom I regard as undesirable immigrants. I do not know whether they are Russian Jews or Italians or what they are, but you will find them wherever you go throughout the country. Only two weeks ago, when I was at home, I made a trip of about twenty miles, and in that distance I met no less than half a dozen of these men whom I call Russian Jews, pedlars with packs on their backs, some of them lying and resting in fence corners. I do not say that these are the worst class, because they are not as bad as diseased people; but to my mind they are not a very desirable class. They do not enter into the industrial activities of the country. It is true, they carry on a trade, a sort of Jew trade. I sometimes think they may be allied with others and have something to do with the robberies that occur from time to time. They go into houses and ply their trade with an assiduity which is peculiar only to themselves. They are a filthy-looking class of people. In summer they may be seen in every direction; in winter they are found around hotels and railway stations plying their trade. They are not the class of people likely to elevate the society or the civilization of the Canadian people, and they are not likely to assimilate with our people to any advantage.

Mr. SIFTON. What would my hon. friend suggest to prevent them coming in?

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest a stricter regulation at the frontier, the same as the Americans have; if necessary, I would put a poll-tax on every one of them; and I would deport those who are likely to become a charge on the charity of the people as soon as they land. There is no reason why we should be obliged to accept the riff-raff of every other country in the world, and tax the charity and generosity of our people to maintain not only those who have moderate

health, but those who are affected with incurable diseases.

Mr. PUTTEE. Can the minister give me the information I asked for ?

Mr. SIFTON. We can readily give information as to the number of people to whom we paid bonuses and the places where they were paid. The bonuses are paid to the steamship agents in the British Isles and on the continent of Europe. The statement comes from them to the department here, it is sent to the office at Winnipeg to be checked, it is brought back and adjusted between the department and the office of the steamship company. If my hon. friend would like a statement, I can have it laid on the table to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the minister if we are paying for the immigrants who come in and settle on the lands of the colonization companies. For instance, we are informed that a number have settled on the lands of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. I was told that many of these come in as immigrants for which the agents in the United States were paid $3 a piece, and then the land company takes advantage of them, and reports them as having been brought in by themselves ; and for that the land is given to the colonization company.

Mr. SIFTON. The only check we have upon the people who come in and are reported by our agents as having been sent through their efforts, is the fact that the agent gives a certificate to the intending immigrant, and upon that certificate the bonus is paid. That is checked by our inspector. Of course, there is no possible system under which at times we are not liable to be defrauded to some extent. The only thing we can do is to watch the inspection as carefully and closely as we can. There may be a few people to whom the bonuses are paid who are not sent by agents, but they are only a very few.

Mr. SPROULE. When are these certificates collected ? Have you not information as to where the person is located ?

Mr. SIFTON. The certificate given by the agent entitles the intending immigrant to reduced fare. It is presented to the railway company, which returns it to us, and upon receipt of the certificate the bonus is paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a man in the United States wants to make a trip across the line and go back again, he can get one of these certificates, I should think, without much difficulty. How do you know that there is not one such in every ten you are paying for ?

Mr. PUTTEE. Seeing that nearly all the steamship agents in Great Britain are also agents of the Immigration Department and that they get a bonus for every prospective settler they can sell a ticket to, it ought to be an easy matter to find out how many declared settlers come from Great Britain to Canada. Of course the agent usually asks each man whether he intends going farming. It means money to the agent if the man should say yes, and he says 'yes,' and the agent has that extra money. I wanted to get that number because I want to see what the immigration amounts to which comes from Great Britain. There is a great deal more in immigration than settlers who go on the lands. I believe that half the immigration from the old country is not settler immigration. The report of last year gives from Great Britain a total of 41,000, and this year I understand it is estimated that the total will not be quite so large. I have here the 'Daily Record' and 'Herald' of Glasgow, Scotland, dated June 22. It will be remembered by those who take an interest in this matter that at the end of May and in the early days of June there were large parties arriving in Quebec, from Glasgow principally, who found that they had been lured into Canada under false pretenses and representations ; and at that time, particularly in the first week of June, our newspapers had on their front pages articles dealing with this matter. When these papers got to Glasgow the 'Record' sent out its representative to discover what it could about the matter in Glasgow ; and on the 22nd of June, the 'Record' published a statement which its reporter got from Mr. Græme Hunter, a gentleman whom we had over in Canada, a year ago last June, for a few days. This is the statement that the 'Record' published

> Mr. Hunter showed documents from the employers of labour in Canada requesting him to forward tradesmen of different kinds to fill situations. We have orders for 26,000 people for Canada. We put 14,740 into Canada last year and of these we have only 123 who were unsatisfied or unsatisfactory. Last year we assisted fares to the extent of £18,420, of which only £800 remained to be paid.

The special statement to which I want to draw particular notice is this : 'We put 14,740 people into Canada last year.' The statements of Mr. Hunter on a good many things are not accepted, but I believe he is reliable in this regard. He is what is called in Great Britain the king strike breaker of the British Isles, and I believe his statement can be relied on when he said he put 14,740 people into Canada last year. And this is only one agency. I have evidence here to show that another large agency, the Leopold agency in London, with offices in the same building as the Canadian government immigration offices, also sent out large numbers, and seeing that the total immigration was 41,000 and that this year it will not be more than that, it is fair to assume

that the average immigration for the year from January before last to December last would be 40,000 from Great Britain. Of course the immigration department reports for a year ending with June, and no doubt this gentleman was talking of the calendar year. He sent out 14,000 and I am bound to say that this and other agencies of this class, which are making use of misrepresentations, are sending altogether one-half of the immigration we are getting from Great Britain.

Mr. CLARKE. Are they paid by the Canadian government ?

Mr. PUTTEE. As far as I can see, the only way they could get paid from the government would be by checking these men through as settlers and through government agents. I do not believe however that they were paid by the Canadian government. I am not going to deal with the question of the difference in the cost of immigration which the taking of this fifty per cent off the settler immigration would make. Last year we spent three-quarters of a million dollars on immigration, and if you take the number of immigrants who went on farms and divide that into the amount of dollars, you can say that each immigrant cost so much. And I believe it would be fair and just to cut off fifty per cent of the immigration, which would make the average cost of each immigrant considerably higher. But what I want to deal more particularly with is this immigration which is not brought in for farming purposes, but which serves its purpose, and which the labouring men of the country warned the people against, and the labouring men have seen their prophecies fulfilled. I am not going to deal with this question either in opposition to or in favour of the immigration policy in respect to the settlement of land. I appreciate the fact that there is in Canada a scarcity of farm labour, that this question is a large one and growing, and that it looks as if it were going to be more serious in the future. The difficulty so far is one to which we have not attempted to apply any remedy, and the government have settled on no policy as to how we are going to supply the farmers of Canada with labour by the month or the year. I believe we have not properly started on that problem yet, and it is a serious one. But what I want to point out is that the wage-workers, the city workers, should not be expected to bear the whole brunt of carrying labour on the labour market for nine months in order that the farmer may use it for two or three months. There is this practice in vogue in Canada among the majority of farmers. In Ontario it is used to a considerable extent and in the west to a large extent. Our farmers require labour just in about the same proportion as they require binders. They require it just when their crops are ripe. They want it for a short time and at a reasonable wage for that short time, and then cast it over on the general labour market for the rest of the year. It is not fair, nor is it a solution of the problem, to imagine that by filling the cities with labour for nine months in the year, the farmer can get relief for two or three months. I am not going to advise the farmer, but if he does not run his business in such a way that he may employ labour all the year round, perhaps he is not managing it as it should be. And it is possible that farms might be run here as they are in other countries, where the farmers can offer employment by the year. Some hon. members, especially from the west, may say that there are positions offered on the farms by the year. No doubt there are, but this advice is always given to the men : It will be better for you to work by the year at five dollars, eight dollars or ten dollars per month than spend your time during nine months looking for work, and work during a couple of months at $35 or $40 per month. But the question I am dealing with is the question of immigration, which is not settler immigration, and I do not want to mix it up with the other at all. I do not want to exaggerate any condition of affairs, and am not going to rely altogether on my own judgment. I wish however just to read a paragraph from a Winnipeg paper, written just after a large work had been started there a few months ago. It is headed : 'Unskilled Labour Cheap ; common labourers are being paid 15 cents per hour.'

Mr. CLARKE. What paper ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The Winnipeg 'Free Press.'

An hon. MEMBER. That is not a good authority.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am simply quoting news matter and not editorial matter.

> Common labourers are being paid 15 cents per hour, which is the present rate in the city for unskilled labour. Some surprise was expressed by the reporter for the 'Free Press' at the low scale of wages, but the manager of the employment agency said that there was no difficulty in securing Galicians and Hungarians at this figure. On inquiry from other sources this statement was confirmed, as several large employers of rough labour say that they can get any amount of unskilled labour at the price stated. One employer said that this was the lowest rate he had paid in the last three years for the same class of labour.

That gives an idea of the demoralized state of the labour market, so far as the wage-earner is concerned in Winnipeg and the west this year. Fifteen cents an hour for unskilled labour means a drop of 7½ cents. and I will risk my word that skilled labour, in most instances, took a corresponding drop. Now, this is a serious thing. The labourer cannot possibly live decently on

what he earns at fifteen cents an hour. It is a serious matter for every wage-earner in the country. And, perhaps, I may be permitted to point out the contrast. When wages are at this low rate it means that all hope of enjoying the prosperity of the country is gone so far as concerns the man who sells his labour for wages. It was complained all last year, and for some time past in fact, that some people in other countries were—as it is called—dumping goods in Canada. That means, our manufacturers say, that others were actually selling goods to the people of Canada for less than it cost to produce the goods. And this was supposed to be—perhaps was, but I will only say supposed to be, as it is not necessary that I should deal with that question now—a serious state of affairs. That was the manufacturers' complaint. It looked like being an issue in this country. But it was forestalled; it was headed off. We have this session the dumping clause and we are told by the Minister of Finance that it is one of the most radical propositions ever adopted by any parliament, and that this government and this parliament are leading the way. But the case here is worse than dumping, for dumping is sending goods into this country and selling them here at less than it costs to produce them. But we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money every year, and other parties in this country are spending many thousands of dollars of money that does not belong to the government to bring in Canada, not farm settlers, but skilled workmen and labourers of all kinds to depress and break down the labour market in Canada. Is that fair to the worker? We declare that our principle in Canada is protection. Protection indeed——

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) is mistaken. Skilled labour is scarce in Canada.

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rosamond) says that this is because skilled labour is scarce. Does the price of an article drop when it is scarce, or does it rise? What have I just read to you? Fifteen cents an hour for labour, when labour ought not to be asked to live in the West for less than twenty-five cents an hour, and twenty-two and a half cents an hour is cutting it very fine indeed. Are we to believe these statements about scarcity of labour published as matters of news in our daily journals, and published not only in Canada, but sent over to some of these agents whose contracts I am going to read to you?

I merely point out the contrast and the unfairness of this treatment of labour in a country that believes in protection to the manufacturer. Now, last winter, the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council issued a circular and sent it to Great Britain. They sent it to over four hundred newspapers in the old country. It was promptly repudiated by the officer of the government, W. T. R. Preston, as other circulars have been repudiated by him, and was adversely commented on by nearly all the newspapers in Canada. The men who drew that up, though they represented 48 labour organizations in the city of Winnipeg, were told that they were men who did not understand what was going on, and that they were so purely selfish that they would rather see the country stand still than be required to get out and hustle like other people. That was only a few months ago. But the thing that the circular pointed out has come to pass, and yet the press of the country has not seen fit to admit the difference between what they promised and the facts as we see them to-day;—with one exception, the Toronto 'Globe' did have the fairness to acknowledge the corn and to say that a very serious injury had been done to labour in this country by the coming to pass of what the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg had predicted. Now, it is a fact—and the Minister of the Interior has told how, some time ago, he had a general knowledge, though not a special knowledge, of it—that there are in Great Britain agencies which are sending out people to Canada under guarantees that they have no business to give; and these people to whom these guarantees are given find themselves disappointed when they come here. Hundreds and thousands are miserably disappointed by the treatment they receive. A number of these agencies have represented themselves as agents of the Canadian government. And, to give the House an idea of the literature put out in Great Britain by these agencies, I will just read one sent out by what is now a fairly notorious agency, the Canadian Labour Bureau. This precious document is headed 'Immigration and Unemployment.' 'Canadian Labour Bureau, 13 Charing Cross, London, S.W.' and then, in small letters, 'In the same building as the Canadian Emigration Department of the Dominion of Canada.' Then in large letters, 'Immediate Employment Guaranteed! Good Situations, High Wages.'

My dear Sir,—I would draw your attention to the fact that, owing to the rapid increase of population in Canada, and to the consequent development of the country, as also to the general commercial prosperity, there is an almost unlimited demand for experienced and inexperienced help of every class, both males and females, in all the various towns of Canada.

Good hands are required for the iron and steel trade, the building trade, as well as for mines, factories and other industrial establishments.

Almost every mail from Canada brings applications for help which is urgently needed, and the inclosed list deals with the actual vacancies that this bureau has to offer at the present time, for men who are strong, able

and willing to work, and who are anxious to improve their position in a country which holds out such excellent prospects as does the Dominion of Canada.

Generally speaking wages are higher than in England, and the cost of living lower.

Nobody booking through this office need be afraid of being without work on arrival in Canada, as it is my principle never to send any one out unless there is a direct opening for him to go to. An introduction from this bureau guarantees permanent work with a reliable firm to suitable men.

No fee will be charged ; the only condition being that every applicant who secures employment through this bureau has also to arrange his passage here.

Mr. BLAIN. Who advises that ?

Mr. PUTTEE. That is published by 'Yours faithfully, Canadian Labour Bureau, Louis Leopold, Secretary.' This matter was brought strikingly to my attention the last time I was in Winnipeg. The fact is I could not stay in the office and attend to anything I wanted to do by reason of the men who came in in numbers showing me the guarantees issued by this Leopold. And these same guarantees of employment have some bearing on the question, which I will deal with later on, as to who it is that wants these men. Here is one of these guarantees which was given to me by one of the men who brought it out from England. It is headed 'Canadian Labour Bureau' and then comes the coat of arms of Canada :

13 Charing Cross, London, S.W.,
8th April, 1904.

My dear Sir,—This will serve to introduce to you Mr. W. J. Boorn who is proceeding to Winnipeg with a view to taking employment as a carpenter. I shall be grateful if you will advise him in his best interests and if you will give him suitable work, or if you will address him to a firm who are in need of his class of help. I beg to commend him to your kind consideration and to thank you in anticipation for anything you may do on his behalf.

I am, dear, sir,
Yours faithfully,
Canadian Labour Bureau,
LOUIS LEOPOLD,
Secretary.

The President,
The Manitoba Construction Co.,
Madomock Block, Fort St.,
Winnipeg.

That was brought to me soon after it had been presented to the foreman of the construction company, and the foreman told the man who delivered this, that there had been 150 of them there that day, and advised him to go back and sue Louis Leopold for bringing them out under false pretenses. The hon. gentleman asks who he represents. I believe that in this business he represents more particularly the Canadian Manufacturers Association, but financially he represents Louis Leopold himself. He had reason lately to cause the publication of a letter in Winnipeg in which he states :

It may interest the representatives of the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council to know that the position in this building has added largely to the result of my business, and that the government officials have even tried several times to get me out of it, but have failed, as I have secured the premises on a long lease.

This agency is in the same building as the Canadian government agency, and he boasts here that this brought him a great deal of business, though he says that the Canadian government cannot get him out. But the point I am trying to drive home is that when it comes to the manufacturer asking for anything we can take such radical steps, but when it comes to the workingmen asking for anything, the furthest we can go is to put an advertisement in the English papers saying that we are not responsible for this man's doings. I think that the authorities should find some effective means of stopping this matter where it is now. I brought the same matter up last year ; if it had been effectively dealt with then we would not have been overrun, as we have been overrun, with a lot of deluded mechanic immigrants this year. I have here the prospectus of this Louis Leopold Company, and I have a tremendous list that was sent over of so-called vacancies in Canada—list after list, giving the number, not only in each trade but in each particular branch. There are also a number of letters that have been sent to me by men to whom Louis Leopold gave them, sending them to various members of the Manufacturers Association asking for work. The Manufacturers Association of course is the body that asks for 25,000 workingmen. I have here a bunch of these recommendations, and every one of them is addressed to a concern in this country that had a strike on at the time. Why, under this same rule it would be just as well if the Sydney Steel Works were to telegraph over to Britain now that they wanted 2,000 men in Sydney right away, that business was so pressing that they wanted the men. Of course they have locked out their men, and so have these other concerns to whom recommendations are sent. In view of this list of vacancies, I may mention that in to-days papers there is a further statement from the Canadian Manufacturers Association in which they claim that over 7,000 vacancies are existing now, giving the numbers, province by province, and in some cases the trades are given. That is the kind of statement that leads people who are not working for wages and who are not in touch with those that are, to imagine that there is a scarcity of skilled workmen in Canada to-day. If that statement to-day is honest and fair, I say that the one of last year was not, and I do not believe that this one is either. If it is, if their intentions are right, instead of say-

ing that there are 7,000 situations vacant, let them come up and give the names of the institutions who want these people, and the kind of employment they are able to furnish, the wages, the hours ; and if those hours are fair, and if the wages are fair, and they are published in the papers of Canada, I will guarantee that to-morrow there will be five applications for every job that these men have to give out. Yet that statement is published to-day, and is sent over to Louis Leopold and to Græme Hunter, that they may post it up in the windows of their offices in Glasgow and London to-morrow, so that they may sell more steamship tickets and get their rake-off, get their deposit, and have their pay as well from the Canadian Manufacturers Association. That is the kind of thing we ought to stop, that is the kind of immigration that is coming to Canada at the present time. I have here an article cut from the Toronto 'Globe' of June 1st. It acknowledges this state of affairs, it could not help doing it in Toronto at that time—shipment after shipment of Scotchmen in the metal trades especially were arriving in Toronto. I have some other recommendations here, some of the complaints that they offered to give me under oath if I wanted them. I have one here, and I believe some were sent to me from the Toronto District Council with the intimation that copies had been sent to other members of parliament. Here is a statement with the coat of arms of Canada upon it :

The Canadian Labour Bureau,
13 Charing Cross, London S. W.,
April 18, 1904.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of 17th instant, re vacancies in Canada for bricklayers, and beg to say in reply that I can place this class of labour immediately on arrival in Winnipeg at the rate of 55 cents per hour.

That is on the 18th of April. I was in Winnipeg on May 4th, and there were 250 idle bricklayers on the streets then. Yet this gentleman on the 18th of April was telling the people in England to whom he wanted to sell tickets, and whom he was asked to send out to this country, that he had immediate employment for them in the city of Winnipeg at 55 cents an hour.

This is an excellent wage, as the cost of living is lower than in this country, very good board and lodging can be had for 12 shillings per week in this town, the lowest fare is £8. If you decide to go out, I shall be pleased to book your passage and will give you a letter of introduction to the gentleman who applied to me for this help and he will place you at once. If you prefer work in Toronto I can also place you there, wages are lower but the cost of living is less, Fare £6.19.7. I shall hope to hear from you in this matter, when I will give you all further information you may need.

This is addressed to Mr. W. R. Davis. This gentleman was what they call in his trade, 'on the rocks,' and was trying to get money to go back. Here is another one much in the same strain. Now I do not need to go further. I have a lot of stuff in connection with Græme Hunter, of Glasgow, but his professions are pretty well known. I know the reply is that these men are not connected with the Canadian government. I see their connection has been repudiated. But I have read from the report of the deputy minister that every steamship agent practically in Great Britain is an agent of the immigration department.

Mr. CLARKE. What do you mean ?

Mr. PUTTEE. That he is made an agent of the Immigration Department for the sake of recommending Canada and selling tickets to Canada rather than to other countries. I notice, for instance, that the commissioner over there, Mr. Preston, recognizes it; in fact I imagine that there has been trouble there, he evidently recognizes that there might be, though he states the contrary. He says :

Very many of the booking agents on account of this financial advantage accruing to them, were believed able to exert some influence in cultivating public opinion in their own localities in favour of the Dominion. In doing so, even if they found such a course financially advantageous, they have not been guilty of conduct which any business man has the slightest occasion to be ashamed of.

I draw the inference that there have been some pretty shady dealings with ticket agents using the stationery of the Dominion government. It may be said to be necessary for Mr. Preston to appoint ticket agents in Great Britain to be immigration agent so that they could put in a good word for Canada when the undecided immigrant comes along, but see how it connects the department generally with this mechanic immigration which has been coming out. Here is a bill that was given to me by a man who brought it in his pocket believing that its presentation would give him work at 55 cents an hour. It is headed :

CANADA WANTS MORE MEN IN THE BUILDING TRADES.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the date ?

Mr. PUTTEE. It would be published in the spring. Its last quotation is dated January 1, 1904. From what I know of the conditions of the building trades in Canada, I would say that the tremendous difference between the building trades in a Canadian city and the building trades in the cities where the men are to whom these circulars are sent out ought to be pointed out. I know a great many men who have worked in the west, in Winnipeg, for twenty years in the building trade who have their records showing what their incomes have been and I am assured by them that in years gone by their records show that the actual number of working days only averaged from 114 to

135 in the year. The Britisher knows nothing about this. It is hardly one day in three. Even at $5 a day it gives a man an income of about $650 a year, not an extravagant income, but to state the fact that the building trades are so highly paid in Canada and to put it before the mechanic in the old country without any explanation and with the seal and endorsement of the Canadian government misleads. This circular proceeds :

Statement by the Government Emigration Commissioner.

Mr. W. T. R. Preston, the Canadian government Commissioner of Emigration in London, supplies the following facts under date of June 10th, 1903 :—

In reply to the suggestion regarding mechanics and artisans, I may say I have received application for assistants from employers of labour in Canada to the number of nearly 20,000. All the leading Canadian journals contain columns of advertisements asking for mechanics and artisans. These newspapers declare that but for the lack of labour building operations on an unprecedently large scale would be undertaken everywhere. One letter just received from a very large employer of labour in Toronto makes the statement : 'Toronto alone at the present time could absorb 25,000 of such people.' In Winnipeg, ordinary mechanics' labourers receive 1 shilling per hour, carpenters and painters 1s. 8d. per hour, while stonemasons, bricklayers, plasterers and others earn from 2s. to 2s. 2d. per hour for a day of ten hours.

In the Dominion of Canada 'Labour Gazette' for May, published by the government, letters from authentic correspondents appear stating 'No man who is able and willing to work need be without employment of some kind.' 'The chief needs of the present time are more labourers and dwelling houses.' 'A scarcity of men is reported in almost all branches of trade.' 'The farm help supplied this year has been of superior kind ; wages are very good, running from £4 to £6 a month, and board.'

The Dominion government is simply repeating the information that is sent over in this prospectus of the Canadian labour bureau.

The Emigrants' Information Office, London, which is under the direction of the Colonial Office, furnishes the following authentic particulars under date of January 1st, 1904 :—

The spring is the best season in the year for mechanics to emigrate to Canada. The mechanics from whom the demand throughout Canada is most general in spring and summer are men in the building trades, especially carpenters. The building, metal, engineering, shipbuilding and manufacturing trades generally, continued busy throughout last year, and skilled men, such as carpenters, plumbers and blacksmiths had no difficulty in procuring work.

Further on it says :

Men engaged in the building trades are therefore advised to proceed to Canada at the earliest opportunity. Winnipeg or Toronto are the places recommended, and cards of introduction will be provided by the undersigned to the government labour bureau to enable men to get into work at once. Full particulars of each man's requirements are sent to Canada well in advance of his arrival. Special parties will leave England every week during the spring and summer, and judging by the extensive new building and railway construction contracts that commence this season, there will be an unprecedented demand for carpenters, bricklayers, masons, blacksmiths, plumbers and painters, especially at Winnipeg and other towns in western Canada.

Passages booked and fullest instructions furnished by Walter E. Rumsey, Canadian emigration agent, 1 Market Street, Shrewsbury.

This man is simply a steamship agent, a ticket agent, but having been made a sub-agent of the Canadian government he issues a circular of that kind sanctioned by the Canadian immigration agent. It directly places the responsibility on the Immigration Department, and I think the department ought to stop it and stop it once for all. I notice that by the item we are now discussing the amount of the salaries for the Immigration Department is increased by $25,000 this year. I think the Immigration Department is getting far too large. It has been in the fortunate position of having been able to increase its expenditure, after the Boer war when Great Britain could not find employment for her people, and it may look as if the increased immigration is due to the large expenditure of money that we are making. I hardly think that is the fact. I am not going to say that one does not back up the other, that the immigration agents are not working in conjunction with the land companies and helping to produce the results. The land companies have obtained control of blocks of land at moderate rates and they give the incoming settlers the privilege of paying $4 or $5 an acre more for that land than they would have to pay if we had not allowed these companies to get these large blocks of land. These companies are sending in the people. They are sending in a greater number than the immigration agents are sending in. They are sending in fifty per cent of the people. It does not seem to be a proper thing in view of the fact that our immigration expenditure is now three-quarters of a million a year to increase it. I know that neither party wishes to attack with any kind of vigour the immigration policy. The wage workers of the country well know and other people well know that the immigration policy is not much more than a menace to them, that a great deal of this mechanic immigration that designedly comes along is encouraged by people in Canada who wish to keep down the rates of wages and who wish to have what they call a fluid labour market. I believe that the immigration estimates could be materially cut down. We have been increasing them in recent years. But, while

we have had large immigration expenditures for many years we have reduced them during some years and there did not seem to be very much difference in the results in those years and I am bound to say that the conditions existing in other countries have as much as anything else to do with the settlement of our lands. I do not for one moment interpose any objection to having agents in other countries publishing and distributing authentic information, or to have agents looking after the interests of the country, but it looks to me to be a dangerous thing to have so many agents in other countries often idle hands as they have proved to be. We have had many instances of it already, as the letter that is now on the ocean addressed to our commissioner in London proves as the report—it is only a report—that Washington will interpose proves, and as the protest from Ireland against our agents there proves. I believe we are making friction where we should not make it; I believe we are spending a great deal of money we need not spend, and I believe it is unfair to the wage earners in Canada to leave unchecked this system of bringing in labour to pauperize the labour market, and at the same time listening always to propositions to increase duty and make goods dear.

Mr. CLARKE. I draw the attention of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) to some statements which appear in the last printed report of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration; and perhaps he will not treat these statements as flippantly and as lightly as he did the statements made by my colleague as to the quality of some of our immigrants. At page 46 of the last printed report of the United States Commissioner General of Immigration you will find this statement:

> In the year 1903 the number of officers engaged in preventing these undesirable immigrants from entering the United States from Canada was increased from 66 to 116.

It was found necessary, in order to preserve the United States from the undesirable immigrants from Canada, to increase the number of officers to that extent. The report says, at page 46:

> During the twelve months ended to-day many persons have applied for admission to the United States via Canada whose personal appearance and general conditions should have precluded the possibility of their having been allowed to embark on any vessel designed to carry passengers under conditions of health and comfort.
>
> It is only necessary to relate that in some instances the filthy conditions have been so abominable as to render it impossible for our medical examiners to give them the attention required by our laws and regulations. The Bureau, like myself, will have to leave it to conjecture how fellow passengers huddled together in the close quarters of an Atlantic liner have endured the contaminating presence of such persons.
>
> Admission to the United States has been invariably denied to such applicants and in some instances it has been deemed unwise to return them to Canada, and deportation to Europe has been effected.

These immigrants were so bad that the United States officers feared to send them back to Canada, because, I presume, they would make attempts to re-enter, and so they shipped them home via New York. The report further says, at page 48:

> Covering a direct line of more than 4,000 miles of frontier including three ocean ports, and inspecting more than 100 trains daily and a large number of ferries, 'sound steamers,' and the growing fleets that ply the Great Lakes, these inspectors, in all kinds of inclement weather, and frequently under most trying circumstances, have boarded every train, met every ferry and every steamer, whether by river, lake or sound, and have prevented the amazing total of 5,158 diseased and otherwise objectionable aliens entering the United States, and have done all this without causing a single complaint on the part of the travelling public.

Then follows a tabulated statement of the number of arrests made along the border of persons trying to smuggle undesirable immigrants into the United States. Year after year we on this side of the House have told the Minister of the Interior that we are prepared to assist him in making a reasonable appropriation to ensure a more efficient medical inspection than that which takes place at the present time. How is it possible that hundreds and hundreds of immigrants who reach Montreal from St John or Halifax are so diseased as not to be admissible to the United States, if a right medical examination was made at the port of landing? How is it possible that such immigrants are allowed to land at Quebec and Montreal? What we demand is a more rigid medical examination. These immigrants should not be permitted to embark on the other side of the Atlantic, but if they contract disease on the voyage they should be sent back at the expense of the steamship companies which bring them out. If the statements of the United States officers are reliable, such immigrants should be rigorously kept out of Canada. It is extraordinary that we should have the opposition and criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite rather than their support, when we draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this matter. We are as anxious as he ought to be to secure eligible immigrants, but we enter our emphatic protest against the laxity of the system which permits hundreds and hundreds of immigrants to remain here who are excluded from the United States. We have just as skilled medical men in Canada as they have in the United States, and if they are able to successfully grapple with the difficulty, so should we. I believe that in some cases the United States employ Canadian medical officers, which is a compliment to our professional men, and if that be so, we certainly should have no difficulty

ourselves in finding a sufficient number of suitable inspectors to protect our frontier and ocean ports against the incursion of these immigrants. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) drew attention to the conditions prevailing in Montreal last spring, when thousands of destitute Italians were permitted to come into this country, and we have not so far been able to place the responsibility for their admission. Some of these poor immigrants became a charge upon the good people of Montreal. The Minister of Labour did not know whence they came. He sent his deputy, a very able and a very clever man, to make inquiries, but he gave it up as a bad job ; and now we have an investigation going on by one of our county judges. Surely there must be something wrong in the machinery of the Labour and Immigration Departments when this untoward condition of things is allowed to go on. We have to call in one of our judges to ascertain where these people came from, under what conditions they were brought to the country, and what has become of them. It is certainly a very serious problem, and it is our duty to raise our voice in protest on every available occasion, until we are satisfied that the plan of the Minister of the Interior is the most efficient and most rigorous method that can be devised to exclude diseased and undesirable immigrants from Canada. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has referred to the methods adopted on the other side of the Atlantic to induce people to emigrate to Canada. Last fall, through the co-operation of a friend in England, I secured a large number of circulars issued by Mr. Louis Leopold, advertising situations vacant, &c., and I sent them to the secretary of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress so that he might see what was going on. My correspondent found the office of Mr. Leopold in the same building as the office of the Canadian immigration agent at London ; he found these circulars bearing the Dominion coat-of-arms, with the words 'Canadian Labour Bureau' ; and he found all the surrounding circumstances calculated to mislead the ordinary intending emigrant to believe that if he came to Canada through the instrumentality of this bureau, he was coming under the auspices of the Canadian government itself.

As I have said, I gave these documents to the secretary of the Dominion Trades and Labour Council, that he might see for himself what was going on, and take the necessary steps to try to awaken the people of the old country as to the misrepresentations that were being made to induce people to come to this country under the promise that immediate permanent employment could be procured. The last time I was at home I had a visit from a friend of mine, who left me two or three papers which I will take the liberty of reading, and I will then pass them over to the hon. minister that he may take steps to put a stop to these misrepresentations which are still going on. Three Scotchmen, named Ferris, Brown and Allan, were induced to come to Canada, and were assured of immediate permanent employment at their trade. These men were represented to me to be miners, men who mined the stone of rock surrounding the coal seams. They had splendid letters, I am told, from those by whom they had been employed for many years, and would have made excellent citizens if the representations made to them had been carried out. They were told that if they came to Toronto they could find employment at once. I need not tell the hon. minister that there is no employment for miners in the city of Toronto ; and they looked in vain for work. They were engaged, when my friend called on me a couple of weeks ago, in helping to clear away the debris at the scene of the recent fire. The following letter is to Mr. Ferris :

Canadian Labour Bureau,
Shipping Agency, 11 Nelson Place,
Stirling, 16th April, 1904.

Dear Sir,—I have now pleasure in sending you herewith three boat and rail tickets to Toronto for yourself, Geo. Brown and John Allan, also a supply of luggage labels for each. Inclosed you will also find two very good letters of introduction, so that you are all sure of employment. You should be ready to embark at Plantation Quay, south side, Glasgow, on 23rd April, at 2 p.m. The balance of the passage money to be paid at 25 Bothwell Street, Glasgow.

Send luggage to reach Glasgow the day before sailing.

I shall be pleased to furnish you with any other information you may desire.

Mr. Ferris was also given a letter by this same Mr. Louis Leopold from the Canadian Labour Bureau, 13 Charing Cross, S. W.

Canadian Labour Bureau,
London, S.W., 14th April, 1904.

My dear Sir,—The bearer of this letter is Mr. John Ferris, who is desirous of getting work in Toronto. He is a brickmaker by trade and I should esteem it a favour if you would advise him as to where he is likely to obtain suitable employment. He is willing to take any work for the time being until he can get a berth in his own line. Thanking you in anticipation for anything you may do on his behalf.

I am, dear sir,
Yours faithfully,
Canadian Labour Bureau,
LOUIS LEOPOLD,
Secretary.

This letter is addressed to R. J. Younge, Esq., Canadian Manufacturers Association, Toronto, Canada. Now, Mr. Chairman, there ought to be some means devised to prevent men from being deceived in this way by agents who represent themselves, and who would appear from the heading on

the letter paper, to be agents of the Canadian government. I believe the government has recently published in the old country papers an announcement respecting some of these people ; but that to my mind it not sufficient. There ought to be some effort made to secure the co-operation of the imperial authorities to stop this work, which is engaged in, I presume, by those who get a commission from the steamship companies to induce people to come to this country. These men, I believe, two of them at least, are married men who left their families behind them, expecting to bring them out in the fall. They will leave Canada in the autumn and return home, and they will not act as very earnest advocates of immigration to Canada after their own experience. If this kind of work is permitted to go on unchallenged, a great deal of damage will be done to Canada. As the hon. member for Winnipeg has said, many misrepresentations have been made to induce mechanics to come to this country. These men have not been able in many cases to get the employment or the wage they were told they could get, and many of them have become dissatisfied and are writing to their friends in the old country denouncing the misrepresentations under which they were induced to come to this country. This is no doubt a difficult matter to deal with, but I do not think we on this side of the House would be doing our duty if we did not point out to the minister the conditions that exist, and I can assure him that he will have our co-operation in any steps he takes to put a stop to a condition of things that is most disgraceful. The effort made by the Department of Labour to keep people from coming in here cannot be regarded as successful. Apparently the machinery used by the Minister of the Interior is not all that it ought to be. We are ready to assist him in perfecting that machinery, because we believe it needs perfecting, and in applying the precautions that ought to be taken. The number of immigrants may be somewhat smaller in years to come, but a better class of people will come to our shores, and the result on the whole will be much more beneficial than if the existing condition of things is permitted to continue.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat mentioned, if I heard him correctly, that there had been some 5,000 undesirable immigrants who presented themselves on the frontier of the United States and were rejected or deported. My hon. friend also mentioned the port of Halifax and the port of St. John as having contributed to that number. I would ask him if he has any number that he could give of these undesirable people who have been traced to entries through the port of Halifax. I know that the inspection by the United States authorities at Halifax is very rigid, and they have rejected all suspects that came under their scale. I also know that the inspection for admission into Canada is equally precise and rigorous. The two inspections are conducted in the same building and almost under the same conditions. Therefore I would like to ask my hon. friend if he has the information at hand, how many of those who presented themselves on the frontier came through the port of Halifax.

Mr. CLARKE. I presume all of them came through the ports of Halifax, St. John and Quebec. I do not know of any other ocean ports through which immigrants come to Canada by the Atlantic.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I would ask him if he knows that one of them came through the port of Halifax ?

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose probably a percentage of them came to St. John, to Halifax and to Quebec.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I want to get exact figures on that point, because it reflects on the inspection at that port.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely the hon. gentleman would not expect me to inquire from the United States authorities how many came through Halifax, how many through St. John and how many through Quebec ? I have given the statement of the commissioner general of immigration of the total number deported, and not permitted to enter the United States, who were going to the United States through Canadian ports. He can determine himself how many came to Halifax, St. John and Quebec. My hon. friend from Lennox points out to me on page 53 of the report a tabulated statement which I will pass over to the hon. gentleman if he likes. This gives the grand total of rejections and deportations as 5,158. The number going to Halifax was 9,573, of which 9,443 were admitted, 130 rejected and 83 deported to Europe from the border. That was by the Dominion Line. The number that came by the Allan Line was 3,399 examined ; 3,368 admitted, 31 deported to Europe, 22 deported to Europe from the border. By the Hamburg-American Line, examined 1,775, admitted 1,746, deported to Europe 29, deported to Europe from the border 89. Then the returns are given from the other ports of St. John and Halifax. I will send the table over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KENDALL. I must protest against any effort to misrepresent my attitude on this question of the quarantine against infectious or contagious diseases. I took no such stand as the one attributed to me. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) told us that a distinguished surgeon, representing Montreal (Mr. Roddick), again and again brought the attention of the committee to the undesirable quality of immigrants

arriving in Montreal, many of whom were suffering from contagious diseases, and were moving freely around the city and enviorns.

Mr. SPROULE. No, the hon. member has got all mixed up.

Mr. KENDALL. I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure, because I know what I intended to say. I said that it was stated in the Montreal papers that these people had found their way into the hospitals and into the private homes of the country, that we had time and again drawn attention to the danger in this House, and that the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick) had spoken of it as well and had referred to the fact that these people were to be found in the hospitals and must have come in through our Canadian ports.

Mr. KENDALL. That is just what I said.

Mr. SPROULE. No, the hon. member said that an eminent physician of Montreal, who has a seat in this House, had time and again drawn attention to it. As a matter of fact, he did not. I said that it was in the papers time and again, that time and again we had drawn the attention of the government to the fact, and that the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick) had spoken of it in the House.

Mr. KENDALL. I went through the 'Hansard' for the last three years and could not find any evidence that Dr. Roddick had referred to this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will look through 'Hansard' more carefully again, he will find it.

Mr. KENDALL. If there is one hon. member in this House, who is well qualified to deal with the subject, it is the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), and if there was great danger to this country, that gentleman would have been here and have rung the changes on the matter again and again. He would have pointed out the defects of the quarantine stations in Montreal, Grosse Isle and other places in such a manner that there would have been no doubt as to the danger. And I submit that when he did not take that pronounced stand on this question, we are probably magnifying the danger that does exist. I do not deny that there is danger, but I say that in our criticisms of the arrangements to prevent the importation of disease at these points, we are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. There is one way in which the House and the country can reach a fair conclusion. It has been suggested to the medical men in this House that on the next occasion when a large immigration steamer comes from Europe, they should take the train and go to Grosse Isle and watch the inspection; and I can assure the hon. gentleman, from the knowledge I have of the port of Halifax, that the medical men in charge there are men well qualified. One is a very distinguished surgeon and the other is a physician of very large practice and high respectability. I am sure that the inspection there is very thorough, and I do not doubt that in Quebec and Montreal the inspection will be found equally thorough. Instead of harping about imaginary evils, it would be far better for the medical men on both sides to go and observe really what is going on at these stations, and we would then be in a better position to discuss the question to advantage.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman rose to set right the impression in this House that he was antagonistic to the quarantining and the prevention of contagious diseases, but now he attacks the opposition for harping on an imaginary danger. Is it an imaginary danger when the American inspector draws attention to the fact that owing to the diseased condition of these immigrants, over 1,300 had to be sent back at the Canadian border?

Mr. KENDALL. They have done just what hon. gentlemen opposite are doing—straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman engaged in professional life at all, or in freezing bait for the purpose of catching fish?

Mr. KENDALL. I am not running a small drug store at a country cross-road.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said. But if he were a medical man and practiced at all, he would appreciate what it means to import contagious diseases. One or two cases of small-pox will cost hundreds and thousands of dollars, not taking into account the very severe trouble that people are subjected to by its introduction into their neighbourhood.

Mr. KENDALL. With the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) permission, I would like to ask him a question. Will the hon. gentleman or any of his friends produce evidence of contagion from a case of trachoma?

Mr. SPROULE. I ask the question again. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) a medical man at all? The question naturally suggests itself when he talks in that fashion. No medical man would waste his time in answering such a question as the hon. gentleman has asked. If he wishes to quote authority—certainly I do not, because every medical man knows it—let him go into the library and bring out any book and read it. These matters are on record in our own debates, for the authorities were quoted a few years ago in this House, to satisfy just such incredulous people as the hon. gentleman. There is not an author who does not say that it is contagious.

Mr. KENDALL. We all know it is contagious; I did not say it was not.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, what more is required ? Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) say that is a proper thing that a person affected with a contagious or infectious disease should be brought in and planted in a community in our country on the plea that there is no danger ?

Mr. KENDALL. I did not say so.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that we are dealing with imaginary difficulties. He says : 'I have heard no more ridiculous criticisms than those of the opposition regarding the health of immigrants.' These are the hon. gentlemen's words. Now, what has brought about the quarantine regulations that are being enforced to-day but the criticism—ridiculous criticism, the hon. gentleman would call it—from this side of the House during successive years ? It was frankly admitted that there was comparatively speaking no restriction upon these immigrants coming a few years ago. But, year after year, we drew the attention of the House to the matter and criticised the inaction of the government. The result was that the government introduced the system which they are carrying out to-day and which they declare to be almost perfect. Yet, an hon. gentleman on that side speaks of our criticism as ridiculous. Is it ridiculous on the part of the representatives of the people to seek to prevent the importation of contagious and infectious disease ? The hon. gentleman says we have enough of that at home. So we have—and far too much. But do we lessen what we have at home by allowing the importation of disease promiscuously from abroad. Would our government be doing its duty in allowing that ? Woud they be carrying out the quarantine regulation that the country expects them to carry out ? The hon. gentleman suggests that if we want to see what this really means, let the medical men of this House go down to the port when an immigrant ship comes in. No doubt if that were done, extra effort would be made to show that most admirable quarantine regulations were being carried out. They would be on dress parade.

Mr. KENDALL. If the hon. gentleman saw one or two shiploads of immigrants he would be able to judge how much of this is serious and how much trivial. I say that the bulk of these cases are trivial cases, and it would be a gross injustice to these immigrants and to Canada to refuse them admission. Of course, a number of these cases are dangerous and should be quarantined.

Mr. SPROULE. No man who knows anything of medical science can speak of contagious disease as being trivial. A case of small-pox may be imported from across the line, and before we are done with it, it may cost us thousands of dollars and the same is true of scarlet fever and of trachoma. It is hard to know when it is stamped out. It may spread to only one or two or it may spread to a hundred. You take a case of trachoma and keep the patient for weeks and months, and even years, and you may have the disease on your hands still. You may get it apparently cured, and still the patient will relapse, becoming unfit for any employment and a danger to the whole community. And yet the hon. gentleman speaks of it as being insignificant and trifling.

Mr. KENDALL. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Trachoma is an infectious disease and these reports show it is the most common of infectious diseases among immigrants. Yet the hon. gentleman, who professes to be a medical man demands to be told of an instance in which this disease has spread. Looking at it as medical men do we not know what the results of a contagious or infectious disease is when planted in a community ? That disease may spread, and it cannot be regarded as an insignificant thing, nor can we afford to relax our efforts to prevent its importation. And are we of the opposition doing less than our duty when we call attention to it and urge upon the government to improve and carry out carefully their quarantine regulations ? Why, it is the opposition who should have credit for this system which the government have adopted and which they declare to be perfect. Instead of being abused by hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially by the medical men among them, the opposition should be given credit for their efforts to protect and promote the health of the community.

Mr. CLARKE. I venture to say that if my hon. friend the junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) will inquire in the library he will find that within the last twelve months some protests have been made —I cannot say that I remember the particulars—from medical associations regarding the importation of diseased immigrants. I will endeavour to find them for him. I am satisfied that protests have been made on that subject by some of the medical organizations of this country. Let me point out that, if the opposition are wrong in their criticism, they certainly do not desire to be wrong, or to take up the time of the committee in pressing upon the government precautions against dangers which may fairly be regarded as of trifling importance. It is because they regard them as more than a bagatelle, which, I think were the hon. gentleman's words.

Mr. KENDALL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—I was comparing the two dangers. I said that one was a bagatelle compared with the other. I did not say that it was a bagatelle in itself.

Mr. CLARKE. We are glad to hear the hon. gentleman's explanation. But 'Han-

sard' to-morrow will tell of the flippant way in which my hon. friend (Mr. Kendall) dealt with the statement presented by my hon. friend and colleague from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). Of course, we accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall). But let me draw his attention as a medical man to a statement I have here. The immigration into the United States last year reached the enormous total of 857,046—almost a million people. Of that number 35,920 came through Canada—less than five per cent of the total. Now, at page 59 of Mr. Sargent's own report, this extraordinary statement is made :

As specially indicative of the value of the system of inspection conducted through the agency of the Montreal office, attention is directed to the number of rejections on account of communicable diseases, 1,439 as compared with the grand total of rejections on the same account at all the seaports of the United States, 1,773.

Through the one port of Montreal, as a result of the rigid medical inspection made by the United States officers, there were within 350 as many undesirable and diseased immigrants detected and sent back as were found in all the United States ports. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) will not think that any criticism directed to prohibit the importation of these people into the country was trifling—was a bagatelle ?

Surely we are in the line of our duty in endeavouring to impress on the minister that every reasonable precaution should be taken to stop the inflow of these people into this country in their endeavour to get into the United States ? As the hon. gentleman knows, and as these reports have shown from time to time, the steamship agents who induce immigrants to come from the continent have got on to the fact that the inspection is extremely rigid in the United States, and they have been diverting the flow of immigrants through our ports into the United States. The Minister of the Interior has taken some steps to bar them from coming in, and now we are presenting him with the report of the Inspector General of Immigration for the United States, showing the conditions which he declares still exists, and the rejections he is obliged to make to keep out of the United States undesirable immigrants. I think we ought to have the help of my hon. friend the junior member for Cape Breton in impressing upon the Minister of the Interior that he is not doing his duty to the people of this country in allowing these diseased immigrants to come in here on their way to the United States, and when they are stopped at the border, being left in this country as a charge upon the taxpayers. If they are still permitted to come into Canada, the steamship companies should be responsible for their maintenance while in the country, and they should be sent back at the expense of these steamship companies to the country whence they came. If the minister will promise that these matters will have his careful attention we will let the item pass.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I beg to call the attention of the member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) to the statement in the book he has sent over to me, on page 53 of the report of the Commisisoner General of Immigration for the United States. In this report it is stated that 4,542 persons presented themselves at the frontier for admission into the United States. Out of that number 1,002 were rejected because they had no certificates, 1,575 because they were paupers or persons likely to become public charges—that is more than half. In addition, a few were rejected for other reasons, leaving out of the whole 1,430 who had dangerous contagious diseases. So the magnitude of the number left here is not so vast as the hon. gentleman says. Now I may allude to the port of Halifax. The statement is here given of the number of immigrants that were deported from the ships side at Halifax, and that fills up the whole. The total is given, those admitted and those deported, and there is not a single individual who came through ports of Halifax or St. John who is put down as having gone through to the United States by the frontier.

Mr. CLARKE. I gave the hon. gentleman the report to read ; he evidently has not completed his task. If he will turn up the number who came by the Hamburg-American Line he will find that there were deported from the border, 59.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). Not one is given as from the port of Halifax.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman will look at it again he will find that I am correct and that he is mistaken. I will send the book back to the hon. gentleman. However, Mr. Chairman, there is no use in continuing to argue with a gentleman who speaks in a trifling way of 1,439 cases of dangerous and contagious diseases having been kept out of the United States, out of the total border rejections for all causes of 4,542. Will any hon. gentleman seriously contend that that condition of things is satisfactory, when 1,400 or 1,500 people, afflicted with contagious diseases, whose destination was the United States, are barred on Canadian soil and left here stranded by American officials ?

Mr. SCOTT. What became of them ?

Mr. CLARKE. God only knows. I have been trying to find out for the last three or four years.

Mr. SCOTT. Did you ever meet any of them ?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes, I am sorry to say I have met them. I say that it is with the desire of assisting the government to put a stop to this condition of things, which is disgraceful, that we have raised these questions from year to year. I am sure the Minister of the Interior will bear testimony to the fact that in offering these criticisms for years past we have pledged ourselves to give him any reasonable assistance we can to inaugurate a thorough medical inspection that will keep this class of immigrants out. I will send the book back to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) so that he can read it again.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I did not say one word as to whether it was desirable that these people should be allowed admission to the United States, or even as to whether they should be allowed to come into Canada. The hon. gentleman coupled the ports of Halifax and St. John, and I took the trouble to look up the numbers that came through those two ports, because his statement reflects on our inspection there. I know the inspection is very rigid. In that column of figures, my hon. friend will see that the total number of admissions is given and the number that were deported. If these two items were added up the total would show there was no remainder to represent any who could have presented themselves at the border. They are not put down in that column as having presented themselves at the border. I did not speak of the desirability of allowing these people to come in, or of what means should be taken to prevent them.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the item passes I would like to say a word in regard to a matter concerning which I heard some adverse criticism earlier in the day, that is, as to the measures taken by the Immigration Department during the early spring of this year and the year before to induce a proper class of immigrants to come from Britain. The department sent over last spring and the spring before a number of practical farmers to different parts of the old country for the purpose of inducing a proper class of agricultural immigrants to come to Canada. I was sorry to hear that system criticised adversely this afternoon. I wish to put on record my view that it is the most effective method which the department has yet adopted for the purpose of inducing a desirable class of British immigrants to come to this country. I think we all agree that the system previously followed of resident agents in the old country was very largely a failure ; and we must admit that the practice of paying a bonus to steamship companies was largely a failure. Both these systems were failures for obvious reasons. I believe that by bringing in contact with the agricultural population of the British islands successful farmers of this country, there is a reasonable probability of securing the class of immigrants we most desire. I do not know whether the department intends to continue this system, but I would not like this item to pass, after having heard the somewhat adverse criticisms that were made, without giving my strong endorsation to that system which has been adopted recently, and which I am satisfied has already been productive of very good results. But still we can reasonably expect that it will be productive of very much better results as time goes on if the system is continued, and as the agricultural population of the old country become more intimately acquainted with the actual farmers who have made a success of farming life in our western country. I do not know but that it would be a good idea to include in these excursions farmers from eastern Canada as well as those from western Canada ; but, speaking of the west, I would certainly, as a western man, wish to endorse most strongly that system of inducing immigration, and I do not consider that the expense so far incurred is at all out of proportion to the benefits likely to accrue ; in fact, I think that a very large part of the money which has been hitherto spent for immigration purposes in the old country, both in the employment of permanent agents there and in paying bonuses to steamship companies, was money absolutely thrown away, or worse than thrown away, and that whether this amount that is now spent be large or small it is for a good purpose, and there is every reason to believe that it will produce a good result.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if it is the intention of his department to send farm delegates over this coming year ?

Mr. SIFTON. I understand my hon. friend refers to the sending of delegates in the fall. I have not come to any conclusion in regard to that. We certainly will not send over any large number.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister state how these delegates were selected last year ? Did the department make the selection themselves or were they selected on the recommendation of members from the west ?

Mr. SIFTON. I selected from my own constituency some men whom I knew personally, but in the selection of men from other counties I took the advice of my hon. friends who were acquainted with these men, and who recommended them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In reference to immigration literature, I believe there was a harvest number of the Winnipeg 'Free Press' issued specially for immigration purposes. Will the hon. gentleman say how many copies were distributed, and what it cost the department for distribution and printing ?

Mr. SIFTON. I am not sure that I am certain as to the publication to which the hon. gentleman is referring.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There was a special harvest number of the 'Free Press' gotten out last fall. I think there were 170,000 or 200,000 copies.

Mr. SIFTON. In 1903 ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. October 7, 1903. I desire to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. minister, because I think it was an injudicious and very unwise distribution of this kind of literature, and one more calculated to injure the country than to bring immigrants to our shores. I think there were somewhere in the neighbourhood of 200,000 copies printed and distributed. My information is that after they had gotten out a certain number of copies and they had been put into general circulation there was found to be an error of judgment on the part of some one, they were withdrawn from circulation and other copies were sent out in lieu thereof. I brought this matter up in the Agricultural Committee, and I asked the commissioner if this was the case. He said there were some statistics which were incorrect, and that that was the only reason why the original distribution was called in and suppressed. I have a copy of each edition, and I find that there was only a very slight difference between the two copies. In the first copy that was gotten out I notice that there are several placards. Here is one representing Uncle Sam standing on one side of the fence looking over into Canadian territory. This placard reads as follows :

> We wish to own our own farms in Canada. Upwards of 50,000 Americans gone to Canada within the past year.

This is one of four placards in the first distribution, or I really believe this is the last edition. It is headed as a sample copy. The one bearing date of October 7th I believe is the second edition, and if so, I think it is more injurious than the first, because I find that two of the placards appearing in the first were changed to read as follows :

> None but the trusts deserve the dough. Here the protective tariff makes the farmer sweat.

This was for distribution on the other side of the line, and was designed to induce American citizens to come over and settle in Canada. I think that would be more apt to antagonize an American citizen than to encourage him to come and settle in Canada. I know that if literature of that kind were circulated in Canada to induce citizens of this country to settle in the United States it would be regarded more as an insult than as an invitation to go there. Not only do I find it injudicious in that respect, but I have taken some sample clippings from this distribution which are calculated to injure our own country. We had a bad storm last September, I think about the 10th or 12th, a storm of almost unexampled severity in the history of our country. Though there was a severe snowstorm, there was no reason for publishing that all over the world, and no reason particularly for publishing it in the United States, where we expect the bulk of our immigration to come from. Still, these are some of the quotations taken from this literature :

> 'As a result of the big storm.'—'The usual drawbacks occur, danger from frost and drought.'—'Small yield from poor farming, from gophers and bad effects of weeds.'—'In the latter place (Southern Alberta)——

I am sure my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) will resent these specimen statements——

> —come suddenly and as no shelter is provided, often ninety per cent of a drove is lost in a single storm.'

Mr. CLARKE. Where is that statement made ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is in this document prepared for distribution, and this is the character it gives to the constituency represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver).

> 'The recent storm had lowered the grade of the wheat.'—'This locality suffered from the drought.'—'Late wheat has suffered some damage from frost, and some that was cut early is slightly sprouted.'—'Bad weather.'—'Raging storm of the 12th instant (September).'—'Notwithstanding the severity of the storm.'—'The past storm.'—'The wheat buyers pronounce that your wheat is frozen.'—'Wheat is really frozen, the snow lying so long on the stooks injured the kernel, and the frost following really injured the wheat.'—'The wet weather has deteriorated the value about 4 cents per bushel.'—'Off colour by reason of the damp weather.'—'the big storm.'—'The wheat was not fit to market.'—'There was no snow here, so the wet has not soaked into the stacks as much as it otherwise would.'—'The snow is nearly gone.'—'The grain is in a very bad condition and will all have to be cut one way. Some say some of it will not cut at all.'—'The recent storm.'—'The big storm.'—'Severe wind storm, with its accompanying fall of snow did considerable damage.'—'By the force of the wind and the weight of the snow oats were prostrated to the ground. Farmers think they will raise sufficiently to be cut at least from one direction.'—'Heavy rain.'—'Damage by the recent storm.'—'The big storm.'—'Continued bad weather.'—'Storm was the worst ever seen by the oldest settlers.'—'Since the snow storm.'—'The snow has injured the crops.'—'The storm.'—'It will never be cut though, as it is lying down never to rise again.'—'Rain, snow and frost.'—'All grain uncut is frozen.'—'Damage done by last Saturday's storm.'—'The storm of the third week of May was a very disastrous one—hundreds of the young cattle perished. Then followed the month of —June—no rain at all. The rain—has retarded operations—cattle are backward on account of the wet weather in August.'

Storm and bad weather are mentioned forty-four times in the issue, and the references include all seasons of the year, all sections of the country, and all kinds of grain

in one general defamation. Does anybody suppose that that kind of literature is calculated to attract settlers to our shores ?

Mr. TALBOT. What is my hon. friend reading from ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am reading extracts taken from this issue sent out by the department as immigration literature. These are reports of correspondents sent to the 'Free Press' all over the country. We do not wish to deny that we had a bad storm, but why should we pay $7,000 to the Winnipeg 'Free Press' to advertise that to the world. True, it was simply so much pap for the political organ of the Minister of the Interior, but I think every candid man will admit that those of us who reside in that part of the country have a grievance ; that the people of Canada should be called upon to spend so much money to advertise a thing in a special edition gotten out for the express purpose of sending it broadcast through the American union. We spent $800,000 on immigration last year, and the question arises : Are we getting sufficient value for that both in quantity and in quality—and quantity is not the most essential thing by a great deal ? I was surprised to hear the member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) minimize the danger we are subjected to through the importation of persons suffering from contagious diseases. He seemed to think that this was rather a trivial matter. I do not deny that we have many of these contagious and infectious diseases within our own borders, but when we have so much of the home grown article is it not doubly astonishing that we should add to it by importation ? The hon. gentleman from Cape Breton seemed rather to resent our criticism, but I think the Minister of the Interior will himself admit that the criticism of his policy from this side of the House in years past has in some measure urged on him the necessity of improvement, and I give him credit for that.

Mr. KENDALL. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) wishes to misrepresent me. My position is, and I have stated it several times ; that we cannot be to particular to keep out certain diseases, but I said that certain contagious diseases were trivial, that a large proportion of these cases referred to are trivial, and that we would do an injustice to this country and an injustice to the immigrants if we rejected them on that account.

Mr. SPROULE. These blunders take a lot of explanation.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister decline to give an explanation of the circulation of this literature ?

Mr. SIFTON. This literature was bought by an officer of the department because it was considered desirable literature. I was in England when the arrangement was made, and hon. gentlemen know that a minister in charge of the Immigration Department cannot read every publication that is bought and circulated on behalf of the department. I am not prepared to say at this moment that if I had read through that publication and had found the statements to which my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) has referred to be a true account of unavoidable circumstances in the Northwest, I would take that as a reason why it should not be distributed. From the time I have taken the immigration work under my charge, we have considered that the truth was good enough to be told with regard to the Northwest, and in telling the truth we have succeeded in this at least : that the people to whom we addressed our literature, believe the representations made in it. If I found in a document which my officers thought was desirable literature to be circulated, that the truth was told as to a storm or anything of that kind, I am not at all sure I would have rejected it simply because that which happens in every agricultural country was shown to have happened in Northwestern Canada. I can express no opinion about it ; it was not my own personal act, but I venture the statement that the people who read that paper were not prejudiced against Canada, by reason of that statement, because any one who knows anything about agriculture in all countries, knows that conditions of this kind arise at times. I have been asked for an explanation and that is the only explanation I can give.

My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) referred at some length to a number of things which have been explained before and in respect to which the position of the government has remained absolutely clear, and it seems like foolish repetition to keep repeating the same explanation over and over again. However, inasmuch as my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) has the appearance and earnestness in urging some of these points, perhaps I might say a word in regard to them. So far as his statement is concerned, that the labour market in Winnipeg is in such a state that ordinary unskilled labour is bringing only fifteen cents per hour, I say at once that I positively refuse to accept that statement as being a correct description of the labour market in Winnipeg. I do not think it is correct, and I will require more evidence than the hon. gentleman's remarks before I accept it as correct. I was in Winnipeg before my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) represented that city, and I have seen the workingmen of that city packing their grips and travelling out because there were no people coming in ; because the country which is tributary to Winnipeg and of which Winnipeg is the entrepot, was not being settled up. I can tell my hon. friend that the reason why this $6,000,000 worth of buildings is going up in the city of Winnipeg now is because of the successful immigration policy carried on under this government. If my hon. friend's constituents are prosper-

ous and if the city he represents is prosperous, it is the immigration policy which my hon. friend has done his best to prevent and discourage which is largely responsible for that prosperity. With regard to the point to which attention has been drawn at great length, respecting the misrepresentations which have been made in the old country, I can only say that that is one of the things which is going to take place under any system of encouraging the immigration of agriculturists. No one ever saw an army without camp followers, and no one ever saw a great movement of population without a certain residium following it, and certain things happening as a consequence of the movement having been inaugurated. It is quite true that certain persons have taken advantage of the immigration movement from Great Britain to Canada, of the advertising we have done, and of the dissemination of information which has taken place under this department, for the purpose of making money in a cheap and easy way by making false representations to mechanics and other people in order to induce them to come to Canada. But the government of Canada is not responsible for that, and I repudiate any responsibility for any false representations made by any one in the United Kingdom. Until this parliament assumes the responsibility of placing on the statute-book a law to enable us to deal with cases of that kind—and I doubt the possibility of parliament placing any such law on the statute-book—I am not disposed to hold myself responsible for anything done in that way. As to the labour bureau setting itself up and making false representations as to the condition of the people in Canada, that is the responsibility of the people making them. We have no law whereby we can prevent any person who sees fit to place a heading on his letter paper which leads an uneducated person to suppose that he is an agent of the Canadian government. We have no law by which we can prevent or punish him. That which we can do we have done. We have sent to a large number of the British newspapers a distinct statement warning the public that the people who are making these representations are not authorized agents of the Canadian government. We have endeavoured to get rid of that office in Charing Cross, but so far without success.

Mr. CLARKE. What steps have been taken to get rid of it?

Mr. SIFTON. We have taken the step of calling the attention of the joint landlord of these people and ourselves to the fact that this man was making false representations and was giving us trouble, and that it was very much desired by ourselves that his tenancy should be terminated. But we are informed that his lease has not expired, and he has as much right in that building as we have.

Mr. CLARKE. Has his lease the same term as that of the Canadian government?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not think so. When my deputy minister went to England some months ago, one of the things which I discussed with him was that he should make an effort to get those people out of that office; and my recollection of the conversation I had with him when he came back was that representations had been made to the landlord, and that the landlord had promised to do the best he could to meet our wishes. My deputy minister says that Mr. Leopold expressed his intention to resist every attempt to put him out. My hon. friend knows enough about the law of landlord and tenancy in England, to know that he cannot put a man out at a very short notice. I do not recollect the length of the lease, but the possibility is that it will be some time at least before we can get rid of him.

Mr. CLARKE. What length has our lease to run? It might be easier for us to go out and leave him there.

Mr. SIFTON. It might; but if my hon. friend saw the building, I hardly think he would advise that. With a great deal of care we have selected an office which everybody who has visited England is pleased to see as the office of the Canadian government. It is in a most desirable locality, and we have gone to a great deal of expense to have it fitted up in an attractive way. We have taken workmen from Canada to fit it up with Canadian wood; it is heated with a Canadian furnace; everything in it is representative of Canada, and the location is regarded as a desirable and satisfactory one from the standpoint of Canada. I doubt very much if the fact that this man has an office upstairs and is carrying on the propaganda he does, is a sufficient reason for us to move. I have little doubt that in a short time he will find it unpleasant and unsatisfactory to continue, and the difficulty will be terminated.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the minister aware that the officers of his department send men upstairs to this man to book their passages?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not think that is the case. If my hon. friend has any information to that effect, I would be very much indebted to him if he would send it to me, and I will promise, if he so desires, to regard the source from which it comes as confidential. The instructions which I have given have been most explicit, and there can be no possible excuse for any officer of the department, either directly or indirectly, in any shape, form or manner, being connected with or encouraging the traffic these people are carrying on.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this immigration office which we are complaining of on the floor above the ground floor ?

Mr. SIFTON. It is a little office on the floor above a portion of our office, which is on the ground floor. There is a stairway going up to it, and the entrance to the stairway is alongside the entrance to our office.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there a lift ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes. There is an elevator and also a stair. The office to which reference is made consists of one little room.

Mr. CLARKE. They book passengers there, and that is about all they do ?

Mr. SIFTON. Apparently. This man Leopold is a steamship agent, I believe ; but, as I have said, everything we can do for the purpose of making it clear that the Canadian government is not responsible for this work has been done.

I want to say a word or two with regard to the subject of medical inspection. From the time Dr. Bryce took charge, I think I can say the inspection became effective. The changes which he brought about became effective about the 1st of April, and since that time I think the medical inspection has been as effective as it can be made. I cannot imagine any way in which it could be made more effective. If my hon friends will take the trouble to go and see the method by which this inspection is carried on, they will be satisfied that the fault does not rest with our officials at the present time. In the first place, we have an inspection for quarantine purposes conducted by the Department of Agriculture. We do not depend on that at all, because the quarantinable diseases do not include all the diseases of an infectious or loathsome character. At the port of Quebec, for instance, the immigrants are landed on the dock, and are sent to a passage way in a building and are ranged off in such a way that they cannot get away. They are brought through a narrow passage which leads through a turnstile into the room where the doctor is waiting to inspect them. There the examination is made and the immigrant has to pass inspection to the satisfaction of the doctor. There is only one possible way in which the inspection can fail to be effective, and that is if the doctor is incompetent ; and as the agent and officers of the department are present and take charge of the immigrants as they are put through the inspection, it is next to impossible that the doctor could be incompetent without some one being aware of the fact. During a short visit I paid to the station at Quebec, no less than 2,400 people passed through the hands of the inspector during that day. In the twenty-four hours there were no less than three steamers arrived loaded with immigrants. It is possible of course that two or three or a half a dozen of this large number might have got through who were affected, not with any serious disease, but with some skin disease of an apparently trifling character ; but taken on the whole, we have a system which I think is effective. I fully recognize the paramount importance of making whatever system we may adopt as effective as possible. I want to add further this remark, that I think my hon. friend, after a little reflection, will admit that no matter what kind of inspection we may have in Canada at the seaboard and all along the border—of course we have none at present along the border, and that would be a very large question of policy to consider—you would still have large numbers of people rejected by the American inspectors as unfit to enter the United States. Take the case at Sault Ste. Marie. For years people have been coming across from northern Michigan in small groups to work in the woods where pulpwood is taken out. Many of these people are Canadians who had gone to Michigan and who were returning from that state. When the lumber mills were closed in Michigan for lack of logs, a considerable number of people who had been engaged in that business crossed our border ; and when the time came when many of them wanted to go back, the Americans had established a most rigid system of inspection at the Sault. Under that system many of the people were prevented going back. Our agent there told me personally, in answer to an inquiry regarding the number of people who had been stopped there, that the excuses under which people were rejected by the American inspectors were in many cases absolutely ridiculous. One man was rejected on the ground of deformity, simply because he had one-half an inch taken off one of his fingers, and that man had come in from the United States in that condition. These inspectors placed along the line will find excuses for rejecting a considerable number of people, and however thorough our system of inspection may be, there will be more or less of that sort of thing all the time.

Mr. CLARKE. What we object to is that in a city like Montreal there shall be stationed medical inspectors representing a foreign government who shall winnow the immigrants who landed at Atlantic seaports and passed our inspectors.

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend can tell me any better way of putting an end to this than having a rigid system of inspection of immigrants as they land, I shall be happy to consider it.

Mr. CLARKE. The American officers should examine them at the port where they land and give them a certificate through to the United States.

Mr. SIFTON. That is done where it can be.

Mr. CLARKE. The immigrants are brought to Halifax and St. John, and from there by rail to Montreal, and at Montreal the great bulk of them are rejected.

Mr. SIFTON. When they are ticketed to the United States, they are examined at the seaport by the American doctors and there dealt with, but the cases to which the hon. gentleman refers are those of people who have landed at a Canadian seaport from a foreign country and are not ticketed to the United States. These have passed our inspection, and we cannot watch every man who passes the inspection and send some one with him to see what he does. All we can do is to make our inspection as strict as possible.

Mr. CLARKE. Those people who are rejected by the United States officials ought to be sent, at the expense of the United States or of the steamships which brought them over, back to where they came from.

Mr. SIFTON. That is a fair question for consideration. It is a system of checking the rejections by the officers of the United States, and it is one we have not yet adopted. It will involve great expense.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman knows that our Canadian steamship companies have to pay $2 a head to the United States officials for the cost of examining these immigrants.

Mr. SIFTON. In many cases when persons are refused admission to the United States at points such as Detroit and Sault Ste. Marie, if these people came lately from foreign ports and the American inspector can ascertain that fact, they are taken straight to New York and shipped from there back to where they came from, and the cost is charged to the steamship company which landed them in the first instance. But in order to check the rejections by the United States inspectors, we would have to watch the operations of each American inspector, and that would require a considerable amount of organization and expense. That is a point I have had under consideration with the Minister of Labour, and in respect of which we will have to ask for some legislation as well as an appropriation of public money in order that it may be effectively dealt with.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to allude for a moment to this paper that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) was kind enough to send over.

Mr. TAYLOR. The $7,000 paper ?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I find that the hon. member for Marquette has gone through this paper and selected a line here and there and read it to the House to try and make the House believe that it is decrying the country. Now, you can take the Bible and you will find where it says there is no God.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, 'The fool saith in his heart, there is no God.' But if you leave out the words 'the fool saith in his heart,' you will find that it says 'there is no God.' This hon. gentleman has garbled this article right through. This, to my mind, is a very fair article. I do not think that any person in this country wants to lead people to believe that we do not have frost occasionally, that there is no rain, that we do not have a little wind. There would be no use in it because people coming in from the United States are travelling all over that country, and they are communicating with their friends. Now, this writer is speaking of a portion of Saskatchewan and he says :

> The crops of this eastern part of Saskatchewan have been good and better, never good and poor—the old settlers say they have never known a failure ; last year and this year have shown very fine crops, both in quantity and quality.

And he underlines this :

> The usual drawbacks occur, danger from frost, drought, small yield from poor farming, from gophers, bad effects of weeds.

But he leaves out the following :

> But in no part of the Northwest, and therefore in no part of Canada is a yearly crop of wheat, oat, barley or flax more assured than in the Saskatoon district.

The hon. gentleman has picked out a little piece in the middle where the writer says there are the usual drawbacks, such as are to be found in any country. But, taking the whole article I think it is a very fair one. I would not object to it going out. It is written about a part of my constituency, and I have no objection to it whatever. I believe in telling the truth about these matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not alluding to the gentlemen of medical knowledge who raised the question in the House a couple of years in succession about the danger to the country from deceived immigrants. I suppose the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) alluded to the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick) who is an eminent medical man. I took the trouble to go over that hon. gentleman's speeches, and I found that he had not referred to the matter at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I never made that statement. I have already denied that I made it and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) has no right to repeat it. I said that this matter had been repeatedly brought to the attention of the government and, amongst the sources from which information came, I mentioned the fact that the hon. member for

Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Roddick) had spoken of it.

Mr. DAVIS. Last year.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I was speaking of the last two or three years. I am not sure that it was last year, but I am sure that I am right in my recollections of what was said.

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will hunt up 'Hansard' I think he will find that the hon. member for Montreal West never mentioned the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I will take the trouble to look and satisfy myself, although I am confident that I was right.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, with reference to the latter part of this quotation referred to by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) it refers to the district of Alberta, and the hon. member (Mr. W. J. Roche) said to my hon. friend from that district (Mr. Oliver) that this was a very nice way to speak of his part of the country. The hon. gentleman knows well, I suppose, that the old proverb is true of the people of the west every one thinks their own crow the whitest. This gentleman, writing from Saskatoon, says that he thinks it is a better part of the country for cattle-raising than Alberta. He says it is said by those familiar with both places that Saskatoon is a better and more certain ground for ranching than Southern Alberta.

The people of Saskatoon think that way rightly or wrongly. And this writer goes on to say:

> In the latter place blizzards come suddenly, and as no shelter is provided, often ninety per cent of a drove is lost in a single storm.

He is simply giving his opinion as to which of these sections is the most suitable for cattle-raising. Everybody knows that you may run cattle on a ranch for six, seven or ten years and save a very large percentage of them, but occasionally we have a very severe winter and perhaps seventy-five per cent of your cattle are lost. This writer is merely giving his opinion and trying to show that that part of Saskatoon is safer for raising cattle than Alberta.

Mr. CLARKE. Read what he says further on.

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose the part the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) refers to is that which I have read with regard to Alberta. Now, he gives his reasons:

> In the latter place blizzards come suddenly, and as no shelter is provided, often ninety per cent of a drove is lost in a single storm.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) think the government should send out literature which it takes so much time to explain?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) can take the paper and read it and he will see that there is nothing wrong about it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is taking twenty minutes to explain it.

Mr. DAVIS. I can remember when hon. gentlemen opposite sent out literature when they were running the immigrartion affairs of this country, and that literature had very little effect in bringing in immigrants. The complaint raised about it is that it did not tell the truth.

Why, as I am reminded by an hon. friend near me they even sent out campaign literature last session which they had to withdraw. For my part, I do not see anything wrong with this article. It tells the truth and that is what we want. There is no use making things out different from what they are. Why, fault is found because this writer speaks of frost. You have frost in Ontario or in Quebec——

Mr. POPE. Never.

Mr. DAVIS. There will be a political frost in the province of Quebec about the time of the next general election. I hope it will not strike my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), but it may even extend that far. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) speaks of the cuts in this paper. Well, here is one of these cuts. A wall is represented and behind it the United States is pictured in the well-known figure of Uncle Sam. There is a placard showing that farm lands there are at from $70 to $150 an acre, and that there is no more government land. Another placard says: 'None but the trusts deserve the dough.' What is wrong about that? Every one knows that in the United States they have followed a system of excessive protection such as hon. gentlemen opposite would like to foist on us and so have built up trusts that are driving the people out of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. He tells us that he believes in stating the truth in these matters. That cut shows that there is no more government land in the United States. Yet it was stated by the Minister of the Interior that one reason why the immigration was not greater was that in the United States they had a lot of unoccupied government land that they were offering to the settlers. Does that paper tell the truth there?

Mr. DAVIS. My hon. friend must remember that they are constantly opening up Indian reservations and so on and there might not have been any government land when this paper was published. The part my hon. friend from Marquette objects to is this: 'The protective tariff makes the farmers sweat.' He says that that is poor advertisement for the United States for it

is running down their country. Well, I have a ltle knowledge of the people who are coming over from the United States, and I think that ninety per cent of the men are coming to get away from the high protective tariff and the trusts that are fostered by that tariff. Then, on the other side of this cut, Canada is represented with the placard 'Millions of acres free.'

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How much did these American immigrants get for their land before they came to Canada? According to that newspaper cut, land there is worth from $75 to $100 an acre. That is the effect of high protection.

Mr. DAVIS. Surely the hon. gentleman does not say that it is high protection that has made the land worth $75 an acre. High protection has not made land worth $75 an acre. If high protection made land dear, it is strange that in 1896 farm lands in Ontario had gone down so far that you could'nt sell them for enough to pay the mortgage. Since the duty has been reduced farm lands have gone up 50 per cent.

Mr. POPE. That is a false statement, and you know it.

Mr. DAVIS. It is true in Ontario, and in the province of Quebec, too.

Mr. POPE. It is a common lie.

Mr. DAVIS. I will venture to say that in the constituency which the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) represents there were a great many houses with slats on the windows in 1896.

Mr. POPE. That is the old story repeated by the Minister of Agriculture fifteen years ago. You ought to get somebody else to post you.

Mr. DAVIS. A lot of people were living in houses that were nailed up with slabs, because they were so poor that they could not buy window glass. Is there anything wrong in saying that we have millions of acres of land to give away free to settlers in the Northwest? It says that settlers' effects are brought in duty free. Anything wrong about that?

Mr. CLANCY. Is that new?

Mr. DAVIS. Is there any reason for concealing it, because it is not new? Did you do it in 1896?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. When you brought over Jew pedlars that we had to arrest in the Northwest Territories and put into jail? I heard some gentleman complain about the miserable class of immigrants we are getting at present. When the hon. gentleman's friends were running the immigration machine they spent a great deal of money and got very little results. The immigrants were like gophers, dodging into one hole and dodging out of another; they came in on one train and out on another. They said they brought in 16,000 immigrants in one year; but if they did, I venture to say there were 25,000 went out—the census shows that. The census shows that in a certain number of years they were supposed to bring into this country something like 1,000,000 people, and they got the money to do it with, but when the census was taken all these people had evaporated, and the natural increase had gone as well.

Mr. CLANCY. Because the hon. gentleman and his friends were telling the world that this country was not fit to live in.

Mr. DAVIS. The member for Marquette is doing the same thing at present; he is putting on 'Hansard' a matter to show that the country is no good. To show how far afield the hon. member for Marquette had to go, how hard pressed he was for something to say against the government, he selected out of a whole page one line and garbled it to bring an accusation against the government. He read this paragraph:

> There was very little number 1 hard in 1902, and while the prospects for this grade were good a few weeks ago, as a result of the big storm——

He underlines these words, 'As a result of the big storm.'

> —there will be not much more this year, or in other words, the grades will compare equally for the two years.

If there had not been a big storm I do not know what the hon. gentleman would have done for some ground on which to criticise the immigration department. Everybody knew there was a storm last year, and that it reduced the grade of wheat. It was no use for the hon. gentleman to try to hide that when we had thousands of people travelling all over the country examining it and writing to their friends in the United States. One of the reasons for which the minister has been so successful is in the character of the immigration literature. In all the immigration literature that has been circulated by this government in the last five or six years there has been a fair statement of the conditions which we have in this country. People do not come in under false pretenses, they know the length of the winter, they know we have good seasons and occasionally we have bad seasons, and when they come they find that we have given them nothing but facts. The fact that we had 125,000 immigrants last year shows that our immigration literature has borne good fruit. These people who came in last year do not come empty-handed; whereas, in 1896, the hon. gentlemen opposite brought in people that had not much money. These people who came in last year brought in six or seven million dollars in cash or goods. They also brought in with them a lot of money of which we have no account at all. I suppose when the immigration officials ask

a man how much money he has got, he says I have $100, $200 or $300. That is the record that the Minister of the Interior gets. But when a gentleman comes into that country with $300 in his pocket, he looks over the country, he makes up his mind that it is a good country to settle in, and he immediately writes back to his agents and tells them to sell out his holdings. Those are sold for $6,000 or $7,000, and that money is all sent across the border and deposited in a Canadian bank, but the Minister of the Interior has no record of that at all. So it is impossible for us to arrive at an estimate of the amount of money these people have brought in. The manager of the Union Bank at Saskatoon told me that when he opened business there the head office instructed him to be very careful about making loans, told him to keep his loans inside his deposits. He started out with the idea that he was not going to do much business but he was not there one month until he could not loan out half the money he was getting in on deposit from these people that were coming into the country. I say that to-day we have a record of some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 these people have brought in, but they have brought in millions more besides. A lot of wealthy people came in from the United States. Hon. gentlemen talk about the vast public debt, some $35 per capita. Now, every one of these 125,000 is helping to reduce that debt, they are all taking a share of it on their shoulders. In bringing in 125,000 people you bring in six millions of money, and you get all that by an expenditure of $650,000 on immigration. I think it is pretty good business, and if the minister keeps on the people of this country will be pretty well satisfied.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the Minister of the Interior will be grateful to the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) for coming to his rescue in defence of the campaign literature that he is circulating under the guise of immigration literature. I do not know whether the literature my hon. friend has read is correct or not, but I think it is fair to say that it is not in the best interests of the people of Canada. We complain that the Minister of the Interior selects the leading political journal of his province and pays out of the public treasury $7,500 to circulate it under the guise of immigration literature for the purpose of inducing people to come to Canada. I have no time at this late hour to enter into a discussion of the matter contained here. The hon. member for Saskatchewan has gone over this paper very minutely this evening, and I do not intend to follow his example, but I will just produce one illustration. I have here some reports of the farm delegates that were sent to the old country by the hon. Minister of the Interior last year for the purpose of telling the people there of the grandeur of the Northwest of Canada. One of these gentlemen has made a reference to this kind of campaign literature, and perhaps he would be a good authority. Mr. W. H. Bryce, who was one of the farm delegates selected by this government, says :

> The information that is given in the literature that is distributed is not what the people want. They do not believe what is printed.

That is what this gentleman says about this kind of literature. I repeat the statement that I think the hon. minister should consider the expenditure of money a little more carefully. I say that it will always be open for discussion and that some portion of the Canadian people will have some right to condemn the hon. gentleman if he is going to subsidize one of the leading political organs in his own province for the purpose of inducing old country people to come to Canada.

I want to say one or two words in respect to the old country delegates, and if it is the policy of this government to continue sending successful farmers from the Northwest to the old country I would like to direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there was practically no preparation for these gentlemen when they arrived in Great Britain. The evidence of that fact comes from these gentlemen themselves. I will turn to the evidence afforded by some of these gentlemen to show why I make this statement. Mr. E. J. Thomson, delegate to Scotland says :

> One suggestion I omitted at its proper place was this : The delegates should be met at the port of landing and instructed as to his district and to proceed to it direct, and at once and thus save the expense of going to London or elsewhere.

Here is a delegate who was sent to the old country. There was no preparation made for this gentleman and he asks that some preparation should be made so that the delegate could go to work immediately without travelling hither and thither in the old country. Another gentleman, Mr. H. C. Whellams, in his report to the government, says :

> On the third of March I went to Gloucester, and I was at first somewhat disappointed to find no advertising done. I at once arranged with the papers for a thorough and complete system of posting and advertising through the columns of the local papers, also by means of hand bills posted throughout the country.

Here is a gentleman sent to the old country to tell the people about the Northwest and when he arrives at his destination he finds that no advertising has been done. Nobody knows that he is in the old country at all. He makes this complaint in his report to the government. Mr. Hugh McGillivray another of these delegates says :

> I started at Aylesbury, the county town, and visited all the principal towns, taking a town each day on market days. I advertised in the local papers ahead and on my arrival would put

up posters furnished by the department that I would be at a certain hotel all that day and evening.

When he went to the market town he would take the posters in his pocket and after he had arrived at the town he would announce that he would be in that town all day. These are some of the points that I would bring to the attention of the hon. minister if it is the policy of the government to continue sending these gentlemen to the old country. I am sure it cannot be said that we are not spending enough money on Mr. Preston and his colleagues in the old country. Surely these gentlemen would have an opportunity of making some preparation for the delegates that we sent over there and who cost the people of Canada $25,000. These gentlemen direct the attention of the government to the fact that no preparation was made for them and how does the hon. gentleman expect that he is going to do a great service to the people if some preparation is not made for these delegates and if the people in the old country who are desirous of coming to Canada and occupying our lands are not notified that these gentlemen will visit their localities and tell them about the advantages of the Canadian Northwest Territories ? How did the hon. gentlemen expect that they would find these delegates when they only remained in these towns from one to two days ?

I would like to ask the hon. minister what the policy of the government is in respect to the scarcity of farm hands in Ontario and eastern Canada or if the government has any policy upon that question. Is the hon. gentleman going to give that question any consideration or not and does he propose putting any amount in the estimates so that the people of Ontario and eastern Canada may be better supplied with farm hands ? I did hear the hon. gentleman make the statement that there was no complaint of that kind made during last year. The hon. gentleman has been misinformed because several complaints have been made and the complaint I think is as great as ever it was in the central part of Ontario and in Quebec. Yet the hon. gentleman seems to give it no attention. In view of the fact that this condition has existed for so many years and that there has been coming to the government year after year a universal complaint that farm hands in Ontario and the eastern part of Canada were scarce, it is time that the hon. gentleman gave some attention to this question so that the farmers of eastern Canada might derive some advantage from the very large expenditure of money that is being made for immigration.

Mr. SIFTON. We have been giving the subject attention for the last two years. We sent some thousands of labourers to the province of Ontario who were distributed amongst the farmers in that province. I am informed that a very considerable number have gone this year. I am quite satisfied that a larger number could have been absorbed and profitably placed in the province of Ontario if a more effective system of distribution were adopted. There is a system of distribution through the officers of the government of Ontario centralized at Toronto. In my judgment a thoroughly effective system of distribution for Quebec and Ontario would be to provide agents at the port of debarkation so that the labourers would be taken charge of when they landed at Quebec and distributed from there to the point where they were to be employed. I am giving that my attention and I hope with the cooperation of the governments of Ontario and Quebec to adopt a system that will be effective.

I am bound to say that a great deal of caution is necessary in dealing with a subject of that kind. It would be very undesirable for the department to dump a large number of labourers either in Ontario or Quebec and find that the system of distributing them was not effective so that a considerable number of them were left without employment. We could not take a risk like that, we have to consider a variety of things such as the housing of the labourers while they are getting employment, and in Quebec and Ontario these present a good deal of difficulty. We have our establishment at Winnipeg and the people there have got into the habit of sending to the provincial and Dominion agents so that the result is that the work of the two governments together results in a very effective system of distribution. Both last year and this year we have sent a very large number of labourers and have supplied a very pressing demand, and we hope to be able to make it more effective as time goes on.

Mr. POPE. In our section of the province of Quebec we have received kind consideration from Mr. Marquette, the provincial immigration agent at Montreal, but we have not been able to get the number of labourers we require. In eastern Canada we can utilize not only immigrants who are suitable as farm labourers, but our industrial development there is capable of employing many who would not be suitable in the west. If it were arranged that the public who desire servants would know where to apply for them, they would very soon all be placed. We have this advantage, that one or two years training on a farm in eastern Canada, would be very useful for these people if they should afterwards go west. Our farmers' sons are rapidly going to the west, and the farmers find themselves short of labour. There is thus an opportunity of developing the usefulness of these immigrants as suitable settlers in the west.

Mr. FOWLER. The extracts read from this issue of the 'Free Press' contain a serious libel upon the district of Alberta as

a ranching country. The very fact that it seemed to afford the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) great satisfaction to be able to read these libels on Alberta, is all the more reason why the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) should come to the defence of his district. The hon. member for Saskatchewan seemed to read these libels on Alberta with great glee, and to wish to add his testimony to their truth. Those who attended the meeting of the Agriculture Committee were pleased at the manner in which the member for Alberta stood up for his district when it appeared to be attacked by Mr. Macoun, and I think on one or two occasions the hon. gentleman became so excited that he wanted to engage in fistic encounters with those who did not agree with him in his views, but to-night he is as mum as a mouse, and never opens his mouth in defence of his district. I hope that even though it is midnight, the hon. gentleman will tell us whether it is true as read from the 'Free Press' by the hon. member for Saskatchewan, that ninety per cent of the cattle in Alberta died in the storms that raged in that district.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the House will excuse me of responsibility for a lack of mentality on the part of the member for King's (Mr. Fowler). The fact that he does not understand something has nothing to do with the case. If any statements were made depreciative of the district of Alberta, it would have been an occasion for me to protest, but the hon. member for Saskatchewan did not read, or make any such statement. He read a letter addressed to the Free Press from a resident of the district of Saskatchewan, in which it was said that the correspondent had heard that certain things occurred in Alberta. I will not take upon myself the responsibility of contradicting everything that every body in Canada has heard in regard to the district of Alberta. If any of these gentlemen opposite will get up and make a statement derogatory of Alberta, I will be prepared to talk to him.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Did not the member for Saskatchewan back up that statement?

Mr. OLIVER. These gentlemen opposite are very absurd. The correspondent from Saskatchewan was claiming superiority for his country as a ranching district, because they did not ranch there at all but stabled their cattle which in Alberta were kept out during winter, and he said he had heard that the cattle in Alberta had suffered great loss.

Mr. POPE. Ninety per cent.

Mr. OLIVER. He had heard that.

Mr. POPE. Do you say that?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I do not say that. I am not responsible for what this writer heard.

Mr. POPE. Will you contradict it?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I won't. I would not be so foolish as to contradict every idiotic rumour a man may hear. The district of Alberta is not in need of defence against absurd rumours. The 'Free Press' did not say that cattle in Alberta had suffered a loss of ninety per cent, and when the hon. member for King's said it did, he was not telling the truth. It was exactly in line of the attitude of the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) who deliberately undertook to mislead this House and to mislead this country in regard to these reports having appeared in the 'Free Press' and for which he was brought to task by the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). If it would be a crime against this country, had these statements appeared in the 'Free Press,' supposing they had been as the hon. member for Marquette said, how much greater crime it was against this country, against the district of Saskatchewan and the district of Alberta, that these statements should be embodied in 'Hansard,' and become a part of the permanent records of this country, as they have been as the result of the hon. member's efforts. If the facts were as the hon. member for King's said they were, when they were not, then he committed a greater offence against the welfare of this country than the man who wrote them or the man who published the paper, because he made them a part of the official record of this country on his responsibility as a member of parliament.

Mr. FOWLER. I would very much prefer being accused of lack of mentality than to be proved out of my own mouth of an absolute lack of honesty and lack of candour, and that is the position which the just now ferocious member for Alberta occupies before this House. The hon. gentleman listened to-night to an attack by one of his colleagues on the district he represents, and he sat there dumb as an oyster apparently not daring to open his mouth; and when I challenge the hon. gentleman to stand up in his place and defend the district from which he comes, he tries to draw a herring across the trail and accuses the hon. member for Marquette of defaming the Northwest when the hon. gentleman for Marquette very properly drew the attention of this House to the fact that this government was spending over $7,000 of public money to disseminate in the United States absolute libels and falsehoods respecting the country.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. member for Marquette did not say they were libels. He said they were probably true, but they should not be circulated.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman for Marquette did characterize them as libels. He drew the attention of the House to the publication of that sheet for the purpose of showing the wrong that was being done

to this country. Because a storm had occurred in the Northwest only once in twenty years, the people to whom the paper was sent, which did not mention that fact, would suppose that it was the usual occurrence, just as the writer of that article reflecting on the district of Alberta as a ranching country did not say it occurred only once in twenty years, but would have the impression go forth that it was the usual occurrence in Alberta, and that the district around Saskatoon was preferable for raising cattle. Speaking of Southern Alberta, the paper said :

> It is said by those familiar with both places that Saskatchewan is a better and more certain ground for ranching than southern Alberta. In the latter place blizzards come suddenly, and as no shelter is provided, often ninety per cent of a drove is lost in a single snow storm.

The hon. gentleman who represents the district of Alberta sat silent when the statement was made about his country ; and yet he pretends to be an honest representative of the people of that district. In the Agriculture Committee, because he forms an unfavourable opinion of Mr. Macoun, he wants to fight everybody in sight. The hon. gentleman had better confine himself to his own district, and not wander so far afield.

Mr. DAVIS. You had better do that yourself.

Mr. FOWLER. The district from which I come does not need any defence. But I have some interests in that very country about which I am speaking.

Mr. DAVIS. Not very much.

Mr. FOWLER. I think they are pretty extensive ; from my standpoint they are at least ; and I am interested in not having that country defamed. That is my excuse for speaking on this occasion, if any excuse is needed. The wrong in this attack is that this paper goes out with a stamp of government approval. I was a little surprised tonight at hearing the hon. Minister of the Interior, in speaking of this matter, try to shift the responsibility on his officers ; but he did not say that he would see that the officer who was responsible for allowing that paper to go forth in that shape would be castigated or even reprimanded, as Mr. Preston was for having written that letter. Notwithstanding that, he said it was perfectly right that these statements should go forth. You want to induce farmers from the United States to settle in the Northwest Territories, and you do it by saying that in Southern Alberta, one of the most important districts of the Northwest, ninety per cent of the cattle are destroyed by reason of the blizzards that often rage throughout that district. It seems to me the hon. member for Alberta has to-night given a most pitable exhibition in sitting silent and not until the lash was applied to him would he rise and say a word on behalf of the district which had been so abused and maligned by the documents which had been distributed by the government of which he is a supporter, a thick-and-thin supporter—an hon. gentleman who professed at one time to be an independent member, and who has developed into one of the most ardent thick-and-thin supporters of the government that can be found within their ranks. He wanted to inflict violence on those who disagreed with him in the Agricultural Committee in regard to what was said by Mr. Macoun with respect to the little-known and sparsely settled Peace River district, and yet to-night he sits mild as a cooing dove and listens to this abuse of his own district of Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member made some reflection on my candour. He said he would rather be accused of lack of mentality than lack of candour. I think he has given evidence to-night that he is as lacking in candour as in mentality, and that he is absolutely lacking in both. I am sorry that my conduct in this House has not the approval of the hon. gentleman ; but as I did not come here under his approval, I will try to suffer under his disapproval. I am here at the approval of the district of Alberta, the district which he says has been maligned by the reading of a quotation from the Winnipeg 'Free Press' by the hon. member for Saskatchewan. If there could be anything more absurd than that statement, it would be the whole attitude and action of the hon. member himself and the part he has taken in this debate to-night. The hon. gentleman is surprised that I sat silent. Well, certainly this House would be surprised if he sat silent and also more greatly surprised if he talked sense when he did not sit silent.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has succeeded in saying anything very clever, although of course he drew forth a cackle from the back benches over there. So far as mentality and candour are concerned, I would be prepared to be judged by a competent jury, but I would hardly consider these gentlemen on the back benches as competent to give a verdict. In neither respect would I care to be reduced to the low level of the hon. gentleman, and I am confident that a comparison of the speeches made by both of us, as shown in the 'Hansard,' would prove that the hon. gentleman has occupied at least ten times longer the time of this House during this, or any other session when we both occupied seats in this House, than I have. I would go still further and would guarantee that in the one-tenth of the time I have talked, as compared with the time the hon. gentleman has taken up, I have talked a thousand times more sense than he did in ten times longer time. No one has yet been able to discover in any speech the hon.

gentleman has made one single, solitary, minute portion of sense. He is looked upon by the great majority of this House, not excluding a great many of the members on the other side, as a sort of mountebank.

Mr. OLIVER. I only wish to refer, not to what the hon. gentleman has just said, but to the allusion he made to my action in the Agricultural Committee. He said I was anxious to use physical force in that committee. I want to say here and now that in that committee, in defence of the district I represent and the people I represent against attacks made by an officer of this government and other members of that committee who sit before me, I was compelled to risk the application of physical force to myself by those hon. gentlemen and take chances upon it or else to submit to just such bullying and just such abusive language as the hon. gentleman has undertaken to deal out to me to-night. I want him and his colleagues to understand that neither in this House nor in the Agricultural Committee shall I submit to hear the country or the people I represent slandered or insulted by any members of this House, whether they are capable mentally or not.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to bring a witness to bear out the statement of my hon. friend and see whether or not all the blame attaches to members of the opposition. I find that in its issue of April 23rd last, the Montreal 'Witness,' thus speaks of the hon. member for Alberta :

> Mr. Macoun, who is one of the best known of the staff of the Geological Survey——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is out of orler.

Mr. INGRAM. When you reach the danger point, you raise the alarm.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask the committee to keep to the question before the House and not introduce a personal controversy. Neither is it in order to discuss what took place in the committee, the report of which is not before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Before this discussion came up, I asked that the report of the committee be presented to the House in order that we might deal with it, and we were told that we could deal with it at any length without its being laid on the table.

Mr. INGRAM. When I was interrupted, I was about to quote from the Montreal 'Witness' and I propose to continue my quotation :

> Mr. Macoun, who is one of the best known of the staff of the Geological survey. . . . . This would come home with especial force to Mr. Frank Oliver, M.P., for Alberta, and we can quite appreciate his bitter disappointment with Mr. Macoun's report, especially as he has been responsible for much vaunting of that country abroad. Such disappointments, however, and however much he may disagree with the report, does not justify him in charging Mr. Macoun with deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. . . . But if Mr. Macoun's report is doing any great injury, it must be principally because of the great publicity it has received owing to the disgraceful scenes this week in the House of Commons Committee of Agriculture, for which Mr. Oliver is principally to blame. . . . . There seems in this case to have been at least none of the aridity referred to above as one of the drawbacks of the climate. Who can tell that better luck may not come to these settlers as it did to those of Manitoba ? It is at least better to hope so than to threaten to horsewhip Mr. Macoun and call him a liar as Mr. Oliver thinks it the proper thing to do.

Mr. SCOTT. Do you say that is a true report ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Did the hon. member for Alberta ever threaten to horsewhip ?

Mr. INGRAM. Certainly he did.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to say I did not.

Mr. INGRAM. I say he did.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is out of order to quote from any newspaper any reference to a committee, and I decline to allow any one to bring in any matter that happened in the committee until the committee has reported.

Mr. INGRAM. I believe, Sir, you are quite right. I fully agree that we have no right to discuss the report, but what I am proving is that the opposition are not open to the charge made by the hon. member for Alberta and I am substantiating the statement made by my hon. friend from King's and am quite in order in doing that. I have in my hand an article which perhaps the hon. member for Alberta may have read. The Toronto 'News' had the hardihood to express an opinion about that hon. gentleman, and I find in the Edmonton 'Bulletin' language of this kind. I do not say that the hon. member penned the article, but after I read it, perhaps hon. members will come to a conclusion as to who is responsible. Speaking of the 'News' the 'Bulletin' says :

> Its reputation based on its short and not over brilliant career under its present management is that of a cross between an attempted bandit and a would-be thug. That is one who—speaking in a literary sense—would rob for profit and murder from principle—always providing the opportunity were favourable.

I do not say that the 'Bulletin' is the hon. gentleman's paper. If it is not, he is in a position to deny that it is.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman deny the description given there of the Toronto 'News'?

Mr. INGRAM. All I have to say is this, that the editor of that paper is in my judgment as competent to edit a paper as the hon. gentleman is. I can tell him more, that the leader of the great party he is supporting will corroborate my statement.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice that the hon. gentleman's answer is entirely non-committal.

Mr. INGRAM. I thought I was answering fully and fairly. I think that the management of the Toronto 'News' is quite capable of answering any editorials that appear in this paper. In respect to the immigration literature—or campaign literature, for it seems to me to be about the same thing nowadays—I find that the Department of Immigration has paid the Winnipeg 'Free Press' $7,000 for a paper issued by that concern. Now, if the Department of the Interior were doing its duty, it would not allow any literature intended to be used for immigration purposes to be sent out without scanning every line to see whether the circulation of it is in the interest of this country. So, I say that when the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) allows the government to circulate at the public expense a newspaper which states as a mere rumour something derogatory to his constituency, he is not doing his duty to those who sent him here, nor is he displaying the energy which he displays when Mr. Macoun, a government officer made a report about his part of the country. Is that lack of energy due to the fact that there are a couple more senatorships being given to the Northwest, or is it because there is an edition of 5,000 immigration pamphlets being published by the Edmonton 'Bulletin?' This pamphlet, the newspapers tell us, comprises 80 pages profusely illustrated with scenes from the district and business places of Edmonton and with portraits of many of the leading men of the town. I wonder if the hon. gentleman himself would be included. These pamphlets, I understand, are to be distributed in the United States and Great Britain. So we have $7,000 for this edition of the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and we have an edition of 5,000 copies coming from the Edmonton 'Bulletin' Office. Is there anything for the Regina 'Leader?' Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) say that there is any of this patronage for the 'Leader?' Now, is this system in the interest of the people? Is it in accordance with sound policy to dole out payments for immigration literature as patronage to favoured people in the Northwest Territories? The government has its printing bureau here. If they would furnish that printing bureau with better facilities why could not all that work be done there?

Mr. FOWLER. Then, what would become of the papers?

Mr. INGRAM. I do not know, but I do know what would become of some of the independent men of this House. Instead of their submitting to the discipline mentioned by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) we should find them with the old frankness and outspokenness of the hon. member for Alberta, not moved by considerations of immigration pamphlets or senatorships.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite think they can do in this House as they thought to do in the Agricultural Committee, prevent me from expressing myself and defending my position by bullying and interruptions. They were not successful there, nor will they be here. Nor will they succeed by piling up misstatements in regard to myself or throwing out vile insinuations, a thing of which we find them to be very capable. Though they may judge other people by their own standards we have to consider where these things come from. In regard to the statements made deliberately by the hon. member for East Elgin that in the Agricultural Committee I threatened Mr. James M. Macoun with horse-whipping I wish to say that that statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. INGRAM. I say it is true.

Mr. OLIVER. I said that Mr. James M. Macoun deserved horse-whipping, and I say so still. But I did not say that either I or anybody else was going to horse-whip him.

An hon. MEMBER. You knew better than to try it.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a sample of the argument placed before the Agricultural Committee, during sitting after sitting, in support of Mr. James M. Macoun in discrediting a large and important section of the Northwest Territories. I am glad these hon. gentlemen have brought the discussion into this House, so that the country may be well informed of the position.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) to the fact that I have ruled that the discussion that took place in the committee cannot be referred to here. We have to deal with the items before us. What took place in the committee is past and gone and we have nothing to do with it.

Mr. OLIVER. I will observe your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Now, I may refer to the insinuations of the hon. gentleman as to the pamphlets printed in the 'Bulletin' Office. I am connected with the Edmonton 'Bulletin.' This is a matter not worthy the consideration of this committee, but seeing that an hon. member has brought it forward, I suppose it is only fair that the facts should be known. The connection of the Edmonton 'Bulletin' with the pamphlet is this: Mr. Sutter, who is the Immigration agent at Edmonton has seen fit to get up an immigration pamphlet as a speculation

of his own. That pamphlet, I understand, is being paid for by the merchants of Edmonton who are taking advertising space in it. The 'Bulletin' was successful in getting the contract for the printing of the pamphlet from Mr. Sutter. The 'Bulletin' does not know the government in the transaction in any way, shape or manner, and I am not aware that Mr. Sutter knows the government in the transaction in any way, shape or manner.

Mr. POPE. Is he a government employee ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is, but I am not aware that he is getting government assistance in getting out this pamphlet.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you aware that he is not ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it is none of my business. But I know that he has solicited a considerable amount of support from Edmonton business men to get out the pamphlet, which is designed, I believe, for free distribution. It is a custom in the progressive towns in the Northwest to get out pamphlets in just such a way as this and place them where they will do the most good, distributing them amongst the government immigration agencies as far as possible. That is what, I understand, has taken place in regard to that pamphlet. So far as its being a matter of government patronage, I am not aware that the government have anything to do with it. I am only aware of it to this extent, that I understand the 'Bulletin' had to compete for the work of printing the pamphlet.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like some statement from the minister on that point. It seems there is being a pamphlet got out for distribution for immigration purposes by a government employee at Edmonton, Mr. Sutter, and that it is being printed by the Edmonton 'Bulletin.' I would like to know if the government are purchasing that pamphlet or paying any consideration for it ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not know anything about it. I never heard of it before.

Mr. DAVIS. The opposition seem to be in a jubilant mood to-night ; there efforts have been great in the last two days. They have talked a great range of subjects ; they have discussed dog-fish, a live earl, fat chickens and sore eyes, and now they want to talk blizzards. Now with reference to this discussion about the district of Alberta, my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) tried to make out that I had said something disparaging to the district of Alberta. I want to say that I did nothing of the kind. I merely read a portion of an article that was written by some resident of the district of Saskatchewan living close to Saskatoon. The hon. member for Marquette took exception to this supplement in the Manitoba 'Free Press' that has been circulated, saying it cast reflections upon the country. This is an article written about the Calgary and Southern Alberta district. It was doubtless written by some resident of Alberta Here is what this article says :

Calgary, September 20th.

One week of steady, fine weather, such as sunny Alberta is famous for, has settled the crop question which has been the leading topic of conversation in this territory for many a week.

Here is where the member for Marquette gets his work in. He underlines the following :

The lateness of the season was alarming, but after the fall storms——

He stopped at the 'fall storms.'

—there has come the usual fall sunshine, during which the grain has ripened bountifully, and the farmer has harvested with ease. The climate of Alberta is once more vindicated and the crops are fully up to expectation. The districts around Calgary, from Innisfail to the northern frontier, have harvested their 400 bushels of wheat, 1,500 bushels of oats and 200 bushels of barley, all of an excellent quality, to the quarter section.

Why did he not read that part of it ? He underlines again the following :

The slight frost of the last storm——

And stops there, he did not read the next line.

—is found to have done very little damage.

He took good care to mention the frost, but he did not take such good care to say that there was no damage done by that frost.

The production of wheat is light because in the country around Calgary the cultivation of it has been almost given up, although the yield per acre averaged much over 20 bushels.

I submit that is a very good article about the district of Southern Alberta. I do not see anything wrong in that.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he mean to say that an article stating that they have almost given up the cultivation of wheat is a good article to distribute amongst intending immigrants ?

Mr. DAVIS. I have not heard of any immigration agent advising any person to go to Calgary to raise wheat, they advise people to go there to raise cattle. It is a good ranching country as well as a good wheat country. The writer of this article goes on to say :

The farmers simply found that other grain was more profitable.

They went out of wheat raising, because they could make more money growing barley and oats.

As to oats, there will be many phenomonal crops. Some farmers claim as much as 75 bushels to the acre.

Does the hon. gentleman want anything better than that ?

—but the average appears to be really about 40 bushels to the acre. The barley is pronounced all right by those farmers who are least disposed to boast of their wealth. There has been an immense increase in the acreage over past years, but for obvious reasons of the large immigration as well as of the progress accomplished by those previously settled, it will be much larger next year.

The whole of that article is a good article. This writer mentions frost, of course. He says there was a slight frost, but it did no damage. The hon. member for Marquette read there was a frost, but he left out the part that said there was no damage.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I placed on the 'Hansard' more than what is underlined there, as the hon. gentleman will find on reading 'Hansard' to-morrow. I read out a great deal more than he has read himself now. There is a great deal underlined that I did not read.

Mr. DAVIS. If he was quoting from this paper, I hope he did not read anything that wasn't in it. I think that is a very good article about Alberta. I don't think any one could write a better article. But the hon member for Marquette garbles the article. he reads a portion and leaves out a portion. He does not read the portion where the writer says it did no damage. He has picked out a few lines to serve his purpose. A man may make a paper say almost anything by picking out a few words here and there. The Bible says there is no God, if you only read a portion of it.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). The Bible does not say that. It is the fool who says that.

Mr. DAVIS. I say that you can read out of the Bible that there is no God. But, take the line before that and the Bible says : 'The fool hath said in his heart there is no God.' My hon. friend from Marquette takes this paper, leaves out a few lines here and a few words there, and garbles its contents for the sake of earning for himself, I suppose, a little kudos in his own constituency, but he must be hard up for an argument against the hon. Minister of the Interior or the immigration branch when he can find nothing better than that. If there were 200,000 copies of that paper circulated and if they cost this country $7,000 I think, judging from the number of desirable people who have been brought into this country the money was well spent and I do not think that it is open to any person to say anything against it. The hon. member for King's New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler) tried to place in my mouth words that I did not say by attributing to me the statement that I said something derogatory of southern Alberta when he knows that I did not say anything of the kind. I merely read an extract from a letter written by a gentleman who is enthusiastic about the southern district of Saskatchewan and who says that southern Saskatchewan is a better district in which to raise cattle than any other part of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. FOWLER. I said that the hon. member for Saskatchewan read this from the paper for the purpose of contrasting the two districts and he has done the same thing now. That is what I said as 'Hansard' will show.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the statement made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan and to compare it with that made by the hon. member for Alberta. The hon. member for Saskatchewan has stated that he approved of the publication of these 200,000 copies and of scattering them broadcast throughout the American union to be paid for by Canadian money. As to the storm what did he prove by that ? I would draw his attention to the fact that the 'storm' does not refer to the storm of the 12th September alone but refers to storms occurring in May as well and that this paper refers to storms, frosts, &c., more than forty times in the same issue. While the hon. gentleman says that is perfectly true, what does the hon. member for Alberta say ? He says that he would not take up the time of the House in denying such an idiotic rumour, that it was absurd, that he dismissed it as unworthy of credence, a statement written by some anonymous person from the Saskatchewan district which he did not think it worth while to make a denial of in this House. Yet the hon. member for Saskatchewan says it is absolutely true. When he quoted this letter from Saskatchewan he also backed it up by stating distinctly that it was true that in some of these storms seventy-five per cent—I remember particularly that he got fifteen per cent below what the correspondent had put it at—of the cattle perished.

Mr. SCOTT. Is that true or not ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is absolutely untrue and I am condemning the government for distributing this literature and paying $7,000 for the purpose of libelling the country. While the hon. member for Alberta states that I am more responsible for having had it placed in 'Hansard,' even if it were true and denounces me for it it was this hon. gentleman who wrangled by the hour and contended that it was quite in order to have what he called libellous statements published and distributed broadcast in reference to his own Peace river country. How very consistent that hon. gentleman is ! The hon. gentleman will acquiesce in using public money for the purpose of paying $7,000 to the Winnipeg 'Free Press' when there was no necessity for that edition, scattering it broadcast and telling the people

of the United States that there was a most exceptional storm on the 12th September, that the crops were damaged and that the farmers could only cut their grain if at all in one way. He is prepared to justify that. If we are spending our money for immigration literature we do not desire to say what is untrue or to publish a libel on the country. Although that hon. gentleman would not defend his constituency to-night, although he would not say that this statement is untrue I say that it is untrue as far as my knowledge goes. Although not a resident of the district I have a sufficient knowledge of it to know that there have been no storms in it in which ninety per cent of the cattle were destroyed. Again I say I denounce this statement as untrue and I say that it is to be regretted that so many thousands of dollars of our money were paid out for the purpose of sending broadcast through the American union a libel upon our country which could only injuriously affect the immigration which we expect to get. In proof of that I have only to say that the hon. gentleman who placed those papers before me stated that he had a letter from a family in the United States who wrote that they had intended to emigrate to Canada until they read the description of this storm in that literature.

Mr. OLIVER. The anxiety which hon. gentlemen opposite show for the welfare of Southern Alberta is very touching. I am sure it will appeal to the people of that favoured district very much. It would be a very sorry thing for southern Alberta as well as the Northwest Territories if they had to depend upon hon. gentlemen opposite for good will or good report. In regard to the results, of the publication of this $7,500, copy of the 'Free Press' and the fear that is expressed by the hon. member for Marquette it may relieve his mind on that point if I tell him that the immigration to Southern Alberta this year, according to the best information given to me, is larger than to any other part of the Northwest Territories not excepting Northern Alberta, so that if there is any application of this edition of the 'Free Press' to the district of Southern Alberta that suggestion and that allegation made by the hon. member for Marquette and other hon. gentlemen have been absolutely disposed of by that fact.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. They could not have read it.

Mr. OLIVER. Showing that the argument they have adopted was as unfounded as their intention was unfair. I here make the statement once more that this hon. gentleman has on his responsibility as a member of parliament representing a western constituency placed upon the pages of 'Hansard' statements which are deliberately garbled and when read in 'Hansard' will lead any person to believe, if they believe the hon. gentleman at all, that the country is not the country that it is or ought to be in order to attract settlers. The hon. gentleman has taken that position in this House, he has taken it deliberately and with malice aforethought simply and solely for the purpose of attacking a member of the government who has done so much to make the Northwest——

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman, as I understand it, makes a statement that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) deliberately and with malice aforethought did so and so.

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly.

Mr. SPROULE. Is such a statement in accordance with parliamentary rules of debate ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) did state that another hon. gentleman had made a statement deliberately and for the purpose of misleading it is certainly unparliamentary.

Mr. OLIVER. Even if it is true ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I will withdraw it even if it is true.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. As a usual thing I pay little or no attention to the Billingsgate that the hon. member for Alberta usually furnishes this House with. I do not propose to descend to that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I do not think I am out of order at all.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the hon. gentleman in order in using the word Billingsgate ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am quite in order and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) should be the last man in the House to take exception to my remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that an hon. member cannot say to another hon. member, anything other than one gentleman would be supposed to say to another.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) is not subject to that rule.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If there is any man in this House who indulges in offensive language to members on this side, it is the hon. member for Alberta. When any one differs from his views, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) cannot combat it in ordinary language, but he must descend to such language as the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) read from the Edmonton 'Bulletin' in reference to the Toronto 'News.' The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) has changed his

opinion in regard to the 'Free Press.' He defends it to-night, but a short time ago referring to the 'Free Press' in the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' he referred to it as a journalistic prostitute. In view of the language he can indulge in, I do not think there is any lecture coming to me from the hon. member for Alberta.

Mr. INGRAM. This all proves that the Department of the Interior should carefully scan every line of literature that is circulated for the purpose of promoting immigration. The hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) accused the member for Marquette of deliberately garbling this literature, notwithstanding that my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) denied it.

Mr. OLIVER. I don't think he denied it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I will deny it now, if you are not satisfied.

Mr. INGRAM. If we who indulge in honest criticism can take exception to language in this literature, how very likely it is that those opposed to immigration to Canada will use it for their own purpose. I understood from the Minister of the Interior that he rather approved of this literature.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member for Marquette stated that he did not want to publish an untruth, but at the same time he did not want to publish the truth.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I absolutely deny that I said anything of the kind.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no hesitation in saying that under certain circumstances it would not pay us to spend public money to publish the truth about such things as this.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I was eight years in the parliament of Nova Scotia before confederation; I have been a representative in this House for a number of years, and I must say that the style of debate I have heard to-night is no credit to either one side nor the other. Surely we ought to remember that we are gentlemen in this House, and that these contradictions from one side to the other should be avoided. This style of debate is sickening.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of the Interior says he has never heard of this publication by the Edmonton 'Bulletin.' What we want to know is whether it is the intention of the department to pay for the whole or any portion of this literature.

Mr. SIFTON. I answered I had never heard of it before.

Mr. INGRAM. That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. SIFTON. Will the hon. gentleman wait till I get through? I said I never heard of it before and that we had no intention of paying for it.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad to hear that statement.

Mr. SIFTON. I made it before.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the policy of the department to allow one of its agents to issue literature for circulation abroad, promoting immigration to any particular section?

Mr. SIFTON. I see no objection to that. Of course if it were brought to our attention we would not permit a statement derogatory to any other district.

Mr. INGRAM. That is after the literature is published. You would lock the stable door after the steed is stolen. Unlike the Liberal opposition before 1896, there is not a gentleman on this side of the House who objects to voting money for a wise expenditure on immigration. When we placed items for immigration in the estimates before the Liberal opposition told us that the expenditure was too large.

Mr. SCOTT. Because you got no results from it.

Mr. COWAN. You paid for literature before it was printed and it was never circulated, although the man got the money.

Mr. INGRAM. Please give an instance.

Mr. COWAN. Prior to 1896, when the ex-member for Assiniboia was proprietor of the Regina 'Leader,' you paid him $2,000 and you were to receive several thousand copies of his paper to be circulated abroad. You paid him the $2,000 before it was printed. You never got a paper to circulate abroad, and he charged at the rate of $22 per column for inserting in connection with the fair held at Regina, the breeding of the different horses that were entered in the speeding ring at the horse races. I remember that one item calculated to attract immigration to the Northwest Territories was the entry of a race horse named Skyscraper, bred out of Thunderbolt and sired by Spinaway. This thing was investigated by the Public Accounts Committee, and there are members opposite to-night who opposed the commissioner's report censuring that sort of thing.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the whole truth?

Mr. COWAN. Absolutely, because I examined the witnesses myself before the committee and the evidence is on record.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the hon. gentleman as truthful about this as he was about the duty on corn.

Mr. COWAN. I was truthful about the duty on corn and I am truthful about this. The hon. gentleman was mistaken about the duty on corn, but I thought I had given him enough information to make him wise.

Mr. INGRAM. The answer of the government he supports contradicted his statement, and bore out my statement on that matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope hon. gentlemen will not get on the corn question now.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has made a statement in regard to the Regina 'Leader' and the contract with the late member for West Assiniboia. I understand that that gentleman sold out to my hon. friend who is now the honoured representative of that constituency.

Mr. COWAN. He did not sell out until long after.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend from Regina, I understand, bought that paper from the late representative of West Assiniboia, with that contract included ; and when the hon. gentleman took over the plant, he did not include the contract.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. That was concerning the printing of law reports.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps it may be as stated by the hon. member for South Essex. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia is here, and he will bear out whether it is correct or not.

Mr. SCOTT. If I may be permitted to say so, I do not very much relish this item which has been brought into the discussion. As far as that is concerned, except as to the amount, the statement of the hon. member for South Essex is absolutely accurate. I think it was $400 or $500 in place of $2,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I am afraid my hon. friend is cornered again. What I want to find out from the Minister of the Interior is the policy of the government in issuing immigration literature. The hon. gentleman to-night noticed a discussion in which certain members of this House are charged with garbling immigration literature. I want to ask him if he allows his agents to issue immigration literature in any town in the Dominion of Canada without first submitting it to the hon. gentleman or his officers ? If anything is wrong in that literature, how can he conscientiously right the wrong that may be done by having the literature circulated. The hon. gentleman says he has no objection to any immigration agent providing any literature.

Mr. SIFTON. We have no rule in regard to the matter to which my hon. friend has referred. I believe there have been three or four cases in which agents of the department have assisted in preparing literature for the district in which they were doing the work. Mr. Sutter, the agent at Edmonton, is a very capable and satisfactory agent, and if he asked to be allowed to prepare a pamphlet, I would not have the slightest objection to his doing so. If afterwards he said something in the pamphlet which was improper or incorrect, he would be censured for it in the same way as any other officer.

Mr. INGRAM. I think that is a very dangerous policy to adopt. If the immigration department had strong opposition from the railway companies of the United States, some of the employees might be tempted to issue immigration literature that would be very injurious to Canada. Every line of immigration literature prepared by any officer of the government should be submitted to the department and the department should be held responsible for the issue of proper literature. The policy at present pursued is a dangerous policy.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite endorse the statement made by the hon. member for East Elgin. I think a great deal of care should be exercised in the selection of the literature that is published and sent abroad either to the United States or Great Britain, so that only proper literature shall be sent out. I deprecate the idea of allowing private individuals to prepare matter of this kind. But we some times find objectionable literature issued even under the superintendent. I hold in my hand a volume which has been sent out from the Interior Department with the compliments of the superintendent of immigration at Ottawa, and on one page of this volume I find this :

Corby's IXL Rye Whisky, Purity Rye Whisky, Canadian Rye Whisky, Three Government Standards ; Corby's Famous Whiskies, distilled and bottled in bond by H. Corby, distiller, Belleville.

Is it necessary to have this kind of matter put into immigration literature ? I do not think it is worth while to use the money of the country to pay for literature of that kind.

Mr. SIFTON. What is the name of the book to which my hon. friend is referring ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The 'Canadian Year Book' for 1904, distributed by the Immigration Department. I merely point this out to show that the Immigration Department is not exercising a proper superintendence over the literature it is sending out. This book contains a great deal of useful information, but this is not the kind of literature which should be sent abroad through the government.

Mr. SIFTON. This is a sort of a year book issued by a private individual. I do not remember seeing a copy of it before. I remember at the time it was issued we paid something for an advertisement in it. I think that that is the extent of the connection the Department of the Interior had with it. The circulation, I think, was guaranteed to be so many, and we paid something for the advertising. I am quite unable to see anything improper in that. It

is not departmental duties. The hon. gentlemen are suffering apparently for want of ammunition if this is all they can discuss.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose we will have to submit to the hon. gentleman's statement, but I want to draw his attention to this. The paper was issued May 24, 1904, and the bottom part of the paragraph says it is designed for the use of immigration agents in the United States and in the old country, an edition of 5,000 being printed for this purpose. It is only fair to the committee that a gentleman who is in the employ of the government should submit these documents for the consideration of the committee. I do not think it is right that an agent in any part of Canada should have the right to get up an advertising medium under the guise of an immigration pamphlet and send it out to all parts of Canada, the United States and Great Britain, without the department or somebody authorized by the department examining into it and finding out whether it is in the interests of the people this document should be sent out for immigration purposes. Will he say to whom in Ottawa this agent sent some copies, because no doubt it is in circulation at present ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not know. I have not seen the document, I do not know what is in it. I am not responsible for what appears in the Edmonton 'Bulletin.' As my attention has been called to the statement that the pamphlet has been written by Mr. Sutter, I will give instructions to have him written to. But I am satisfied to have him write a description of Alberta and the department may be just as responsible as if it had been prepared here in Ottawa in the department itself. I have every confidence in Mr. Sutter's ability.

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $533,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand that the Brandon immigration buildings were destroyed some time ago—one by fire and one by a windstorm. Is it the intention to rebuild ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—SIR ELZEAR TASCHEREAU.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Before that motion is carried I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman who is at present leading the House (Mr. Fielding) to a cablegram in the Montreal 'Star' of yesterday—July 21, as follows :—

Sir Elzear Taschereau has left London unexpectedly for Canada. He sails from Liverpool by the 'Ionian' to-day.

It is not known whether this sudden change of plans is due to a summons from Ottawa, but it necessitates his breaking important private and public engagements here, including the hearing of an important Dominion redistribution appeal before the Judicial Committee.

I would ask the hon. minister if he is aware of this, and whether any communications have passed between the Chief Justice and the government, and if the government were made aware of Sir Elzéar Taschereau's intentions to leave England as suddenly as he seems to have done ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have no information on the subject, but I think it highly improbable, as the government have no authority over the judges of our court.

Mr. CLARKE. And the government are not aware of the action of the Chief Justice ?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot say absolutely. If the hon. gentleman wants definite information, I must ask him to give notice in the usual way. The government have nothing to do with the judges of the Supreme Court.

Mr. CLARKE. But does it not seem an extraordinary thing for the Chief Justice who is over in England for the purpose of hearing these cases to leave London before the cases are heard ?

Mr. FIELDING. Judges sometimes do strange things.

Mr. SPROULE. What work shall we take up at the sitting to-day ?

Mr. FIELDING. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will take up his estimates.

Motion agred to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m.—Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 22, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

SUPPLY—SIR ELZEAR TASCHEREAU.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has any information to communicate to the House with reference to the movements of Sir Elzear Taschereau? Before the House adjourned this morning I took the opportunity of calling the attention of the Finance Minister who was leading the House to a cablegram which appeared in the 'Montreal Star' of yesterday announcing that His Lordship had left London suddenly and intended to sail by the steamship 'Ionian.' Is the right hon. gentleman aware that he has left London suddenly; and, if so, what is the reason? Has he been recalled?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no information whatever.

Mr. BARKER. Have the government made any inquiry as to the remarks of Chief Justice Taschereau, as they did in the case of Lord Dundonald?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a difference between the position held by the Chief Justice and that held by Lord Dundonald. We asked Lord Dundonald in regard to the remarks he had made, as he was an official of ours. Sir Elzear Taschereau is not an official of this government.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. When are the final supplementary estimates to be brought down? Is there any other legislation to be brought down than that on the order paper?

Mr. FIELDING. I stated yesterday that I hoped the estimates might be down to-day, but I am inclined to think they will not be down until Monday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not contemplated to bring in any more legislation.

Mr. HAGGART. I see a report in the papers that a Bill is to be introduced in reference to superannuation in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to that I cannot say in the absence of the Minister of Railways. There may be some departmental measures, but it is not intended to bring anything of a contentious nature.

Mr. SPROULE. At this stage I think we ought to have some information from the government in regard to the Bills on the order paper which they intend to put through and those which they intend to drop. It is rumoured that it is not the intention of the government to put them all through. Can the Prime Minister give us any information on that point?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On Monday next my hon. friend the Minister of Finance intends to bring down the estimates. Then we shall have practically everything we intend to bring down during the present session, unless some measures of a non-contentious character; and then if my hon. friend is in a mood to go home as much as I am, we may give him some information and perhaps be guided by his intention.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the opposition that is running the House, but the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I beg to ask the Minister of Finance if he can inform the House when we may expect another meeting of that committee? There is still one important Bill undisposed of, and it is very desirable that the committee should meet at an early day in order to finish up the business.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I am not able to give my hon. friend any information on the subject. I was under the impression that the business of the Banking and Commerce Committee was completed. There is one Bill, I understand, which has not been disposed of; but I was informed, as I believe my hon. friend has been, that that Bill was not to be proceeded with. If that be the case, I do not see any need of calling the committee. I have no objection to it being called, but I have no information of what the intention of the chairman is. I am inclined to think that the promoter does not intend to proceed with the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I may say that while the promoter may not intend to proceed with it, possibly the committee may.

Mr. FIELDING. I will take the responsibility of saying, as one member of the committee, that as it is a private Bill, if the promoter does not want to proceed with it, I do not see how anybody else can have any interest in pressing it.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is in the hands of the committee.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Experimental Farms, $100,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. When we had this item up before, the minister promised to bring down a statement showing the reason for the discrepancy of about $20,000 between his report and the report of the Auditor General as to the expenditure on experimental farms.

Mr. FISHER. When this matter was up before, the hon. gentleman pointed out what appeared to be a discrepancy between the statements in the Auditor General's Report and the statement at the end of the farm

report of this year, on page 429. The Auditor General's Report at page D—36 gives a statement of the expenditure on the Central Experimental Farm, amounting to $55,-205.60. The discrepancy that appears is due to the following: The salaries of the officers at the central farm are charged in the Auditor General's Report all to the Central Farm, but in the experimental farm detailed expenditure the salaries of the director, $4,000; accountant, $758.31; assistant accountant, $416.65; stenographer, $800; amounting to $5,974.96, are divided amongst the different farms in the ratio of thirty per cent to the Central Experimental Farm and 17½ per cent ($1,045.62) to each of the other farms. This makes a total of $4,182.47 to be deducted from the items in the Auditor General's Report. In the botanical and entomological division 30 per cent is charged to the central farm and 17½ per cent to each of the others. This division is charged $3.787.56 in the Auditor General's Report. The salaries of Messrs. Fletcher, Guignard and Gibson are comprised in this figure with some other slight expenditures. The total of the four parts charged to the branch farms is $2,345, which deducted leaves $1,442.56 charged to the central farm. The chemical division is divided in the same way. The salaries of Messrs. Shutt, Charlton and the other gentlemen amount to $4,100, and the additional expenses make a total of $4,706.86 in the Auditor General's Report, out of which $3,296.76 is charged to the branch farms leaving $1,410.10. The travelling expenses are the same in both cases. There are a number of small items of freight on exhibition supplies at Nappan and charged to central farm in error amounting to 35 cents to be deducted and $120 for value of grain for exhibitors to be added. The telegrams and telephones are not divided and they amount to $144.06. In office help, &c., there was a proportion of office help charged for the distribution of seed grain as marked on the vouchers, which the Auditor General through some error charged to the central farm. That item comes to $4,018.71 instead of $4,543.71. In printing, stationery, newspapers, and periodicals, cost of money orders for chemicals, payment of chemicals, supplies and seed, instead of being $109.09 should be $104.35. In seed-grain, trees, &c., we have to add to the Auditor General's figures 97 cents and for freight on seeds from Ottawa to Nappan chargeable to Nappan $1.20, we have to deduct from the Auditor General's figures which will make that item $446.21 instead of $446.44. The horticultural division is the same in both, viz., $5,110.92. In the distribution of seed grain, trees, office help, &c., there was $525; for office help, $125.48 value of grain supplied by Brandon Farm; $712.64 value of grain supplied by Indian Head Farm, $438.43 supplied by central farm, less screenings used for seed, $334.55, leaving the difference of $1,467 which ought to be added to the Auditor General's figures making it $6,029.56, instead of $4,562.56. The farm report shows $5,871.82 to which is to be added $157.74 for the distribution of seed, and the two lumped together make $6,029.56 exactly the figures which appear in the Auditor General's Report. Under seed testing, and care of green houses, &c., the cost of taking meteorological observations is charged in the farm account as contingencies has to be deducted from that item in the Auditor General's Report. The reason of this is that the man who takes charge of the green houses is paid for the meteorological observations. The Auditor General has put that in with seed testing and care of green houses, whereas in the farm report it is charged to contingencies. The item in the Auditor General's Report is $1,091.39. the same item in the farm report being $1,019.39. If you subtract the $72 from the Auditor General's Report it brings it down to the $1,019.39. The item for arboretum, forestry, and care of grounds is the same in each report. In live stock the value of one short horn bull sent from Ottawa to Agassiz $350, is to be deducted from the Auditor General's figures, leaving the balance, $1,-146.08. This was credited to the central farm stock in the Auditor General's figures. In farm work, &c., as the division of cereal breeding, &c., had only been in operation for a portion of the year, the expenses were included in this item and they amount to $2,805.47. There was also a small charge for services in London, England. of $25.54, making the item altogether in the Auditor General's Report, $7,913.36. There was credited in the Auditor General's Report to the Central Experimental Farm, for feed supply to poultry, and various other items amounting to $1,072.52, which deducted from $7,913.36, leaves $6.840.84 the exact item that appears in the report. For draining implements. blacksmithing and harness supplies, manure and fertilizers and dairy department, the items are the same. In the poultry department the value of feed suplied from the farm $218.59 ought to be added to $1,773.45, which makes $1,992.04, the exact item in the farm report. In Bee supplies the item is the same.

The following table will show the difference between the Auditor General's figures and the Farm's figures, 1902-3:—

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

—			Auditor's.	Farm.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
Salaries general			5,974 96	1,792 49
(How made up in farm account).				
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
30 per cent charged to Central Experimental Farm—				
17½ per cent charged to Nappan	$	1,045 62		
17½ " " Brandon		1,045 62		
17½ " " Indian Head		1,045 62		
17½ " " Agassiz		1,045 61		
			4,182 47	
			1,792 49	1,792 49
Botanical and Entomological Division			3,787 56	1,442 56
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
30 per cent charged to Central Farm—				
17½ " " Nappan		586 25		
17½ " " Brandon		586 25		
17½ " " Indian Head		586 25		
17½ " " Agassiz		586 25		
			2,345 00	
			1,442 56	1,442 56
Chemical Division			4,706 86	1,412 90
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
30 per cent charged to Central Farm—				
17½ " " Nappan		824 19		
17½ " " Brandon		824 19		
17½ " " Indian Head		824 19		
17½ " " Agassiz		824 19		
			3,296 76	
Add to Auditor's figures—			1,410 10	
P. O. Commission on money order remittance for chemical supplies, charged in error to newspapers and periodicals			2 80	
			1,412 90	1,412 90
Travelling expenses			1,651 66	1,651 66
Add to Auditor's figures—				
Exhibitions			602 98	723 33
Value of grain in straw and threshed, especially prepared for exhibitions and credited to farm work, &c.			120 00	
Deduct from Farm figures—				
Freight on exhibition supplies at Nappan and charged to Central Farm in error				35
Telegrams and telephones			722 98	722 98
			144 06	144 06
Office help, &c			4,543 71	4,018 71
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
Proportion office help chargeable to the distribution of seed grain and potatoes, as marked on vouchers			525 00	
			4,018 71	4,018 71
Printing and stationery			826 68	826 68
Newspapers and periodicals			109 09	104 35
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
Cost of money orders for payment of chemicals	$	2 80		
" " supplies		0 97		
" " seeds		0 97		
			4 74	
			104 35	104 35

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

—			Auditor's.	Farm.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
Seeds, grain, trees, &c.			446 44	446 21
Add to Auditor's figures—				
Cost of money orders for payment of seeds, newspapers and books.			0 97	
			447 41	
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
Freight on seeds from Ottawa to Nappan (chargeable to Nappan).			1 20	
			446 21	446 21
Horticultural division			5,110 92	5,110 92
Distribution of seed grain, trees, &c.			4,562 56	5,871 82 157 74
Add to Auditor's figures—				
Office help.		$ 525 00		
Value of grain supplied by Brandon farm		125 48		
" " Indian Head farm		712 64		
" " Central farm	$ 438 43			
Less screenings used for feed	334 55			
		103 88		
			1,467 00	
			6,029 56	6,029 56
Seed testing and care of greenhouses			1,091 39	1,019 39
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
Cost of taking meteorological observations, charged in Farm account to contingencies (in Auditor's report to salaries, marked contingencies).			72 00	
			1,019 39	1,019 39
Arboretum			1,892 03	1,892 03
Forestry and care of grounds			1,335 81	1,335 81
Live stock			1,496 08	1,146 08
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
Value of one Shorthorn bull, &c., sent from Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, to Agassiz. (Credited to Central Farm stock and charged to stock at Agassiz).			350 00	
			1,146 08	1,146 08
Farm work, &c.			5,082 35	6,840 84
Add to Auditor's figures—				
As the division of cereal breeding, &c., had only been in operation for a portion of the year the expenses were included in this item			2,805 47	
Expert services in London, Eng., determining value of 8 samples of Canadian wheat			25 54	
			7,913 36	
Deduct from Auditor's figures—				
Value feed supplied to poultry		$ 218 59		
" grain " to grain distribution		438 43		
" roots " to stock for feed from experiment plots.		295 50		
" grain held for exhibitions		120 00		
			1,072 52	
All deducted from farm work			6,840 84	6,840 84
Draining			1,958 06	1,958 06
Implements, tools, &c			708 67	708 67
Blacksmithing and harness supplies.			379 54	379 54
Manure and fertilizers			310 42	310 42

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

—	Auditor's.	Farm.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Dairy department	715 27	715 27
Add to Auditor's figures—		
Poultry department	1,773 45	1,992 04
Value of feed supplied from farm	218 59	
	1,992 04	1,992 04
Bee supplies	218 47	218 47
Contingencies	128 06	320 34
Add to Auditor's figures—		
Roadmaking under separate heading in Auditor's report	116 81	
Taking meteorological observations included in seed testing and care of grounds by Auditor	72 00	
Cleaning museum, under separate heading in Auditors report	2 50	
P.O. money orders for supplies included by Auditor in newspapers and periodicals	0 97	
	320 34	320 34
Division of cereal breeding, &c	2,805 47	
This item included in farm work, &c., in farm report		2,805 47
Feed for stock and veterinary service	930 44	feed 1,496 43 v. s. 64 06
Add to auditor's figures—		
Value of grain screenings from farm	334 55	
" roots from experimental plots	295 50	
	1,560 49	1,560 49
Museum	2 50	
This item included in contingencies in farm report		2 50
Care of stock	3,087 45	3,087 45
Road making and drawing gravel	116 81	
This item included in contingencies in farm report		116 81
Steers purchased for feeding experiments	2,787 85	2,787 85
Cr.		
Proceeds of sale of steers purchased for feeding experiments	4,082 00	4,082 00

These are the only discrepancies in the details and I think I have here shown that practically with the exception of slight details and I think I have here shown that three-quarters of this difference is included in the division of salaries and the division of wages. Otherwise the discrepancies are only slight differences of opinion in the charges of certain items.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has produced a large number of figures showing divisions and subdivisions to account for the discrepancies, but I say to you Mr. Chairman and to this committee that neither he nor any other person can account for it in any other way than by saying that the statement which he has published and sent out to the country is not a fair statement. I make the proposition now that he can refer the figures I am about to give to any accountant he may name—and I will ask hon. members on both sides to take down the figures I am about to give and if they do not say, one and all, that the statement I make is correct in every particular, then I will say that the hon. gentleman's statement is correct. He has said: I have run the farm at Ottawa, I have run the four other experimental farms and the total expenditure of the people's money which I made in connection with the running of those farms has been $84,128.10. I will give these figures from his own report. We have here a statement of the expenditure on Dominion Experimental Farms for the year ending June 30th, 1903. The figures for the different farms are as follows:

Central Experimental Farm	$40,022 36
Nappan	11,499 95
Brandon	11,581 67
Indian Head	10,568 57
Agassiz	10,455 63
Total	$84,128 18

Mr. FISHER.

That, the minister says is the total expenditure of the money of the people of this country in running these farms.

Now, we will see what the Auditor General says, and I will ask hon. members on the opposite side to write down these figures or to refer to the Auditor General's Report to verify them.

Farm—Page in A.G.		Amount.	
Central (Ottawa)	D—36....	$55,205 60	
"	V—94....	8,205 68	
"	V—112....	1,430 22	
"	V—113....	110 65	
			$64,592 15
Nappan..	D—40....	$9,043 04	
"	V—93....	30 06	
			9,073 10
Brandon	D—44....	$9,251 09	
"	V—93....	496 61	
			9 747 70
Indian Head... ..	D—47....	$8,825 15	
"	V—93....	1,159 78	
			9,984 93
Agassiz..	D—49....	$7,649 58	
"	V—95....	379 12	
			8,028 70
Grand total..			$110 782 58

Besides this there is a special vote for printing and distribution as stated in the minister's report at page 432, of $7,000, making a total expenditure of $117,782.58.

From this there is to be deducted the reenue from the different farms as follows :

Farm—page in A.G	Revenue.
Central (Ottawa) D—130	$2,974
Nappan..	D—129.. $834 55
Indian Head	D—129.. 702 12
Brandon..	D—128.. 591 23
Agassiz..	D—128.. 410 84
Total..	$5,512 74

Leaving a balance of expenditure over revenue of $103,269.84, and the hon. minister reports he has only spent $84,128.19, or $19,141.66 less than the actual expenditure. That is the statement I made yesterday and which I repeat, and I challenge the minister or any auditor or accountant to contradict it. Will the hon. gentleman go on the platform and tell the farmers that they can run their farms without fuel and light ? Yet in making up the expenditure, he leaves out these two important items. Turn to the Auditor General's Report V—112 and you will see there charged against the experimental farm the item of boiler inspection company, inspection of two boilers, $20. If a farmer used a boiler for the purpose of cooking grain and anything went wrong with it, would not the cost of repairs be a charge against the farm ? Then take these other items :

Thos. Fitzsimmons, cartage of wood to farm, 5¼ cords at $1..	$ 5 25
John Heney & Son, sawn maple, 25 cords at $8, 10½ at $6.50	268 25
McCulloch & Co., furnace and nut coal, 154 tons at $7.25, 2½ at $8....	1,136 72

Then there are repairs to the buildings which I have not taken into account. I have just taken down the coal and wood and inspection of boilers, making a total of $1,430.32. I have not taken into account the sundries :

Detailed, 1901-2, page V—137..	$3,229 27
Detailed with Ottawa building, repairs, V—110..	1,381 50

Then on page 113 there is :

Experimental Farm, Canada Atlantic Railway, transportation of ten barrels of gasoline from Buffalo..	$10 70
Star Oil Works, Buffalo, 515½ gallons of 88 per cent gasoline at 19 cents.. ..	97 95

These are moneys expended in connection with the farm, yet they are not included in the statement of my hon. friend published as a statement of the total expenditure. If we turn up V—94 of the Auditor General's Report we find other charges which the minister has omitted :

Street car tickets, $18.85 ; cab-hire, $4 ; post office money orders, $4.36 ; sundries, $2..	$29 21
Lime, 75 bushels at 22 cents ; papering brush, $1.35 ; pair of scissors, $1.50 ; jointer, $2.50 ; large pine roller, turned, $5.25 ; 2 porous cells, $1.20..	28 30

These items are made up of goods purchased by the Public Works Department as expenditure in connection with the farm, yet the hon. gentleman ignores all that, and in his report he says that the total expenditure is $84,000, whereas that amount is $19,141 short of what was actually expended. And until he explains where that $19,000 was got, this item should not pass, but should be reduced by that sum.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman has made some very strong statements.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very correct statements, which required strong language.

Mr. FISHER. And this the hon. gentleman is master of. He has quoted from the Auditor General's Report, and I accept as correct the figures which he has taken from that report.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then you will accept my whole statement as correct ?

Mr. FISHER. No, figures and deductions from figures are two different things. The hon. gentleman quoted the Auditor General's Report, which is divided into sections, and section D is applied to the Department of Agriculture. In that section there are many figures which correspond exactly with those in the departmental report. Then the hon. gentleman went to the section which is devoted to public works and took a lot of items out of that department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was that not expenditure in connection with the experimental farm ?

Mr. FISHER. They are expenditures of the Public Works Department in connection, it is true, with the experimental farm.

Mr. TAYLOR. You could not run a farm without them.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then you should have added to your account that expenditure.

Mr. FISHER. I have followed the method adopted by the Auditor General and prefer his plan to that of my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report has nothing to do with the report of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will only keep cool, I will be able to explain the matter to him. He has become confused by figures from two different parts of the Auditor General's report. I prefer following the lines of the division of expenditure adopted by the Auditor General, and I have kept to them and have put into the farm report the figures which the Auditor General has embraced under the heading 'D,' which applies to agriculture. I have not gone through the whole of the other departments to find out whether there are in them any figures which might possibly be twisted into subserviency of my work. The hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that the Public Works Department deals with the public buildings of the Dominion. It takes care of the post offices. It pays for the heating, lighting, management and repairs to post offices, but these are not charged against the administration of the Post Office Department by the Auditor General. The Public Works Department deals with the care of custom offices all over the country, and it heats, lights and repairs them and pays the caretaker.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the Minister of Customs or the Postmaster General can seek to contrast the revenue of their departments with the cost of running those departments do they show every item of cost ?

Mr. FISHER. They do not. What I have done in that respect is exactly what the Post Office Department and the Customs Department do. The Post Office Department does not charge itself with the expense of caretaking, heating or lighting the post office buildings. Nor does the Customs Department charge itself with these items in connection with the custom house. Nor does the Auditor General charge these departments with the expenditures made by the Public Works Department in connection with these buildings any more than he charges such expenditures against the experimental farms. And the hon. gentleman has proved that by going to the Auditor General's statement and actually taking the figures from the accounts of the Public Works Department and adding them to the charges made by the Auditor General for expenses of the experimental farms. The hon. gentleman has cited the Auditor General. He has appealed unto Cæsar. I agree to that appeal, and I go before Cæsar with him. And Cæsar, in the person of the Auditor General, tells us in his report that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is entirely wrong. It could hardly be otherwise, because the figures that I have given with respect to the experimental farms are identically the figures of the Auditor General himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) and the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and the other ministers are dealing with the public funds of this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) says to the people of this country : I have spent $84,000 of your money in running the experimental farms. I say that that statement is not correct. I go to the source of the information to which the hon. gentleman has referred me—the Auditor General's Report. I take every dollar that was paid in connection with the farms in order that I may know what the expense to the country of those farms has been. The Auditor General simply keeps accounts of the money he distributes for all purposes——

Mr. FISHER. Under different heads.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course. But, under whatever head it may appear that does not affect the amount that the people have to pay for the running these experimental farms. Could any farmer in the country run his farm without paying for fuel and light ? And why has not the hon. gentleman the manliness to charge all the amounts of such expenditure in connection with these experimental farms ? I submit that question as a practical question to any farmer in the country. The farmers of this country have put this hon. gentleman in as Minister of Agriculture, and he is supposed to handle their money carefully and with judgment. He reports to the farmers that he has spent $84,000 of their money in running the farms, but he says nothing about other items aggregating $20,000 that has been spent in this connection. Suppose that the president of a company or the manager of a bank were to make a statement to his shareholders in which he left out of account $20,000 of the expenses incurred in running the company, how long would he be allowed to hold his position ? Why, he would not be left in office twenty-four hours. And that is what I call upon the farmers to do, to say to this hon. gentleman : You have published a false statement of your expenditure——

Mr. FISHER. I give just what the Auditor General gives.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman says that he appeals to the Auditor General. Well, I will meet him at the Auditor Generals office at any hour to-day or to-morrow, or any day next week——

Mr. FOWLER. Except Sunday.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, except Sunday ; I won't work on Sunday and I won't travel on Sunday. I will meet him in the Auditor General's office at anytime he likes and will accept the Auditor General's statement as to the correctness of what I say.

Mr. FISHER. I shall not go to the Auditor General——

Mr. TAYLOR. You are backing out already.

Mr. FISHER. No, there is no need to go to the Auditor General, for he is here in this report. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is subjecting himself to unnecessary worry. He used to be on this side of the House, and supported a former Minister of Agriculture. But he did not indict that minister because of the way the accounts were made out although they were kept in exactly the same form as before by the Auditor General and by the farm accountant. I am sorry he thinks the Auditor General makes up the accounts so badly.

Mr. TAYLOR. He has made them up correctly, and I quoted from his report.

Mr. FISHER. I have taken the figures exactly as they are in the Auditor General's Report. So the hon. gentleman need not get excited over it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not excited. But I represent a constituency of farmers and I do not want them to be deceived.

Mr. FISHER. This is a case, evidently, where appearances are deceitful. I am sorry the hon. gentleman should appear to be excited when he is not excited.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is my nature.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is. And I will let it go at that, acknowledging that nature is too strong for us sometimes.

Mr. LENNOX. Probably we can get along without being excited, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) who has charge of this matter will be fair. The statement at page 429 of the Experimental Farm report, issued by the hon. gentleman, is headed in this way : 'Statement of Expenditure on the Experimental Farms for the Year ending June 30th, 1903.' Then the expenditure for the several farms is set out, all in the same manner. It will be sufficient for my purpose to read the heading of the first,—'Central Experimental Farm, Expenditure 1902-3.' Now the hon. gentleman says he will appeal unto Cæsar in the person of the Auditor General. We are having a great variety of names for that gentleman of late, many of them not very complimentary, I am sorry to say. Cæsar was a warrior, a great military genius, and, as we are appealing to warriors and great military men, I shall appeal to a greater military authority than even Cæsar—I appeal to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) himself. He can hardly object to that, for he combines the virtues of Cæsar, Hannibal, Napoleon and all the rest of them. It hardly comes well from the hon. gentleman to twit the hon. member from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) with being excited, or belligerent or anything of that kind, for, although now the hon. gentleman, while dealing with his estimates, exhibits a mild demeanour, yet, the other night upon the same question his attitude was very belligerent. He might take to himself a little of the suggestion that he has offered to the hon. member for South Leeds.

What I want to ask the hon. gentleman is this : Does it matter at all what system of book-keeping prevailed some years ago if that system is wrong ? Is it fair to the country, is it fair to the farmers, whom the hon. gentleman officially represents, that he should persist in that which misleads, which deceives the people, which prevents them having an adequate grasp of the true condition of affairs ? I ask the hon. gentleman as an honest man, aye, as an honest farmer, I speak again as a farmer to a farmer, and I ask him, is he giving the people a fair representation of the case when he presents a statement which is headed as expenditure of the farms, unless he includes in that statement all the expenditure of the farms ? When he says that the total expenditure is $84,128.18, is it honest, is it truthful, to omit from that expenditure the sum of $19,141.66 found in the Auditor General's report ? The hon. gentleman says that he has made it up exactly in the same way as it has ben maede up before. Now I ask if it is not time that we should have honest and straightforward book-keeping, whatever we may have had in the past. Is it truthful, is it fair to send out to the people of this country a statement which purports to be the sum total of all the expenditure on these farms, and yet the hon. gentleman has to admt in this House that there is $19,000 of ordinary expenditure for the year ending 1903 which has been deliberately omitted from that statement ? And what class of expenditure is it ? It is expenditure for ordinary repairs, it is expenditure for little matters in connection with the various farms, it is expenditure for coal, for wood, for fuel and a thousand other small matters that arise in connection with the management and carrying on of the farms. Now let me appeal to the hon. gentleman as a farmer. He said the other day that he was ready to go out and discuss these matters on the hustings with the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). Let him

go there, or let him send some one who is not acquainted with the facts the hon. gentleman has mentioned to-day. Suppose at the meeting I happen to mention that the total expenditure on the farms for the year ending 1903 was $103,269, and a good supporter of the hon. gentleman says: No, it was $84,128. I say the hon. gentleman is wrong, but he says he is right. He then reads this published statement of the Minister of Agriculture on page 429 and following pages purporting to give every dollar of expenditure in connection with the farms, and by it I am absolutely wrong. What will the people say? I venture to say that Grit and Tory alike, every man in that audience will have to come to the conclusion that I am wrong. Why, because this statement of expenditure on the Dominion experimental farms for the year ending 30th June, 1903, if it means anything, means the total expenditure on those farms. Now this is not an issue between the Auditor General and the hon. gentleman, it is an issue between the people and the hon. gentleman, and I appeal to the hon. gentleman himself, not to Cæsar, not to the Czar, as some hon. gentlemen opposite now call the Auditor General—I appeal to the hon. gentleman himself, to this great and distinguished combination of militarism and agriculture, I appeal to him to treat the people fairly, and not suppress a sum of $19,000 from the amount which he says gives the total expenditure on these farms.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked me a question to-day in reference to this expenditure. There is a report of the experimental farm, there is an accountant connected with that farm, and it is for him to pay out the money. In these tables that are given here I understand there appears another report, a statement that the expenditure is made up and paid by him under the true head.

Mr. TAYLOR. I refer the hon. gentleman to page 429 of the report.

Mr. PATERSON. I saw the heading, but his report does not show that the expenditure for coal is included, he does not say that. If the question is asked by the hon. member for Leeds why he has not put that in, the answer would be that he did not pay for it, he is giving an account only of what he himself has done. But it is evident that other payments have been made. But I do not see that we should blame the government because these other payments are found in the Auditor General's Report. Now the Auditor General is not under the direction of the director of the experimental farms or of the Minister of Agriculture, in the preparation of his statement. He is the master in that respect, and he has determined that the proper way of keeping these accounts and of publishing them, is to give them, as I understand it, under the head of experimental farms. The expenditures are made directly by the accountant of that farm, while other expenditures that are incurred are not paid through him, but being paid through the Public Works Department, he places them under the head of the Public Works Department. Now, I suppose the Minister of Agriculture could have no objection if the Auditor General saw fit, under the head of experimental farms in his report, to put in the items that are paid for out of moneys that are placed in the hands of the Public Works Department. The Minister of Agriculture or the director of experimental farms could not object. But they have no power to tell the Auditor General to keep his accounts that way. The Auditor General keeps the accounts in the way that he deems right, and therefore, under the head of Public Works, he says, I will put the coal that is used on the experimental farms, and I will put these other items. It seems to me the blame does not lie with the Minister of Agriculture, but that if there be any blame, and I do not see that there is any, it must lie with the gentleman who has full authority and power to present these accounts to the public as he pleases. Now the Auditor General I presume would reason this way: This House votes for lighting and heating of public buildings, a certain sum is voted for that purpose, and out of that the Public Works Department take charge of the heating and lighting and caretaking, for instance, for the Customs, the Post Office, the Inland Revenue Department, and perhaps in some other cases, and the Public Works Department pays the caretaker of the building, the fuel, the lighting, and defray the whole expense.

Well, that expenditure appears in the report of the Auditor General, giving the country to understand and know that it has taken so much money to light, say a public building in Ottawa. Is the Auditor General then to divide up the cost of heating, lighting, &c., and charge so much of it against the Post Office Department and so much against the Customs Department? I cannot see that this heading is deliberately intended to mislead and I do not think that anyone can see that. It says that it is a statement of the expenditure on the Dominion Experimental Farm for the year ending June 30, 1903. It gives the different expenditures and then it is signed by the accountant of the department. In this the accountant gives the statement of the expenditures made to him. How could he give other expenditures which were not made to him?

Mr. CLANCY. He knew of the other expenditures and my hon. friend must know that he knew of them and he could have included them.

Mr. PATERSON. Then should the Post Office Department, the Customs Depart-

ment, the Inland Revenue Department, &c., take their proportion of this expenditure and publish it ?

Mr. CLANCY. This is a statement going to the country showing how a particular account has been made up. It is not on the same footing as the accounts of the Post Office or Customs Departments. If the accountant failed to put in every item of expenditure in connection with that farm, no matter what service it was for, so long as it belonged to that farm, the account would be misleading.

Mr. PATERSON. Apparently I cannot mark it any plainer.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have done very well ; you have done the best you could.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman says the accountant could have asked the Auditor General—

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. PATERSON. How then would we know the amount of coal ?

Mr. CLANCY. He could go and find out as any honest man who wanted to make a true account could, and put in a foot note—

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend has suggested a foot note. There might be a suggestion there. These accounts have been kept in that way from confederation or from the institution of experimental farms and—

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that it makes any difference whether the accounts have been kept in that way in the past or not ? It is a question of what is fair and honest.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman says it is a question of what is fair and honest. I would not like to put it in that way because the hon. gentleman would be saying that for all these years since the farms were instituted the accounts have been kept unfairly and dishonestly. I would not like to say that, and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman says that or not. If a change in book-keeping can be made which will make the subject plainer, that is a fitting matter for consideration, but do not attribute unfairness or dishonesty to the accountant who prepared the statement of last year because he simply gave a statement and made an account of the expenditure in precisely the same way as it had been made by every accountant since experimental farms were instituted. If the Auditor General took the view of the hon. gentleman opposite—and he is the one particularly charged with showing to the people of this country how the public moneys are expended—it is quite open to the Auditor General to do what the hon. gentleman says. It is easier for him to do it, than it is to have it done by the plan suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) as he will see, because the hon. member for Bothwell admits this account will have to go to different coal dealers and to the parties who made repairs and ask them for their accounts. He might be told by these parties : We have rendered our account to the department that ordered it. The hon. gentleman has all of these accounts. If the hon. gentlemen are right, the Auditor General should at once give instructions that in future the coal for experimental farms and all expenditures of that kind instead of being put in the report under the head of public works, is to be put under the head of experimental farms.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the duty of the Auditor General to keep the accounts of the various departments and make out their book-keeping to ascertain whether the accounts have been properly paid, and value given for them.

Mr. PATERSON. The Auditor General has all of these accounts before him and he could as easily instruct his accountants instead of putting expenditures of this class for experimental farms under public works, say that they are to be placed under letter D, experimental farms. He has all the details and would simply have to give instructions.

Mr. TALYOR. Why should not the accountant of the farms do this ? He has the accounts in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend must see that according to his argument if there is any fault in the book-keeping his criticism is entirely against the Auditor General.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is directly against the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. PATERSON. It cannot be against the Minister of Agriculture. He did not pay for the coal, he did not pay for the repairs, and as he did not pay for these things he is not warranted in putting them in.

Mr. TAYLOR. He says that his statement gives the total expenditure in connection with the farms.

Mr. PATERSON. He does not.

Mr. TAYLOR. He does.

Mr. PATERSON. This is headed :

Statement of the expenditure on the Dominion Experimental Farms for the year ending June 30, 1903.

He does not say total expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister when on the platform was asked from the audience how much the farm at Ottawa cost, he would turn up this report and say : There are the minister's figures for it ; they are correct. Every farmer would believe this for it is in the blue-book.

Mr. PATERSON. The farmers would not nor would the hon. member for Leeds. The Auditor General can easily arrange this and it is he who is to blame if any blame there be in this matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he is not.

Mr. PATERSON. The thing could be accomplished at once by the Auditor General doing what the hon. gentleman asks should be done, because if we were to give his instructions to the accountant of the farm, it could be easily arranged. He could send to the accountant of the farm a statement of these different expenditures for coal, &c., and say : that is to be included in your report. It is the Auditor General that has to deal with that. The Auditor General can instruct the accountant to give him the figures and he need not put the expenditure under the head of public works, but under the head of experimental farm. You take the public buildings throughout the Dominion where you have Customs, Post Office, Inland Revenue, and perhaps Indian Department offices, and there is no estimate made of the proportion that should go to each department. I take it that the public know that in carrying on the different branches of the public service, under the head of public works expenditure, items such as have been brought to our attention today are charged.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose the hon. gentleman is addressing a meeting in my constituency as he usually does, and some honest farmer were to say : Mr. Paterson what is the total expenditure on the experimental farm at Ottawa ? Would the hon. gentleman say $84,128.82, or would he say $103,269.84 ? If I were absent I suppose he would give the lower figure, but if I were present he would say $103,269.84.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, you don't believe that. To be frank, I would not be telling the whole truth, as I understand it by the discussion here to-day, if I were to give that lower figure mentioned, but I would be justified in saying that the total expenditure as shown by the accountant was $84,128.82, although there were charges to other branches of the public service a portion of which were incurred for the farm.

Mr. INGRAM. The good practical common-sense farmers want to know the truth regardless of all these niceties of book-keeping, and when the Minister of Agriculture stated in the report that the cost of the experimental farm was only $84,128.82, it was not an honest statement of the expenses of the experimental farm. As my friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says : this is a misleading report. There is no getting around the fact that it is not true. We are not disputing the manner in which the Auditor General keeps the accounts, but we are disputing the dishonest statement in this report and no man can deny it. No man can say it is a correct statement and tell the truth. I have no doubt that gentlemen on the other side of the House when they address the farmers will say that the expenditure on the experimental farm was $84,128.82, whereas if they told the total truth it would be $103,269.84. That is the whole thing in a nutshell and no one can dispute it.

Mr. PATERSON. It is hardly the whole thing in a nutshell. We have frequently debated in this House questions as to the system of book-keeping and for instance as to whether the distinction between capital and ordinary expenditure should not be abolished. That, however, has not been done, and the old system has been continued. I suppose the reason is that these statements are valuable for purposes of comparison. Since the farm was instituted the accountant makes up his statement on exactly the same lines, and thus you can make a comparison between the statement in 1896 and the statement in 1903. If you now added certain charges which were not added before you could not have a fair comparative statement. I am not judging the question as to whether it would not be better to change the system or not, but I am pointing out that in preserving the old system it is useful in comparing the expenditure. If you wish to adopt a new system you could not get at a comparison without adding a note to explain the difference. There is no attempt to mislead the people. The accountant does not say that it is the total expenditure, and no one can be deceived by his statement. The remedy is easily in the hands of the Auditor General if he wishes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Don't obstruct the passage of the item.

Mr. PATERSON. All right.

Mr. SPROULE. I was rather amused at the desire of the Minister of Customs to throw the blame on the Auditor General instead of on the Minister of Agriculture. That seemed to be the whole aim.

Mr. PATERSON. Not to blame.

Mr. SPROULE. He said : Who is to blame ? It is the Auditor General—he could have done this and done that ; he could have picked out all these various items and put them together, and could have done the book-keeping for the farm as well as auditing the accounts. Is the Minister of Customs not aware that the duty of the Auditor General is only to audit the accounts?

Mr. PATERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I think added to that is the duty of presenting these accounts to the public.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that. In regard to the accounts of the Public Works Department, it is his duty to ascertain whether the expenditure has been made in accordance with the conditions of the vote of parliament and the law which provides for such expenditure. When he finds that it is correct, he has a right to show it to the public in some way. He puts it under the various branches, and shows it by his index, and in doing that he has done his full duty. He has nothing to do with showing how or where the money has been expended on the farm ; and the Minister of Customs, instead of blaming the Auditor General, should blame the Minister of Agriculture, whose duty it is to show how and for what the expenditure has taken place. The hon. Minister of Agriculture says the hon. member for South Leeds chooses to appeal to Cæsar, meaning that the Auditor General is Cæsar. Well, Cæsar was right and Fisher was wrong, that is the only difference. It is not the duty of the Auditor General to compile the different expenditures and to say : Everything that was spent on the farm is to be found here. He shows by his index where it is to be found under the various heads, and in doing that he has done his whole duty. On the other hand, what is the position of the Minister of Agriculture ? Suppose all these farms belonged to me, and I put a steward there to run them, and placed at his disposal so much cash for that purpose ; and suppose I instructed him to make a statement to me yearly as to what had been done on these farms. Suppose I owned a farm at Ottawa, another at Nappan, another at Brandon, another at Indian Head and another at Agassiz ; and suppose I looked over the statement he made to me to see what had been done with my money and how much it had cost to run each of these farms ; what am I to expect by that statement ? Am I to regard it as giving part of the expenditure or the whole of it ? I put my steward over the different properties and ask him to render me an account which will show the income and expenditure on all these different farms. Would I regard him as doing his duty or as worthy of the position he occupies if he rendered me an account which misled me ? As a farmer I was misled by the account given in the hon. minister's report. If I ask any farmer in this country to tell me what it has cost to run these farms, will he not take that account on page 429 of this report and say, there is the account of the expenditure. When I come to balance up my cash account and find that it is $19,941 short, I ask, what has become of that money ? He tells me : I used part of that to buy coal for the experimental farm, to make repairs on the building, to provide other little necessaries. I say : That does not appear in your account. No, it does not, but the farm requires these things. How long would any man in this House keep a steward who managed his farm in such a way as that ? Would he blame the Auditor General for that ? Would he not blame the man who is in charge and who is responsible for the making out the accounts ? What is the answer of the hon. minister to-day ? That was the way it was done before. It may have been, but is that the proper way for a business government to argue ? Is that the correct thing to say to the people when they endeavour to analyze the cost of the various departments of this government ? The present government, when in opposition, over and over again claimed that the methods of their predecessors were wrong, and promised that if they were put in power they would adopt the right method. Why have they not done so? Why do they desire to shield themselves behind the Auditor General and throw the blame upon a man who is no more responsible than I am, and exonerate the party who is charged with the responsibility of showing the farmers of the country how much it has cost to run these farms ? The Minister of Agriculture has appealed to Cæsar, and Cæsar is right, while the Minister of Agriculture is wrong.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentlemen see that they are wrong, I do not wish to proceed with this matter much further ; but this is the point I make. Here is the report which the Auditor General presents to the public in his report on page D—29 :

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Summary.

Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, (Page D—36)..	$55,205 60
Branch Experimental Farm, Nappan, (Page D—40)..	9,043 04
Branch Experimental Farm, Brandon, (Page D—44)	9,251 09
Branch Experimental Farm, Indian Head (Page D—47)..	8,825 15
Branch Experimental Farm, Agassiz, (Page D—49)..	7,649 58
	$89,974 46

This is a summary of the expenditure on the experimental farms as given to the public of Canada by the Auditor General. Why is it not said that the Auditor General, in giving that summary to the people of Canada has given out a statement that is not true ?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the language which hon. gentlemen opposite are applying to the statements made in this report. I am not saying it is not true, I am not finding a word of fault with the Auditor General, but I say that my hon. colleague has followed the plan adopted in the Auditor General's Report, and if you find fault with the Minister of Agriculture, you must deal out the same criticism to the Auditor General. What

was there to have prevented the Auditor General from putting these items connected with the experimental farm, but which are charged to Public Works, under the heading of experimental farms ?

Mr. CLANCY. He could not do that, because the items were voted for public works and not for the experimental farm, and the Auditor General charges against each department the expenditure voted for it.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman is right, but in any case the Auditor General could have added a foot-note—as hon. gentlemen opposite say the Minister of Agriculture should have done—explaining that these items were expenditures on the experimental farms, although charged to public works.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend will turn to V—113 he will find that the Auditor General has done this. He will find there certain expenditures under the heading of public works marked as belonging to the experimental farm.

Mr. PATERSON. But you do not find any reference to this in the edition dealing with the experimental farms. If the hon. gentleman finds fault with the Department of Agriculture for not having a foot-note showing that other expenditures connected with the experimental farm were to be found under other heads, he should find fault with the Auditor General, because there is nothing in his report giving the expenditures on the experimental farm to show that under the heading of public works there are other expenditures directly connected with those farms. But the Auditor General gives the expenditure of the experimental farm as amounting to $89,994, which is the statement embodied in the report of the Department of Agriculture. And if a foot-note be advisable in the one case, it is equally so in the other.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) described my report as a dishonest and misleading statement, and said that if I followed the practice of former years, that practice ought to be changed. I am not prepared to admit that my statement is misleading or dishonest. It is an actual statement of the disbursements of the farm according to the system followed by all former accountants. The hon. gentleman says that that system ought to be changed and that there ought to be in the statements the items of expenditure on the farm which are charged to public works as well as the expenditures voted for the farms themselves. Well, that suggestion is worthy of consideration and I do not take very strong exception to it. But hon. gentlemen opposite would be ready to condemn the government if the government were to change the system of book-keeping hitherto followed. We would be immediately accused of doing something very wrong. I am afraid that these hon. gentlemen are rather suspicious and they would suspect us of trying to hide something, of trying to show a different comparison if we were to change the system which has hitherto always been in vogue. I say positively that the same system as is followed in this year's report has been in vogue ever since the establishment of the experimental farm. It was in vogue under my predecessor. The reports issued by my predecessor contain exactly the same statements and the same discrepancies, taken from the Auditor General's Report. I have here two of the reports under the late government.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the use of the minister taking up time to establish that when everybody admits it ?

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. member for Leeds admit that the statement which I have published, and which he denounces as dishonest and misleading, is exactly the same kind of statement as my predecessors were publishing ? Does he charge them with the same crime ? Does he charge them with having made similar misleading and false statements ? If he does, I have nothing more to say. If he will stand up now and say that what he has been accusing me of his own leaders were guilty of, his whole attack falls absolutely to the ground as far as any party advantage is concerned. But the contention of the hon. member for Simcoe is different. He says the system should be changed. That is a question for consideration. It may be a bad system, but if it is bad to-day, it was equally bad under my predecessors. It was a bad system when the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) supported it and allowed it to pass without objection or criticism. The whole argument from a political point of view falls entirely to the ground, and there is simply left a question of book-keeping, which I am quite ready to consider and discuss ; and if the Auditor General thinks it best to make that change in our report, I am ready to follow his advice. But up to the present I have been following the lines laid down by the Auditor General and in doing so I have been doing exactly what all the Ministers of Agriculture from Sir John Carling, who established the farms, down to myself, have been doing in connection with the book-keeping of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I gave the hon. minister yesterday the figures in the Auditor General's Report for 1895-6, as they compared with 1902-3.

Mr. FISHER. I am not comparing expenditures ; I am comparing systems.

Mr. TAYLOR. The office expenditure under the late administration was $1,750, and under the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) it is $4,935.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is altogether shifting his ground.

Mr. TAYLOR. The late government administered the affairs in connection with the experimental farms more to the satisfaction of the country on an expenditure of $19,173 than the hon. gentleman does on an expenditure of $44,878.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not the question.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is very anxious to get his colleague out of a hole. But he cannot do it, with all his sophistry. He wants to appeal to the Auditor General. Well, in the Auditor General's Report page V—93, he will find another summary of expenditures of experimental farms : Nappan, $30.06 ; Brandon, $496.61 ; Indian Head, $1,759.78 ; Agassiz, $379.12 ; Central Experimental Farm, $8,205.68. And this is not included in the summary given on the other page.

Mr. PATERSON. The Minister of Agriculture is not to blame for that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does not the accountant of the experimental farms get all the accounts, and must he not approve them before the Auditor General will pay them ?

Mr. FISHER. Not until after the Auditor General's Report is issued.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's account covers the fiscal year, just as the experimental farm report does.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has not understood what I mean. The Auditor General's Report is printed and laid on the table long after the report of the experimental farms is prepared and sent to the printer. So, we cannot make up the report on the basis of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General will not pay a cent until——

Mr. FISHER. I am not talking about payments, but about the reports—

Mr. TAYLOR. I am talking about business, and I am showing that the hon. gentleman does not manage the experimental farms in a businesslike way. This we are told is a business government——

Mr. FISHER. I accept that.

Mr. TAYLOR. —and we want them to manage the affairs committed to them and to present reports like business people. The accountant at the experimental farm must initial the accounts before they are paid. Why, then, does he not enter each account as an expenditure ?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) should be reasonable and listen to what is told him. The hon. Minister of Agriculture pointed out that it is impossible to do as he suggests because the report of the experimental farms is in type before the Auditor General's Report is placed on the table, so it is impossible to base the experimental farm report upon the figures in the Anditor General's Report.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will take that statement with a grain of salt.

Mr. PATERSON. You should not say that.

Mr. FISHER. I made the statement positively.

Mr. TAYLOR. The accounts are closed to the same day—30th June—and there is no account in the Auditor General's Report relating to the experimental farms but is shown to the Minister of Agriculture's accountant long before the entry is made in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FISHER. No, not one of the Public Work's accounts is shown to us. We know nothing about them until the Auditor General's Report comes out.

Mr. TAYLOR. All he has to do is to go to the Auditor General at any time——

Mr. FISHER. Not for the same items.

Mr. TAYLOR. All he has to do is to find out from the Public Works Department what has been spent for the experimental farms—how much coal has been bought, how much has been paid for light and so on. All these items must be taken account of by the farmer in his business ; yet, the hon. gentleman renders his account to the people of Canada without charging these items and in a form that will mislead the people. A good many people have almost as much faith in a blue-book as they have in their Bible. They think that nobody would put out a blue-book that is not in accordance with the facts. Yet, here is a blue-book which misrepresents the expenditure on the experimental farms to the extent of about $20,000. And when this is pointed out, the Minister of Customs comes to the rescue of his colleagues. The Minister of Agriculture himself says that he will appeal to Caesar in the person of the Auditor General. And when I accepted that and offered to go with him to the Auditor General he backed down. Why ? Because he knows the verdict will be against him. There is not a farmer who reads my statement, but who will say that I am right and that the report put out by the Minister of Agriculture is a misleading one. The

hon. gentleman has shown himself an unworthy steward, and he will be dismissed by his masters, the people. I have just read the figures from the Auditor General's Report of one whole series of items that do not appear as charged against the experimental farms in their report, although the money was spent on account of the experimental farms. Suppose that every business in the country were run that way. Suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) ran his factory in Brantford——

Mr. PATERSON. No, I am out of business.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, he has stock in the business and has a business manager there. That business manager will prepare a statement for the directors of that company. If that statement showed a deficiency of $19,000 in the bank account, the manager would very soon be dismissed. And I believe the people will say that the Minister of Agriculture has been guilty of a similar offence in sending out this misleading blue-book ?

Mr. PATERSON. How many have you sent out ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not one. I would not send out a lying document to the people. I discovered the error as soon as I opened it. Yet, the Minister of Customs will get on the platform and talk about this Minister of Agriculture, represent him as a horny-handed son of toil, and a sound business administrator, although it has been pointed to him here to-day that this report does not give within about $20,000 of the expenditure on the experimental farms.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have been listening carefully to the discussion, and I have one suggestion to make to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) The question that he refers to is one that ought to be discussed in Committee of Public Accounts. It is a question of the method of keeping accounts, and it is almost a waste of time to discuss such a question here.

At one o'clock committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to turn to page 78 of the report of the experimental farms. The hon. gentleman will find there under the heading 'Balance sheet or financial statement of live stock feeding operations on 200 acre farm. July 1, 1902 to June 30, 1903.' A table is given under the heading of comparative receipts. Commencing at the top of that table the number of horses is given at 19 in 1902 ; in 1903 they are at the same number. The returns are put down at $2,041.20. That return is extended in the column of gross returns made up of increase in value, value of products and animals sold. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how he arrives at that $2,041.20 ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will notice that the statement is under the heading of 'Balance sheet or financial statement of live stock feeding operations on 200 acre farm, July 1, 1902 to June 30, 1903.' The whole of the horses on the farm are charged there, 19 in number. That is the return of the value of their work on the experimental farm of 200 acres, and the value of their work apart from this.

Mr. CLANCY. There is a statement here that does not quite accord with the hon. gentleman's statement. It says :

> In the case of horses, the services of the nineteen head are valued at $3,061.80, but since the labour of 6 horses is required to do the work on the 200-acre farm, only $2,041.20, or two-thirds of the value of their labour is credited to them.

That would mean, since there are only six horses engaged, $340 for each horse. Now how is that arrived at ? How is the work of six horses put down at that value ? Other horses are running about the fields or the barnyard. How is that enormous sum of $340 arrived at as the value of each horse ?

Mr. FISHER. I was not quite correct in what I said before, I cannot myself quite understand that statement. It appears to be contradictory. I will have to telephone to the accountant and find out just what that means.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain the next item : 'Shorthorns, pure bred and grade.' On July 1st, 1902, there were 16, valued at $2,155, or an average price of $135 each. The next year there were 20, valued at $3,410, or an average of $170 each, making a difference between the two years of $1,255 increase. Then under the heading of 'Returns' there is $627.77, making an increase in value altogether of $1,882.77. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how that has arisen ?

Mr. FISHER. In the first place, there is an increase in the number of animals. In the second place the 20 animals are different from the 16 animals. Then the animals are valued at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year, showing that they had increased in value. The increase in the value of the 20 over the value of the 16 is the amount which the hon. gentleman mentions, $1,255. Then in addition, the produce sold from these animals is put down at $627 77. Part of that produce sold is the number of calves, and part is milk production. The two things together make up the sum that is to be credited to the shorthorn herd as their product during the year ; that is to say, the increase in value of the animals and the value of the product

sold during the year, amount together to $1,882.77.

Mr. CLANCY. It cannot be milk, because that is charged on the other side of the account. The hon. gentleman accounts for it in this way: That in 1902 there were 16 animals, and in 1903 there were 20 animals. The average price in 1902 was $135, and the average price in 1903 was $170. Now how many of these animals that were there in 1902 were there in 1903; how many were purchased, and what was paid for the animals in the meantime?

Mr. FISHER. I have not under my hand a list of the animals or of the individual animals. I cannot tell how many of those 16 are included in the 20. I have a list of the cows in the earlier part of the report, but that would not include the bulls. But the fact is there were 20 animals at the end of the year and 16 at the beginning. That not only causes an increase in value by the 4 additional head, but the probability is that some of these animals were of greater value at the end of the year than at the beginning, arising from their growth and their increased productiveness. Each animal is valued separately, and its just and fair value at the time the valuation is taken is put upon it.

Mr. CLANCY. The farm report gives a balance in favour of the live stock operation of $2,245.26. That includes an allowance for the feed of all kinds given to these animals, but from the figures given here it would seem that the amount paid to the men enumerated as being employed in the care of this stock came to $2,856. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that the sum put down for wages for the care of stock is $3,087.45. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will scarcely say that that is the whole cost of the raising of this stock. There are other men connected with the farm whose salaries have been paid, and the live stock should bear at least some proportion of these salaries as well as the other branches. I refer to such officials as the director, the accountant, &c.

Mr. FISHER. I can only say that the statement on pages 78 and 79 of the Farm Report is a summary of the work on the 200-acre farm, which includes in its management the stock on the experimental farm. The statement was prepared in a summary form, and does not pretend to go into all details. I confess that I do not understand the situation in regard to the horses, and I have sent for that information. There are a large number of employees on the farm who have nothing to do with the stock. The charge for the care of stock in the Auditor General's Report is different from that in the Farm Report, and I do not understand the difference. I have sent for that information also. I do not think it is fair to charge the salary of the director, &c., to the 200-acre farm.

Mr. CLANCY. To what would you charge it?

Mr. FISHER. To the experimental work. A farmer running a 200-acre farm would not have a director and an accountant. The request has been made that this account should be kept in the way a farmer would run his farm.

Mr. CLANCY. This is under the control of the director, and there are other persons whose services are constantly required in this connection.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that will be a fair charge against it. If it were an ordinary farm, the man running it would correspond to the farm foreman, or the agriculturist, who is solely directing the operations.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, too, there is no charge made for pasture for these animals during the half year when they must have pasture.

Mr. FISHER. I do not at the moment see anything in this report for pasture, although that should be included. If the animals are fed on the farm, the pasturage ought to be charged to them the same as the feed in the winter. I will see that it is done another year.

Mr. BLAIN. There is an expenditure of $7,000 for printing and distribution of bulletins and reports, which is not charged to the farm at all. Is it not an expenditure in connection with the farm, and why is it not charged to it?

Mr. FISHER. It is an expenditure in the way of distributing the knowledge acquired on the farm, but, of course, it is in no way connected with the operations of the farm. It is done by a staff of clerks who are paid specially out of this $7,000, and it appears on both sides of the balance.

Mr. SHERRITT. Coming from an agricultural district, I may be excused for saying a word or two on this matter. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) stated that he did not distribute any of the reports of the agricultural department to the people in his riding. I am not in that position, because there is no departmental report that I have distributed so freely as this one. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) stated that he did not distribute these reports because he did not wish to distribute any thing that was false. I consider myself just as honourable and as honest as he is, but I regret to say that I am not in that position, because I sent out these reports believing that they contained the truth and up to the present debate I was not aware that they are misleading. It is true that certain matters which were brought out in the discussion last year and the year before led me to believe that these agricultural reports were to some extent wrong. For instance, when I questioned the

minister as to how he valued his hay, he said he valued it at eight dollars per ton and he weighed it as it came in from the field, whereas every one knows that hay is supposed to shrink about one-third, and the course pursued by the minister in that respect was to my mind greatly misleading. However, I did not think the report of the Agricultural Department was misleading to the extent it is. I have had many applications for these reports by my constituents in North Middlesex, and I sent them out without any explanation. It would appear now that in order to have them properly understood I should have sent the Auditor General's Report along with them. Had I sent the Auditor General's Report out at the same time as the agricultural report, I believe the farmers of North Middlesex are quite intelligent enough to go through both reports and arrive at correct conclusions from a study of each, but placing that agricultural report in the hands of any man it is not possible for him to understand it correctly, or to see that there should be $19,000 added to the expenses of the farm more than is therein stated, I was amazed to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that this report is not misleading. To my mind that is a ridiculous statement. I was pleased with what the Minister of Customs said to some extent; because, although he tried to go all round it he did not undertake to justify the report or to say that it was not misleading. However, he did say that because the wicked Tories had done the same thing prior to 1896, that was sufficient justification for the Minister of Agriculture to send out a misleading report. I am satisfied that not one of these gentlemen on the opposite side of the House in discussing public questions on the platform has ever referred to the fact that the expenditure on the experimental farm is much larger than is shown in the report. On the contrary they based their remarks on the figures contained in it as being found in the blue-book that could not lie. I may say that from this out, when sending out the report of the Agricultural Department, I intend to send an explanation stating the real facts of the case. Not only is this report misleading to men who seek information, but I think it is a very bad example to the young men of our country that a man occupying the high position of Minister of Agriculture should not only send out this misleading report, but should stand up in the House as he did and state it was not misleading. I fail to see how any person of the intelligence and ability of the Minister of Agriculture could say that this Agricultural report is not misleading. It is said that the Auditor General's Reports are public property. That is true, but every one is well aware that there are a dozen of the agricultural reports put in the hands of the public for every one of the Auditor General's Reports. There is no possible way for the average farmer to find out what the true state of affairs is by reading that report as it is at present published. I do not wish to detain the House, but coming from an agricultural district as I do, I consider it is my duty to stand up here and confess to having sent these reports out not knowing they were misleading and that there was an additional expenditure of $19,000 in connection with that farm which was not known to the public.

Mr. CLANCY. I notice that the teams are put down at $2.50 a day, which of course includes the man. If you allow the man $1.25 a day that would leave another $1.25 a day for the team, and of course the horses have to be fed. Suppose the six horses worked 300 days, instead of having $2,000 to their credit they would only have $375. Then there is a charge of 2½ cents a bushel for threshing. That is the ordinary price paid to these machines going around the country, but the men have to be fed in addition to that and the 2½ cents a bushel does not anywhere near represent the cost. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there is not a man in Canada who could get his threshing done, including the pay of the men engaged, their board and so on, for 2½ cents a bushel. Every farmer in the House knows that that is perfectly ridiculous. I would like to know how that figure is arrived at.

Mr. FISHER. In the first place, let me reply in regard to the horses. If the hon. gentleman will look at the bottom of page 58 and at the top of page 59, he will find a full explanation of the cost of the horses. It shows that on a team there is a margin of 32 cents a day, after paying for the feed of the horses, and $1.41⅔ per day for the driver. The 32 cents per day covers the wear and tear on the harness and replacing the horses as they grow old. A daily allowance of 16 cents per horse amounts to $48 in the year of 300 working days. That shows abundant margin left for wear and tear on the harness and for replacing the horses. If the hon. gentleman examines that account, I think he will find it accurate. I cannot myself see any flaw in it.

Mr. CLANCY. I will point out the flaw. In the first place, the calculation is made on nineteen horses when only six are used. When you divide the amount among nineteen, you will get a much smaller amount for each horse.

Mr. FISHER. The calculation is worked out for each horse; it does not matter whether the number is nineteen or six. When you take a pair of horses to do some work, we charge that to two horses. The cost of feeding and caring for a team comes to $2.16. We base this on 300 working days; but when the account is for eating, the charge is for 365 days. For the cost of horse labour $2.50 per day is allowed for each

working day, which leaves a margin of 32 cents on a team, for wear and tear of harness and replacing horses as they grow old. That 32 cents on 300 working days amounts to $48 for every horse on the farm, which is an abundant sum to cover wear and tear of harness and the replacing of the horses.

Mr. CLANCY. To what account is charged the days on which the horses are standing idle? I will give an extreme example, and will put the average cost of a horse at just what is stated here. Suppose the horses work only one month during the year, do you simply charge their labour at the rate of $2.50 a day, and keep them for the whole year? The hon. gentleman has kept these horses at a certain expense, and he is not charging that to any other service. The statement is entirely misleading.

Mr. FISHER. I will take the hon. gentleman exactly at his word. I only wish to make a fair statement, and I take the statement shown as one. Six horses on a 200-acre farm would have to work practically 300 days in the year.

Mr. CLANCY. Do they work half that?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, as a matter of fact there are not ten days in the year in which the horses on the experimental farm are idle. I say that positively, because there is a great variety of work, and the horses are kept working all the time, every month in the year. In the winter time there is teaming to be done, hauling manure, and a great deal of teaming backwards and forwards to the city. That might not and would not be the case on an ordinary farm; but at the same time I think my hon. friend or any other farmer would arrange his work so that six horses on a 200-acre farm would be employed 300 days in the year. If he did not do that, his management of the farm would not be as economical and careful as it might be. The statement is based on a horse working 300 days in the year, which gives them about 15 days ordinary working days in which they would not do anything. The work of each team is charged at the rate of $2.50 per day, which I do not think is unreasonable. The details are given on page 59.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think there is any man of experience in the use of horses in this House who will say that even in the most favourable weather, you can use a horse more than twenty days in a month. The hon. gentleman astounds me when he adheres to that calculation made to show that any man could employ a team of horses during 300 days in the year. If you can get a farmer in this House who will back that statement, I will make the hon. minister a public apology.

Mr. FISHER. We have at the farm the actual details of what every horse does every day, and I will incorporate a summary of that in next year's report.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman would also have to incorporate a certificate as to the perfect sanity and character of the man who would make such a statement.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. It is quite evident from the discussion we have had that the report of the Minister of Agriculture is completely misleading as regards the expenditures on the experimental farm. When this report of the Minister's Department is sent out, the public accept it of course as giving a correct statement of the facts; and if any one on the hustings were to declare that the experimental farm at Ottawa costs more than was set down in the report, no one would be inclined to believe him. But we have it amply proved in this debate that no less a sum than $19,000 has been left out in the statement of expenditure. That sum has been expended on the different experimental farms but not one dollar of it is accounted for in this report. Of course we can understand that the minister who not only has charge of the Department of Agriculture—the most important in the country and one which gives abundant scope for the exercise of all his energies and ability—but also at intervals takes charge of the Department of Militia, cannot be held strictly accountable, but it is high time that the people should know how this department is managed. Why should the people's money be spent in getting up a report which is absolutely incorrect? How are we to find out how much is spent on these farms? As the great taxpayers of this country, we have a right to have a proper report and not a partisan report. We have a right to a report that will enable us to make comparisons between the acts of this government and of their predecessors. I remember that when hon. gentlemen opposite were appealing to the country, they criticised these points of book-keeping and declared that if they were put in power they would submit the accounts to the public in such fashion that everybody might know how the money was spent. And they said: If we do not act in accordance with our professions, turn us out. The amount of money they are spending and the way they are accounting for it is a flat contradiction of every promise which they gave in this respect, and I believe that at the next appeal the country will take them at their word and turn them out. I hope that in the future we shall not have such a wrangle about these points but that the facts will be placed before the people so fairly and so clearly that there will be no difficulty in understanding what is the actual cost of these experimental farms.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to call attention to page 59 of the Experimental Farm Reports. It shows that for the twelve

months from December 1st, 1902, to November 30th, 1903, the food of the horses was valued at $1,552.10. To care for the horses cost $560, making a total cost of $2,112.10 for 19 head, or $111.16 to feed and care for one horse for the year, or 37 cents per day, counting 300 working days in the year. Now, why confine it to the 300 working days of the year? These horses had to be kept for the 365 days of the year.

Mr. FISHER. The total cost of keeping each horse is $111.16, and if this were averaged over 365 days it would make less than 37 cents per day. This would cause a reduction in the apparent cost for each working day. If we were to do that, the hon. gentleman would have a right to complain that we did not provide for the keep of the horses for those days when they were not working. We have charged up against the 300 working days enough to cover the cost of the keep of the horses for the 365 days of the year.

Mr. CLANCY. The statement of the hon. minister is, perhaps, correct. If so, I was in error——

Mr. FISHER. I am sure my statement is the true explanation, and that the hon. gentleman's criticism was based upon a misapprehension. I would like to say to him also that I have an explanation about the comparative statement with regard to the horses (page 78), to which he referred. I have not seen the officer who is in charge of this department, but I can see through it now in a way I could not before. It says:

> In the case of horses, the services of the nineteen head are valued at $3,061.80, but since the labour of six horses is required to do the work on the 200-acre farm, only $2,041.20, or two-thirds of the value of their labour is credited to them.

The reason for that is this: The feed raised by the 200-acre farm feeds all the horses and the rest of the live stock on the farm that we are now taking account of. But the work of six of these horses is required for the 200-acre farm. Therefore, we have no right to credit all the 19 horses with doing work. But if we have 13 horses whose work is not applied to the 200-acre farm, but is given to the rest of the experimental farm establishment, then the 200-acre farm deserves to be credited with the value of the services of these 13 horses. For all practical purposes it is enough if one-third of the value of the services of all the horses is left out, because about one-third of the labour of all is applied to the 200-acre farm and two-thirds is applied to the other work in the experimental farm establishment.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) has pointed out that only six horses are doing the work. Are not the other 13 also working horses?

Mr. FISHER. Not all engaged in farm work. There is the horse that draws the 'bus to and from the farm, and the horse used for driving purposes. They have nothing to do with the 200-acre farm.

Mr. CLANCY. Then why should they be taken into account in the way of profit?

Mr. FISHER. Because the 200-acre farm feeds and provides for them.

Mr. CLANCY. But he is giving credit of $2,041 to six horses that are working.

Mr. FISHER. The six horses are necessary on the 200-acre farm, and their services are not counted. Their maintenance has to be provided by the 200-acre farm, and therefore they are not charged with their maintenance or credited with their work. But this 200-acre farm also supports 13 other horses, whose work is not necessary on the 200-acre farm. They might be kept elsewhere and put at outside work and, if they were, the 200-acre farm would have a right to be credited with the value of their services.

Mr. CLANCY. But they are not performing any.

Mr. FISHER. They are performing services for the rest of the establishment. The other parts of the establishment are benefiting by these horses that are maintained on the 200-acre farm. Suppose that the 200-acre farm raised 1,000 bushels of oats and that Dr. Saunders, as director, took the oats and sent them out to farmers all over the country, would it not be fair to credit the 200-acre farm with the 1,000 bushels of oats? You certainly ought to, just the same as if they were taken to the market and sold. So the hay, the oats, the meal and the work of the men are charged to the 200-acre farm, and are applied to the keep of the 13 horses which are not needed for the work on that farm. Therefore, we credit this item with two-thirds of the keep of 19 horses, only one-third of the 19 horses being needed for the farm, and we credit the farm with two-thirds of the keep of the horses which are not used.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman states that only 6 horses are employed on the 200 acre farm.

Mr. FISHER. The 13 horses are working for somebody else.

Mr. CLANCY. Here are 6 horses employed. If you have ten men and only employ five, you are certainly not going to pay wages to those you do not employ.

Mr. FISHER. These horses are working elsewhere, but they are fed and maintained there on the farm. Supposing the hon. member was a farmer and he required for his own use 4 horses. But he had an opportunity in the neighbourhood of running some teams for a lumber yard or a brick yard, and he kept on his farm 16 other horses and he fed them there, and fed the men and

maintained them there. But if he got his wages for sending them out to work for others, would he not consider it right to credit his farm with so much of the wages that he got for letting out those horses? This is a similar instance. The 200 acre farm requires 6 horses, but it maintains and feeds 13 other horses which are used on another part of the experimental farm, and that other part must pay to the 200 acre farm the value of the services of those horses, and this item is the value of the services of those horses which is credited to the 200 acre farm.

Mr. CLANCY. Assuming the horses were of the same value, although only 6 of them worked out of the 19, it would mean the live stock were entitled to a credit of $2,041. On the other side of the account, the feed of course is charged up for the keep of the 19 horses. But there is no statement here showing how that $2,041 is arrived at.

Mr. FISHER. The paragraph above is not quite so clear as it might be. I did not understand it when I first read it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that each horse has to earn over $100, each one of the 19, because they are credited with $2,041.

Mr. FISHER. I have just been given a list of the work done by the other horses. There are 3 for the omnibus, 4 are used for the Horticultural Department, 3 or 4 keep the lawns in order, and 3 are riders. This makes up the 13 horses extra.

Mr. TAYLOR. And there are 13 men to look after them?

Mr. FISHER. The men who look after the horses go with them. But I think my hon. friend understands now the explanation which I have given.

Mr. CLANCY. I will understand if the hon. gentleman tells me how he arrives at what each horse earns, and how he earns it.

Mr. FISHER. The services of the horses are put down at $3,061.80.

Mr. CLANCY. How is that arrived at?

Mr. FISHER. I will have that worked out in a minute or two. Perhaps there are some other questions the hon. gentleman would like to ask me in the meantime.

Mr. CLANCY. I may say that I do not intend to prolong the debate. I only want to see how he arrives at that figure.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to know that myself. I take the figures from my officers as being correct, and I have no doubt they are. I have found, when I tested them by working them out, that they were correct.

Mr. CLANCY. In working them out, it might be well to make this further calculation. I am unable to understand why we should take six horses and credit two thirds of the value of their labour to them, as in the statement on page 78 of the report.

Mr. FISHER. The word 'their' in that statement on page 78 is improperly used. It refers not to the work of the six horses but of the nineteen horses.

Mr. BOYD. I would ask the minister what position Mr. W. S. Sparks occupies in the department and what his salary is.

Mr. FISHER. He is not now in the department nor in this country, but during the last winter he was employed for some institute work.

Mr. BOYD. At whose request was he employed in the institute work?

Mr. FISHER. He was introduced to me and in conversation discussed matters connected with horse breeding and training in this country. He had been recommended to me by a number of people and he asked me if he could not perform any service for the department. I then put him on to give addresses on horse training, &c., and he also acted as judge at various shows with the approval of the department.

Mr. BOYD. Was he employed permanently?

Mr. FISHER. No; he received so much a day and expenses in the usual way.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I feel interested in these estimates because I am interested in agriculture. Every member in this House, no matter whether he is a practical farmer or a lawyer, is interested in agriculture simply because one half of all the exports of this country are the products of agriculture. Therefore anything that could be done to encourage farming and to induce the farmer to produce more productions of a better quality is of great good to our country. I think the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is entitled to the thanks of the country for having elicited a good deal of information in reference to the false system of book-keeping that has been practised ever since confederation, apparently, in regard to the experimental farm. I hope that from this time forward the Minister of Agriculture will see that everything in connection with the farms is so placed that there will be nothing misleading about it and that every man reading the returns will be able to tell exactly how much the experimental farm costs us. The minister says that this system was inaugurated long before he became minister and therefore he claims that he is not responsible for it, but he knew about it and when he knew about it, he should have amended it. Therefore the minister will pardon me if I say that he should not be excused and cannot blame the hon. member for Leeds for bringing this matter up because it certainly is, as the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) says, misleading. Yesterday we had

an agricultural discussion and I suppose it would be hardly proper for me to refer to it, but I may say that I voted against the minister yesterday afternoon simply because I considered that he had not discharged his duty in the matter of placing an official weigher in Montreal. That thing has been discussed and the matter settled, and I hope that the minister will see that the farmers of the country get justice, so that when they send their stuff to market there will be some one there with authority to stand between the buyer and seller and see that justice is done. This matter seems so far to have been neglected but I hope that the resolution will not be in vain. Every farmer on that side should have voted for it yesterday, and they would have done so if they had heard the question discussed but many of them were not in the House. I do not wish to make any further remarks on this subject but I would say that I am prepared to assist the Minister of Agriculture in everything that he can do to aid the farmers. Complaints have been made in reference to the cold storage systems that have been started in different parts of the Dominion. I think that this cold storage is all right and that inducements should be offered to start cold storage plants all over this country. There is no doubt but that ultimately they will be established in every city, town and village because they are a necessity and because they will enhance the value of all our perishable products. Therefore I think the minister is right when he encourages the farmers to make use of this system. I would like to send reports of the experimental farms to all the farmers in my riding, but I do not think I had better send them out unless there is a foot note to the effect that all the lighting and all the coal is charged to the Public Works Department. I think a farmer would make a very poor showing if he did not take into calculation the cost of fuel, wood, &c., on his farm. I think he would soon come out at the wrong end, because it is a matter of great importance, and $19,000 is about one-fifth of the cost of the whole experimental farm. Thus one-fifth of the real cost of running this experimental farm is charged to capital account or some other account. I hope that in the future this will all be set forth so plainly that he who runs may read.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in reference to horses. A pair of horses earns $1.08, which would make 54 cents for one horse, and a man earns $1.41⅔ according to the average wages paid to teamsters. That leaves $1.08 and a small fraction for two horses, or 54 cents for each, which at 300 days would be $162 a year. For nineteen horses it would be $3,078. The figures here are $3,061.80, but that is due to the fact that one or two horses were sick and did not earn anything. Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the earnings are taken and credited to live stock on the farm and that leaves $2,041.20 as the earnings of the horses for outside work.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not believe it is possible for each horse to work 300 days in the year, but at all events we are dealing with the live stock section here and not with a 200 acre farm.

Mr. FISHER. I think there is something in the argument of my hon. friend but as the work of six horses was required for that 200 acre farm we credit their services to it.

Mr. CLANCY. In order to be consistent, the minister should revise these figures. Evidently he has mixed up the farm with the live stock.

Mr. SPROULE. How many thoroughbred cattle are on the farm, and to what breeds do they belong ?

Mr. FISHER. The statement on page 78 shows the breeds but does not say how many are pure and how many grade.

Mr. SPROULE. You have them mixed up. How do you make the returns ?

Mr. FISHER. These returns are the revenue from the animals and their increase in value ; if they decrease in value it would be deducted.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you do with the swine ?

Mr. FISHER. We breed them and sell them. The chief revenue is from young pigs for breeding purposes and the sale of fat pigs raised on experimental work to the butcher.

Mr. McGOWAN. Are the pigs all pure bred ?

Mr. FISHER. Not all, but most of them.

Patent Record, $5,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is an additional vote, caused by the increased numbers of patents issued. It is all for printing, and is paid over to the Printing Bureau. We get a larger revenue, of course.

Experimental farms, $10,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is to cover last year's expenditure, which is brought up to the amount I ask for this year.

Exhibitions, $45,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this include the St. Louis exhibition ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Whom have you sent as commissioner to that exhibition ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. William Hutchison is the only commissioner.

Mr. FOWLER. What other officers are there ?

Mr. FISHER. There are a number of secondary officers, men in charge, besides certain officers who have been sent to explain our exhibits. I will get a list of them for the hon. gentleman, and in the meantime we can let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

For the branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, including live stock, dairy, cold storage, extension of markets, poultry, seed and fruit division ; employees paid from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $220,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is the usual item for this branch of my department. It is the same amount as we have had for the year just past. Some expenditures which we have had during the last year will not be needed in the future, because the payments for cold storage on steamship lines are closed up, and we shall not have to spend the same amount for that service this year that we did last year ; but I propose to extend the service in other directions, so that we shall require about the same amount of money.

Mr. SPROULE. What work is being carried on under this branch ?

Mr. FISHER. In the first place, we have work of a general character in regard to the commerce and transportation of agricultural products. The branch is divided into seven main divisions, which are set out in the report of the department for the year. I will give the estimated expenditures for the ensuing year :

General head office	$31,000
Live stock division	34,000
Dairy division..	61,000
Cold storage division....	19,600
Fruit division..	25,500
Seed division..	17,900
Extension market	19,000
Poultry division..	15,000
Total..	$220,000

Mr. SPROULE. How many hands employed in the general head offices ?

Mr. FISHER. Besides the commissioner, whose salary is $5,000, there are employed Mr. O'Hara, Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Thomas, and several others and the messengers, whose aggregate salaries amount to $5,650. Then there is the publishing work, for which the clerical staff costs $1,500. There are also the renting of offices, $1,800 ; caretaker, $500 ; messenger, $365 ; printing and stationery, $3,500 ; travelling expenses, $1,800 ; and contingencies, $4,400. About $4,500 are left open to be allocated according to any plan that may be worked out during the year requiring extra expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you doing in the live stock line ?

Mr. FISHER. We provide lectures and assistance to various fat stock shows. My hon. friend no doubt attended the Guelph fat stock show and must have noticed the great interest taken there in the department where illustrations, demonstrations and lectures were delivered. The interest taken in these is simply wonderful and that is the work to which we specially devote ourselves.

Mr. SPROULE. How much do you pay for these lectures ?

Mr. FISHER. I propose next year to devote about $4,000 to the five shows.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you have $30,000 left.

Mr. FISHER. There have been established what are called straight stallion shows and breeding animal shows at different points. For these we have laid aside $1,000. We have undertaken work in connection with the ordinary fairs—the country and township local fairs. We have been trying to get those established on a fixed basis, so as to have a certain amount of similarity in the prize list and management. We hope to make these fairs model fairs. Our work in the Whitby fair was very flatteringly commented on.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman's department co-operate with the local directors ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, these fairs are entirely managed by their local associations. We only advise them when they write and ask us. The live stock commissioner has had many experiences in that work when employed by the Ontario government as institute manager. That is, when they ask for a little help in this respect we give it. We have not been giving them any prizes or any money for them to spend ; but when they come and say that in this or that respect they are a little weak, we try, by sending them a judge or some one to help them in their management, to improve the quality, management and style of these fairs. We set aside $1,000 for this purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Upon what principle do you divide it ? Does the minister give assistance to every one who applies ?

Mr. FISHER. A thousand dollars would not go far if we did that. We try to make conditions that we will give aid when the people do certain things. Speaking from memory the only fairs that have received assistance of this kind so far are those of Whitby and Richmond, Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. This accounts for about $6,000 out of a vote of $34,000. What is the balance to be devoted to ?

Mr. FISHER. A part will be devoted to work in connection with auction sales of live stock in British Columbia, the Northwest Territories, Ontario and the maritime provinces. The live stock associations of these provinces have been arranging for auction sales of live stock, and we have been helping in the work. That will cost us according to our present plans $2,450. Then we have been helping local fairs with expert judges. Some years ago there was a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed as to the men obtainable as judges for small local fairs. The suggestion was made that we should try and supply competent men to judge the various classes exhibited. We have been able, by arrangement with well known judges of different classes of live stock, to secure their services. In response to the applications sent us from the local fairs, we have been able to supply a very considerable number of expert judges, sometimes officers of the departments and sometimes men whom we have secured from outside. We have had most appreciative letters from the different fairs where these gentlemen have acted, and the demand for their services is growing all the time. We have now hundreds of requests from all over the country to send judges of this or that class of live stock to the different fairs.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you pay these judges ?

Mr. FISHER. We pay them $3 a day and their travelling expenses. We do not pay for their maintenance at the place where the fair is held, but make it a rule that the people shall entertain them. We seek to arrange a circuit for each man so as to reduce the expense.

Mr. SPROULE. Are only Grits employed on this job ?

Mr. FISHER. Not at all. I could give a long list of men thus employed who are strong supporters of the opposition. I do not say there are no Grits, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, many of the best live stock men in Canada are Grits. But I might mention, for instance, Mr. Joseph Brethour who is one of the leading swine breeders of the country and who has always been a good Conservative. We have employed him for the last two or three years. Another name that occurs to me is Robert Johnston, of South Ontario, who never cast a Grit vote in his life, I believe.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of this vote will be used in this service ?

Mr. FISHER. About $3,700. One feature introduced with regard to the work of these judges has proven very acceptable. We have asked the judges to explain their reasons for their judgment, illustrating their talk with the animals in the ring. In this way they point out exactly why one animal was given first prize, another second prize and another none. Under the old practice, the judge made the award and nobody knew why—sometimes the audience found it pretty hard to understand. But we have insisted that our judges give reasons for their opinions. I have been told by many farmers personally that it is a grand thing to give the public in this way the opinions of competent judges.

Mr. BLAIN. When a man is sent out to judge, let us say, horses, at a fair, does he become the absolute judge of that department ? Are the prizes awarded on his statement alone, or does he co-operate with the local judges ?

Mr. FISHER. The one-judge system at fairs is being more generally adopted. Our judges generally act alone. But, of course, we only send them out on request.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that where a board of directors send in word that they require the services of a judge the minister will send out a competent man at the expense of the department ?

Mr. FISHER. We have been doing a great deal of that, making no charge except that we require that the people shall entertain the judges.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not quite what I wanted to know. Suppose that twenty counties ask for a judge, will the minister send a judge to each of them ?

Mr. FISHER. Wherever we can. But if we are not able to get competent judges if we will not send out anybody in whom we have not the most perfect confidence.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister send to the same place repeatedly ? For instance, I understand that some judges were sent to Whitby last year ; will he send judges every year to the same place ?

Mr. FISHER. I think so. We sent to thirty-three fairs last year altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. What other lines does the minister intend to take up that will require the balance of this item ?

Mr. FISHER. We have been doing a good deal in the way of institute lectures. The local governments, as a general rule, carry on institute work within the several provinces. They are constantly applying to us for assistance. The province of Ontario is very well equipped in that respect, but the other provinces have difficulty in getting competent men to act as lecturers. My department has a number of officers in its employ whom we are able to spare for this service during part of the year. In New Brunswick as a rule, the institutes meet for three or four weeks at one period of the year and then for three or four weeks

at another season. We try if possible to provide speakers on such and such a subject who will go round to the various constituencies, and we have been able to supply a certain number of men to meet all demands. If we can secure thoroughly competent men to do that work we are glad to do so. When an official of the department is sent out on that business his expenses are charged to this item in the estimates. We cover all the provinces to a certain extent, but we do less in Ontario, because the local government is attending to that.

Mr. SPROULE. What consideration do you allow them ?

Mr. FISHER. Three dollars a day and their expenses. That is the price the Ontario government pays. When they are doing this work they are not paid their salary in addition. If their salary is by the year, they do not get the $3 a day, they get nothing but their expenses. We have men employed who are not on salary, but who engage in this business for one or two months in the winter or in the summer. These get $3 a day and expenses. But when a man is an officer of the department on a salary, he gets nothing extra.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman give us a list of all those men employed last year and bring down the amount that each got ?

Mr. FISHER. I will lay that on the table.

Mr. SPROULE. How much have you for that ?

Mr. FISHER. We take $3,575. Twenty-eight speakers were employed last year, who attended 199 meetings. Generally two of them go together, in some cases three, and in some cases one. Then we had last winter a national stock convention of live stock men who came here on invitation of the farm, to organize a live stock association somewhat on the lines of an organization of a similar character in the United States and of one in Great Britain. We hope to continue that effort, and the department will incur some expense. There is the printing of a report for distribution, stenographic expenses, and expenses in bringing people from a distance, officials who are chosen, by the local associations.

Then we are working out what is called a standard of excellence, with a bulletin or report of the work and conclusions of the live stock association. We expect that to cost $2,500. The officers of the department and the leading breeders of the country are trying to establish what we might call a score, by means of score cards, or standard of the different breeds of animals in the country, which we call a standard of excellence. We have a large number of breeds of animals, and the judges at fairs find that the types which breeders have to aim at in their breeding are not well described. There is hardly any description of it, and the live stock commissioner with some assistance in the department is working to establish and to get out a book of standard excellence for the different breeds. It is rather an elaborate piece of work and a difficult one. It has to be done in conjunction with the leading breeders of each particular breed. Some bulletins will be issued in connection with that work. We shall have to spend money in the way of getting information, and employing a clerk to compile it. Then we will have to pay for printing and issuing that information There are a great many cuts and illustrations of the typical animals of each breed which will be included, and these will be expensive. Then bulletins on the subject will be issued and will have to be paid for, as well as the printing and distribution.

Then there is work in connection with a national live stock record. My hon. friend will remember that the meeting of the live stock men this winter asked us to establish a Dominion record. That is a pretty difficult task. There are local records to-day in different parts of the country. We wish to carry out the views and ideas of the live stock men of that convention, and I think their aim is a very laudable one. The object is to have one thoroughly recognized record for every particular breed in this country. At the present time there are records in Quebec, Nova Scotia, Ontario and in the west, but one does not recognize the other in every case. The consequence is that a man may buy an animal to-day which he is told is a thoroughbred, which is registered, and he may be given a pedigree and certificate of registration. But when he comes to sell that animal to somebody else, the buyer looks up some other record to find the animal, and he does not find it, and he says this animal is not a pure bred. Of course there is a lot of dispute and difficulty in consequence. Farmers are wasting their money and are being deceived, not intentionally perhaps, but at the same time are being deceived in the purchase of pedigree live stock. The live stock men ask us to work toward the establishment of a national record. It will be a difficult task, a great many different and sometimes conflicting interests will have to be reconciled. At the same time I want to try and bring it about, and that will involve some expenditure of money. We shall need to bring people together from different parts of the country to discuss the matter.

Then there is the suggestion of a live stock census—quite a different thing from the census we have heard so much about. There is being an effort made to improve the quality of particular dairy cows. One of the most effective pieces of work ever done, I think, in the improvement of dairy animals

has been done by ex-Governor Hoard of Wisconsin, a well known dairy writer and authority of the United States. Governor Hoard edits and publishes a journal known as 'Hoard's Dairyman,' in the neighbourhood of his own home, where he has not only a printing office but a record office. He has been making records of the different herds of animals, and of individual animals, and showing the difference there is between the herds in different parts of the country.

The records which he has already collected are very startling and have attracted a great deal of attention in the dairy world. I venture to say that no work could be done which would do so much to improve our dairy animals as the keeping of records to show the great difference of production and of work, if I may call it so, of our dairy cows. I want to inaugurate that kind of work and to try to bring it about that our dairy interests throughout the country will not only study as to which is the best herd, but as to which of the animals in each herd is doing good work and which is running her owner into debt, for I am sorry to say that there are a great many cows in this country which are not only of no use to their owners but are worse than useless because they run them into debt. A great deal of work of this kind has been done in Denmark where the dairy interests are the best organized of any in the world. I have had a report upon the system established there for this purpose and it seems to have worked out most satisfactorily. If we can accomplish one-tenth, I might almost say one-hundredth, of the good results which have been accomplished by this method in Denmark in Canada during the next ten years, we will add $1,000,000 per annum to the value of the product of the same number of cows.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister explain the superiority of the Danish over the Canadian system ?

Mr. FISHER. The organization there is very superior. They have been doing work among their farmers which we have not yet been able to accomplish. The dairymen have formed among themselves associations for this kind of work and they keep records of each cow and then compare notes. Each association employs an expert to make tests of the milk, for butter-fat, &c. They have also adopted more generally than any other country in the world the co-operation system in dairying by which the factories are owned and operated by joint stock companies, the shares of which are held by the men who supply the milk. In that way each and every one is interested personally in his own success and in their joint success, with the result that the work is carried on in a better manner and with better organization than in any other place in the world.

Mr. BLAIN. What kind of cows do they use ?

Mr. FISHER. Chiefly the dairy breed which is native to Denmark, called, I think, the Anglian.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. No it will not be carried for four hours unless we get the information.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly the hon. gentleman will get all the information he desires.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. We come next to the dairying.

Mr. FISHER. We have for dairying $60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. To what extent have cheese makers availed themselves of these cheese curing rooms ?

Mr. FISHER. We have the four establishments and they have been filled to overflowing with the exception of that at St. Hyacinthe. Those at Cowansville, Brockville and Woodstock were full to overflowing all season and this year that at St. Hyacinthe is also full.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any charge for the use of the rooms ?

Mr. FISHER. We have taken a certain amount of the profit. There are two profits due to the curing of cheese in this room. The cheese is of a better quality so that there is an average increase in price of about one-eighth of a cent a pound. There is also less shrinkage in cheese cured in these cool curing rooms than in the ordinary curing rooms and we have taken for ourselves the difference in the shrinkage.

Mr. SPROULE. Do cheese shrink at all if properly cooled ? I wonder what my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. MacLaren) says to that ?

Mr. A. F. MacLAREN. I was going to ask the minister about the paraffining of cheese. Cheese which has been paraffined does not shrink, but cheese which has not been paraffined does shrink. I have known cheese which has not been paraffined to shrink from one to three pounds a box in ordinary cellars or curing rooms in two or three months, but if the cheese is paraffined there is very little shrinkage. I would like to have the minister's opinion as to that.

Mr. FISHER. The cheese in our curing rooms are not paraffined until they are about ten days old. We experimented with paraffining cheese at the very commencement, but now we wait until it is ten days old. As we know, the cheese does shrink in the first ten days of the curing, but after they are paraffined they do not shrink much more.

Mr. A. F. MacLAREN. Do you still paraffine cheese as you put them in storage, when they are ten days old ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN. Do you think it is a good idea ?

Mr. FISHER. My expert officers think so.

Mr. MacLAREN. It would be a great mistake to paraffine them too soon and before a certain amount of evaporation takes place. It would not be a bad idea to issue to the cheese-makers throughout the country instructions as to paraffining, because sometimes they paraffine them too soon, and sometimes when they are too old.

Mr. FISHER. That information has been given.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to extend these four central stations ?

Mr. FISHER. These were established as a test in the curing of cheese, and also as a test of the feasibility of collecting cheese for curing under one roof. These four establishments were quite sufficient to carry out this test. I do not think it will be necessary for the government to increase the number of these curing rooms, but this year I intend to undertake the work along somewhat different lines. A good many people think that the system of central curing rooms is not so economical and efficient on the whole as to induce a large number of factories to improve their own curing rooms. I have been arranging this year to fit up and improve four ordinary cheese factories where the cheese would be cured under ordinary conditions, except that there would be the addition of a room where the temperature could be controlled. I propose to spend a little money on that.

Mr. SPROULE. How much ?

Mr. FISHER. I think $5,000.

Mr. A. F. MacLAREN. Where are these factories to be located ?

Mr. FISHER. In the Lake St. John district. In that district the dairying is making great strides, but still they are not in a central district where they can get the advantage of these curing rooms, and we intend to fit up four factories there to illustrate this kind of work.

Mr. TAYLOR. In reference to the paraffining of cheese, I want to read the following extract from the trade bulletin :

> The London special correspondent of the 'Trade Bulletin' writes that journal 'Bristol buyers advise me this week that there is too much waxed cheese coming in, and as they have objected to this before, it is a pity makers do not take the hint.'
>
> The 'Trade Bulletin' thereupon returns to the discussion of the subject and says : 'It is to be regretted that the government Agricultural Department at Ottawa should have advocated the waxing of cheese with paraffine by factorymen, especially as there is such great objection to paraffined cheese on the other side of the Atlantic, and as our makers are supposed to study the requirements of the trade there, it is to be hoped that they will discontinue this highly objectionable practice. A Montreal exporter while in England last fall was instructed by three firms there not to ship them a box of waxed cheese as their customers strongly objected to them, on the grounds that the cheese lost considerable weight ; one importer stating that he would not buy waxed cheese unless he was allowed 2 pounds per box. What is required in the English market is cheese with a bright natural skin in the summer time, and cheese made in the fall should appear in the natural condition with a nice dry green mold on the skin, showing a little maturity. Paraffined cheese prevents this natural appearance, besides causing loss in weight to the retailer. As so many objections continue to be raised in the great consuming centres of Great Britain against waxing cheese, surely our factorymen will not persist in a practice that is calculated to injure the enviable prestige of their goods in the English market.

Cheese have to evaporate, and if you paraffine them and seal them, just so soon as the retailer cuts them on his counter they will evaporate, and he will suffer loss. The British market is protesting against this system. This question and the question of the cool curing rooms was discussed at the Brockville Board of Trade a few days ago. The minister is not going to extend the cool curing rooms, and the reason is that his friends are protesting against it. Mr. Evertts, one of the strongest supporters of the present government in the constituency, has this to say :

> M. K. Evertts, the extensive cheese manufacturer, who now resides in Smith's Falls, spoke at considerable length, roundly denouncing the Ottawa government on its dairy policy, particularly the introduction of the experimental cheese curing stations, which he characterized as the biggest humbug ever imposed upon the people.

That is the language used by one of the supporters of the Minister of Agriculture, a gentleman who is a large manufacturer of cheese in the constituency of Leeds, and who is opposed to these cool curing rooms. As a matter of fact, the one at Brockville is not central, but we find that the government last year spent $1,100 to pay the farmers for drawing their cheese to it, because they would not do so without that inducement. Mr. Evertts controls some eighteen or twenty factories, and he says that this system introduced by the Minister of Agriculture is the biggest humbug ever perpetrated upon the people. That remark does not come from a Tory source ; it comes from a gentleman who is one of the strongest supporters of the present government and who is one of the largest cheese manufacturers in the country. The Minister of Agriculture says he will spend $5,000 in the

Lake St. John district this year, and I find that last year $3,475 were paid as bonuses in Quebec, that Prince Edward Island got $150, and that Ontario got $325.

Mr. FISHER. For what ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe that any factory that puts in a load of sawdust and a few loads of ice gets a bonus.

Mr. FISHER. These are all butter factories ; not cheese factories.

Mr. TAYLOR. If instead of spending $82,000 on these illustration stations he would give it in bonuses to factories producing a certain quantity, he would have object lessons all over the country, and not have the thing confined to four places all over the Dominion.

Mr. FISHER. These bonuses are under a system which has been established for seven years. A bonus of $100 is paid to any butter factory which would establish a cold storage room, and this has induced factories to put in cool storage rooms and has contributed very materially to the improved quality of our butter. I believe that nearly three-fourths of all the butter factories in Canada have adopted this system. There are a great many more butter factories in Quebec than in Ontario. Every one knows that while Ontario is the great cheese-producing province, Quebec is the great butter producing province. The people of Quebec, with their natural enterprise, put up these butter factories first and got the bonuses. A great many of these factories were drawing bonuses before, but a good many did not begin until last year.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you give a bonus wherever there is a butter factory ?

Mr. FISHER. We give a bonus wherever there is a butter factory fitted up with cold storage and otherwise equipped in accordance with the requirements. We give $50 in the first year, and $25 in each of the two succeeding years, if it is operated, making $100 in three years. I am glad to know that over two-thirds of all the butter factories in Canada have earned the bonus, the result being that during the last year or two we have not expended quite as much as we did a few years ago. The province of Quebec is increasing its number of factories, and consequently its production of butter very largely and rapidly, and therefore draws more of these bonuses than other parts of the country. All other parts of the country, however, are free to draw it wherever the conditions are fulfilled. My hon. friend spoke about the paraffining of cheese. I am free to admit that there has been a difference of opinion on that subject. When paraffined cheese was first sent to England the trade viewed it with some suspicion, and in some instances sent out instructions to buyers not to buy it. But we have this noteworthy fact, that during the present season at every one of these stations the cheese in the cool-curing rooms has been all paraffined, and this cheese has been sold under a special brand and at a higher price than any other cheese in the neighbourhood.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Evertts contradicts that.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot help that ; the facts contradict Mr. Evertts. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that cool-cured cheese is sold in a class by itself and commands from one-eighth to one-quarter cent per pound more than any other cheese sold on the same board. Mr. Evertts is a well-known dairyman, and if he said that at all, he must have said it over a year ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was less than a year ago. It was last fall.

Mr. FISHER. That was when the prejudice still existed with regard to paraffined cheese. I admit that when the cheese was paraffined at a day old, the results were not as good as they are to-day, when it is paraffined at ten days old.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Evertts did not refer to the paraffining at all. It was the cool-curing he referred to.

Mr. FISHER. I thought the hon. gentleman said that statement had reference to the paraffining. I can only say that the price obtained to-day for cheese which comes out of the cool-curing rooms is sufficient to refute that statement, whether it applies to paraffining or cool-curing.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you pay all the cost of this system ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. When we first established these factories, nobody knew what it would cost, and we thought it advisable to facilitate as much as we could the dairymen sending their cheese to them.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you continue that system now ?

Mr. FISHER. It is proposed to continue it this season ; but in another season it will not be worked out on the same basis. As an illustration I may state that this year a factory at Brockville which had not been sending its cheese to the cool-curing room came to the manager of the station and begged to be allowed to do so. The manager asked the reason, and he was told that it was because a Montreal firm had informed them that they could give a quarter of a cent per pound more for the whole season's output if it were put into the government cool-curing room than if it were cooled at home. I am satisfied that in another year all the factories will draw their cheese to the cool-curing room, because we have proved the advantages of it.

Mr. SPROULE. That may have been a device of the buyer of the cheese. The devices of the trade are very numerous.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the hon. gentleman need assign that motive.

Mr. A. F. MacLAREN. When cheese is properly cured, put into cold storage at the proper age, and properly paraffined, its quality is greatly improved. The great difficulty is the lack of education on the part of those dealing with the cheese when to paraffine it. Last year a great many cheeses were paraffined too green and put into the cold storage room too green; but now they are doing better and getting a higher price for the cheese. It is all a matter of education, and when that is accomplished the paraffining and cold storage of cheese will be of great benefit to the people of this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Speaking of the cool curing stations, Mr. Evertts, said:

The money used in the erection and carrying on of these curing rooms was a useless expenditure. Mr. Evertts claimed that the results achieved did not warrant their continuance in operation. They did not aid the patrons in obtaining one-sixteenth of a cent more for their cheese than others.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, this year.

Mr. TAYLOR. (reading)——

He challenged a single person to contradict him. These rooms were held up as models for others to follow. How many had built curing rooms after the fashion of the Brockville pine monument? Not a one. And as to the cost of construction, operation, &c., the country was yet in darkness, notwithstanding a deliberate promise made by Professor Ruddick last year to give such information. Mr. Evertts said the dairymen were getting their eyes opened. There was too much playing to the gallery by men in high places.

If anybody gets the benefit, it is the buyer, because the seller does not put his cheese into these curing rooms. No farmer or manufacturer will hold his cheese two or three weeks. He sells to the buyers every week, and if any one puts the cheese in to these cool curing rooms, it must be the buyer. Take the Brockville board and you will see that the cheeses sold there have not been in the cold storage rooms. The department paid $1,111.06 for hauling cheese to the station and deliberately bought a lot and put it in these rooms and are still holding it. They have not sold it yet, if the return brought down is correct.

Mr. FISHER. I have not got this week's sales at Brockville, but I have the report of the 27th of June and I find that the prices then were eight cents, but that the cool cured cheese brought 8 3-16, 8⅛, 8¼, 8⅜ and 8½.

An hon. MEMBER. Who got the benefit?

Mr. FISHER. The patrons and the bankers did. The buyer will get another benefit because when he sells in England he will get ⅛ of a cent more or ¼ of a cent more for this cool cured cheese than for the other. What is more, those paraffine cheeses that came from the cool curing room weighed more per hundred pounds of the milk put into them than did the other cheese which was sold for eight cents. So that the patrons who had their cheese in the cool room gets the advantage both ways. My hon. friend has said that no one has taken advantage of this. Why, right in Mr. Evertt's own district, I have a list of the factories who have cool curing rooms on the model of the one at Brockville, but of course not on the same scale. There are these cool curing rooms at Oxford Mills, Patterson's Corners, the Farmer's Own Factory, the Enterprise Factory and a number of others. And there is a factory with these cool rooms in the Smith's Falls section, so that the hon. gentleman will see that these factories have taken example of the model we have set them and are doing the work themselves. The object is to improve the dairy business, and we have to expend money for the purpose of getting at the facts. Then we can give the facts and data to the public and the public can make use of them. The results are not to be estimated by the returns of any individual outlay, but by the advantage which the whole industry reaps from the expenditure. That is the principle we go on in our agricultural investigations.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that the minister has purchased cheese which he has not yet sold?

Mr. FISHER. When we were making the experiment we tried to put in one or two cheese in each case from the same vat—two of them in the cool curing room and two of them in an ordinary curing room. As those cheese belonged to the patrons, it would not be fair to experiment with them at the expense of the experimenters. Therefore we bought them, and as last year the cheese market was rather demoralized, a good many we bought early in the season could not sell to advantage.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that last year was a great cheese market.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman will ask the buyers and sellers he will find it was not. The patrons got high prices, but we were buyers and were in the same position as many who bought cheese at prices in the early part of the season which it has never reached since.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was the aggregate loss?

Mr. FISHER. The year before there was a profit and last year there was a loss. The whole transaction is not yet finished, but the loss will be under $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister know how much of that is due to the bad system

of keeping and curing cheese and how much to the fall in the market ?

Mr. FISHER. There was no bad system of keeping and curing. The cheese that was cured sold at a higher price than the other.

Mr. A. F. MacLAREN. If you paid the average price this spring, there would be necessarily a loss of two or three cents a pound after paying interest and storage.

Mr. FISHER. They have been shipped to England, but we have not yet got the returns. We had to keep them for experimental purposes in order to judge of the effects of cool-curing as against the ordinary curing. Had we shoved them off on the market, we would not have been able to test them.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that by the fall the cheese were pretty well sold off.

Mr. FISHER. Not so soon as that. In any case it would not do to shove these cheese off on the market a few days after they were bought.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman says he got them from week to week commencing last May. Surely they did not need to be kept until this May.

Mr. FISHER. I am told that they were sold at an average of three or four months old. But we cannot make up a statement of the exact details until we get the returns from England.

Mr. SPROULE. And the hon. gentleman lost about $2,000 on the transaction ?

Mr. FISHER. About that.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an admirable example to set the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. Even if we had bought these cheese as an ordinary commercial transaction we might have lost on them, as business men have lost this year. But, we had to keep the cheese regardless of the condition of the market in order to carry on the test we were making. Had we shoved them on the market to take advantage of a temporary rise in price, we might better never have bought them at all, because our tests would not have been carried out and our report could not have been made.

Mr. SPROULE. That is about on a par with the explanation given by the boy as to why the rabbit climbed the hemlock tree—he had to climb it, the dog was so close behind him.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find that in 1902-3, the minister purchased for the Woodstock cool-curing room, $3,085 worth of cheese, and in 1903-4, $6,829 worth. Now, can he tell us why he wanted to buy about $10,000 worth of cheese ? And will he say, in view of these purchases, that he has not been speculating in cheese ? I have the reports for the other cool-curing rooms here, and I find that altogether he bought about $40,000 or $50,000 worth of cheese. The cheese that he bought for Cowansville in 1902-3 he sold at a loss of $224.78. For the next year he bought $4,103.47 worth, from which he has a revenue of $1,370. But in this return he says that the cheese for that year is not all disposed of and so the revenue is not all in.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 155) for the relief of Annie Christman.—Mr. Calvert.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOWLER. I was asking the minister before six o'clock about the salary of the assistant to the commissioner, at St. Louis, Mr. E. P. Eastman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Eastman receives $7 a day to cover everything. He also receives his transportation from his home to St. Louis and back at the close of the exhibition. That is what I pay to all of those of that status.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the minister aware that he is not a British subject ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I was not aware of that.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Eastman is not a British subject, he is an American. He has been resident for some years in New Brunswick but has always refused to become a naturalized British subject and remains an American citizen to this day. I think the minister could not have been aware of that.

Mr. FISHER. No I was not.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose the minister will follow up the course which I believe is being adopted with respect to American engineers on the Grand Trunk Pacific and will at once have the appointment cancelled. It seems to me there would be enough Canadian applicants for a position of that kind and that it should be given to a Canadian rather than to a foreign citizen.

Mr. FISHER. I certainly intended to appoint Canadians and I will inquire into that matter.

Mr. FOWLER. If the minister finds that this person is an American citizen I would like to know what course he will take.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to inquire into all the circumstances of the case before making a definite answer, but cer-

tainly my policy would be to employ Canadians under all circumstances.

Mr. FOWLER. I can scarcely conceive of any circumstance which would justify an appointment of this kind. The fact that this gentleman has resided for some time within the borders of Canada would not be a justification, if the gentleman has persistently refused to become a Canadian citizen. His appointment would be worse under these circumstances than if he had been on this side only a few months and had not gained that knowledge which would convince him of the superiority of Canadian over American citizenship. I would like to have a straight expression of opinion from the minister as to what he would do if the facts bear out my statement.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman's statement is absolutely accurate all through it would appear to be an exaggerated case. I can, however imagine that a man might reside in this country for many years and not become naturalized. In my own county which is a border district I have known men to live in Canada for 20 or 30 years who have never gone through the form of naturalization, and the question of their citizenship has never come up unless they have sought to vote at an election and have been challenged. Of course if my hon. friend is correct in saying this gentleman has persistently refused in an offensive way to become a Canadian citizen that would have to be taken into consideration. I would not care to say more than I have, that in a general way my policy would be to employ Canadians only, and if an individual in the government employ showed himself to be antagonistic to the nationality of Canada I do not think it would be wise to retain him in our employment.

Mr. FOWLER. When I say he refused I mean that he refused by neglecting to do so although the matter was brought many times to his attention because he had on several occasions tried to vote and had been challenged, run out of the booth and refused the chance to vote. Thus the matter has been brought very closely to his attention and it certainly must be some inherent dislike to Canadian citizenship that has prevented his becoming naturalized. He has been an active politician outside of voting but he has never been permitted to vote because he would not become a Canadian citizen although reaping all the benefits of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. FISHER. I will look into the matter carefully.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total cost of the St. Louis exhibition be ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that we have spent in the neighbourhood of $125,000 for the past fiscal year and that the total cost will be between $275,000 and $300,000 according to expectation.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that very much larger than was anticipated ?

Mr. FISHER. I think, speaking from memory, that I estimated it would be about $250,000 to $275,000.

For the branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, including live stock, dairy, cold storage, extension of markets, poultry, seed and fruit division ; employees paid from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $220,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The day before yesterday when we were discussing poultry stations and chicken feeding, I understood the minister to say that the poultry, owing to the experimental way in which they were fed and marketed, realized 10, 12, and 15 cents per pound. Now I find in the Auditor General's Report, that from the Alberton station, P.E.I., there were sold to Montreal 321 pounds, for $16.05 of these specially fed, scientifically killed chickens, packed in a crate and sent in cold storage to Montreal, realizing 5 cents a pound. From Mount Stewart, P.E.I., there were sent 52 cases to Great Britain, 2,466 pounds, realizing $236.15, or a fraction over 9 cents per pound, less freight and all expenses. Of 433 pounds of poultry from Rogersville, N.B., 201 pounds were sold in Montreal, realizing $10.05, or 5 cents per pound. From Bondville, Que., 11 cases were sold in Montreal, 558 pounds, realizing $40.26, or 7 cents per pounds, after deducting freight expenses. From Chicoutimi there were fourteen cases sold to Great Britain, 557 pounds, for $33.25, or 6 cents and a fraction per pound. Holmesville, Ont. —my hon. friend dilated for a long time on the great showing made by Holmesville—I see there were 59 cases, containing 750 chickens, weighing 2,617 pounds, sold in Great Britain and realizing $97.92, or 3¾ cents per pound. Now, any old woman in the country, catching a scrub chicken, twisting its neck her own way, could pluck the feathers off it and sell it for a good deal more than these chickens that were killed scientifically, packed in crates, put in cold storage and sent to Great Britain and sold for 3¾ cents per pound. Renfrew—I am sorry my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Wright) is not here ; I find in the Auditor General's Report D—112 what was done at Renfrew. There were sold to Great Britain twelve cases, 625 pounds, for $43.84, or 7 cents per pound. That is what the chickens brought raised in Renfrew. Now these are just a few samples, and I want the minister to explain why he made the statement the day before yesterday with regard to the chickens that were experimented on, when some of them did not bring as much as the cost of their food, to say nothing about any other expenses ; they did not realize as much money as was paid out for the chickens and for the food they ate. Why, these chickens sent from Holmesville to Great Britain only brought 3¾ cents per pound.

It must be either that the chickens were spoiled after being scientifically fed, or in the killing process their necks were broken the wrong way. Something must have damaged the flavour of the meat, or it would have brought more than that; or it was perhaps the defective cold storage of the hon. gentleman. I want the hon. gentleman to explain how that came about.

Mr. SPROULE. He might also remember the statement he made yesterday, which was supported by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright), that owing to the splendid way the chickens were fattened, the attractiveness of the food to the human family, the market had been wonderfully increased, and people were consuming much more; the market had increased and the chickens realized a larger price.

Mr. FISHER. I have not got the details here to show why some of these lots were sold at those low prices. But right alongside of them my hon. friend will see there are other instances where chickens did sell at 12 and 13 cents a pound. I have not got the details of these sales at low prices. There must have been something wrong, but what it was I cannot tell. What I read the other night was a statement of those men who had sold at the prices indicated, who had watched the operation of these stations, and had themselves sold the chickens at the prices I gave. The chickens were fattened on the principles taught at those stations, which these gentlemen themselves had managed successfully in that way. There must be some explanation for the low prices, perhaps in regard to the export, or something of that kind.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the station in Prince Edward Island in charge of a man named Haszard, who is now the hon. member for West Queen's ?

Mr. FISHER. That station was not in charge of Mr. Haszard. It was in charge of a Charlottetown gentleman who was recommended by Mr. Haszard to run that station, and for a little while the accounts of the station went through Mr. Haszard's hands. But he was not then a member of the House. Because the accounts went through his hands for a little while his name appears in the Auditor General's Report. As a matter of fact he was simply the medium of communication between the department and the man who was doing the work at that station.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that man still in charge; I think he was not a very successful operator ?

Mr. FISHER. That station is closed and I believe the man who had charge of it is doing business on his own account.

Mr. FOWLER. The same business.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, fattening and selling chickens.

Mr. FOWLER. The cost of that station was $290 and the return $6. I hope he will do better than that on his own account.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman had the full information he would find the circumstances different.

Mr. FOWLER. That is what the Auditor General's Report showed.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but the Auditor General's Report closes on the 30th of June, and while the expenditure appears one year the receipts would appear in the next year.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not account for it, because for two or three years in succession the expenditure has been very much larger than the receipts. Yesterday the minister told us with a flourish of trumpets that his cold storage was perfection, and that the method adopted for fattening chickens was perfection, but now we find that the chickens fattened at Holmesville under his scientific system were sold in England for three and a half cents per pound, so that either the cold storage or the fattening process is a failure. Will the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) explain ?

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention of the department to continue the chicken fattening stations as heretofore ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. Occasionally we close some up and then we start another in a different locality so as to educate the people in the vicinity of each station, and in some cases the men in charge go into business on their own account. I have promised to start one or two in Manitoba, and one or two in British Columbia next year in compliance with the wishes of the people, who are anxious to have them.

Mr. SPROULE. How many stations are now in operation ?

Mr. FISHER. Seventeen.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the revenue from, and the expenditure on these stations last year ?

Mr. FISHER. That would have to be figured out.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can give my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) the information. According to the Auditor General's Report these seventeen stations cost last year $14,929.49; the revenue from them was $4,327.85 and the net loss to the country $10,601.64.

Mr. SPROULE. That's a splendid lesson for the farmers of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. More than that; taking the cost of the feed and the cost of the chickens, not including labour or any other

expense, the loss was $2,693.66. At Holmesville, there was a difference between the sales and the cost of the chickens and the feed of $363. We are told that this is accounted for because the chickens had their necks twisted the wrong way and they sold for only three and three-quarter cents per pound in England. At Bondville, P.Q., the cost of chickens and feed was $889, the sales brought $485, and the loss $404. The Bondville chickens sold for five cents a pound in Montreal and some shipped to England from Holmesville brought only three and three-quarter cents to seven and a half cents per pound. This proves that either the cold storage or the fattening system is defective.

Mr. FISHER. No one ought expect that the work of these stations should be covered by the sales, but there is some justification for what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) says. I believe it is correct to say that in some cases the chickens have not sold for as much as the food and the first cost of the chickens. I have been inquiring and I have found that there have been mistakes made and some leakages. The management of some of these stations cannot be allowed to continue. I do not expect that the sales of the chickens will cover the teaching and illustration work, but they certainly should pay for the prime cost and the cost of the feed. There is no question about that; there is no excuse for anything else and I am now having it thoroughly investigated to see just where the leakage is. It is abundantly possible to buy chickens in the ordinary markets from the farmers, fatten them, and sell them at a profit. That has been done over and over again in these stations. There are instances in which it has not been done. I believe that in some cases they have bought poor chickens. In other cases they have been incited by competition to buy too many chickens and to pay too much for them. The proper control has not been exercised over these operations ; but I expect to correct that, so that such instances as my hon. friend has cited will not be found in future. But I think it is important that the work should go on in the country, because I know how successful it has been in many ways, and how it has resulted in a very large increase in poultry production, and a considerable increase in profit to a large number of farmers and poultry owners who have followed the lines of this work.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend says there is a leak in some of these stations, and he is having the cause of it investigated. There must be a leak in every one of them, because every one shows a loss as between the cost of the chickens and the feed and the revenue. There have been the following losses : Alberton, P.E.I., $74.98 ; Eldon, P.E.I., $181.49 ; Glenfinnan, P.E.I., $155.08; Mount Stewart, P.E.I., $113.57. Rusticoville, P.E.I., $75.08 ; Vernon River, P.E.I., $36.74 ; Amherst, N.S., $331.77 ; Mabou, N.S., $151.39 ; Andover, N.B., $227.57 ; Rogersville, N.B., $105.45 ; Bondville, Que., $397.79 ; Chicoutimi, Que., $97.74 ; Bowmanville, Ont., $258.69 ; Holmesville, Ont., $455.85 ; Renfrew, Ont., $12.23 ; Calgary, N. W. T., $18.24. And yet the hon. member for West Huron says the farmers of his part of the country are delighted with this system, under which the chickens have been sold for 3¾ cents a pound after having been fed on this scientific plan and after having had their necks broken in the most scientific manner. No wonder my hon. friend wants it to continue in his constituency. I think the opposition would do right to oppose the voting of a dollar to continue this business, and to ask the minister to stop it at once, so that that loss to the country of $10,000 which occurred last year will not be repeated.

Mr. SPROULE. I think they must have fed these chickens on sawdust and starved them to death. I am surprised that the minister is not almost ashamed of himself, after the glowing speech he made yesterday about the wonderful development there was in the poultry trade of this country owing to the splendid lessons which had been given to the farmers by these chicken stations, and the increased price at which poultry had been sold as a result of being scientifically fattened. He made out that the consumption had been immensely increased because the chickens were so much more appreciated. He had told the farmers of this country that he wanted to go into a new line which would only cost them $14,929. and yet the very first year there is a loss of $10,000 out of the $15,000 expended—two-thirds of the whole sum, besides all the labour which went for nothing. What a wonderful sense of gratitude the farmers of Canada ought to have toward the Minister of Agriculture for these chicken-fattening stations. It seems to me that one of two things accounts for the result—either that the system is bad or that the cold storage is bad. We were treated to a glowing description of the cold storage, which was represented to be the very best that could be devised ; yet the chickens were sold at 3¾ cents a pound when an old woman can bring chickens to the market from the barnyard, where they are not fattened at all, and sell them at 8 cents or 9 cents, or 10 cents a pound. I want to point out that at each of the experimental farms there is a chicken branch and a professor of poultry. What is he doing ? He is teaching the farmers the best breeds for laying purposes and the best breeds for fattening. All these farms are experimenting along these lines and every year their reports give the results of these experiments. We thought that was enough. A couple of thousands of dollars a year are

spent at the Central farm for this purpose, and I do not know how much at the other farms. Why should this work be duplicated? The hon. minister is starting another system of chicken stations and experimenters all over the country, so that at each place a good supporter can get $300 or $400 for amusing himself by fattening chickens that sell at 3½ cents or 3¾ cents a pound. We have reports from the experimental farms distributed to the farmers of the country, containing presumably the very knowledge we are trying to get from individuals in various parts of the country. Is it necessary to squander the public money in this way? For every dollar of return to the people they spend $3, of which $2 have gone to the government supporter or gone to waste in order to show how you can fatten chickens at a loss every time. What kind of a lesson is that to give to the farmers of the country? Will they thank the government for it? Will they regard the Minister of Agriculture or those under him as adepts in the chicken business? I do not think they will. The very disclosures which have been made are the strongest argument that the money used for this purpose is thrown away, and that the boasted cold storage which we have heard so much about is a failure as well. There is no doubt whatever of this, as otherwise more would have been realized from these stations. Take the chickens on an ordinary farm that are running about picking up refuse and comparatively speaking not fed at all, they are sold at better prices and yield more profitable returns.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the policy of the hon. gentleman to continue keeping up these fattening stations? It seems to me that when a fattening station has been in operation in any locality for two or three years, the farmers there ought to have learned all they can from the process, and these stations might very well be abandoned. Take the station at Holmesville, and the figures show the expenditure last year $2,793.79 and the revenue $554.57, leaving a deficit of $2,229.22. If this station be established for educational purposes, my hon. friend who represents that county has not been very well educated. Of course he is occupying the chair and I do not want to say very much about him, but he told the House that the people up there were delighted with it, and that before these chicken fattening stations were put in operation, chickens were sold at about five cents a pound, whereas now they are sold at ten cents a pound. But it appears that the chickens fattened in the very establishment to which he was referring were sold at three and three-quarter cents a pound. It therefore does not look as if the policy adopted by the Minister of Agriculture was very educational in its effect.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FISHER. The poultry business has undoubtedly been stimulated by the establishment of these stations. There is a larger number of birds raised and fattened than ever before, and as a rule the prices are higher because these birds are better fattened. The hon. gentleman has made a suggestion which is quite in line with what we have been doing. As a general rule these fattening stations are not carried on for more than two or three years in certain localities. But in Holmesville and in one or two places in Prince Edward Island and the province of Quebec, we have breeding stations. We have found by a series of experiments that the birds we raise do better than those we buy for fattening purposes, and we therefore have been breeding birds of a particular type; and as a matter of fact, last season a large number were sold for breeding purposes instead of being fattened. Over 2,000 were thus sold. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has hit the nail on the head to a certain extent, because we have been trying to encourage the breeding of this type and have probably been selling them too cheap.

Mr. TAYLOR. They do not cost anything to raise.

Mr. FISHER. It costs something to raise them. But we find there is always a strong request to us not to close a station once it is started, and I have perhaps not been as strict in that respect as I ought to be and hope to be in future.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it a good plan to have so many of these establishments? If the stations on the experimental farm are carried on on the same lines and the information disseminated through bulletins, our farmers will get all the information they need in that way.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the object lessons furnished by these stations has done a great deal of good.

Mr. SPROULE. I am unable to see how that can be. If a farmer were to follow the example set by the government, he would soon find himself in the poorhouse, and the only lesson he would take from these stations would be to avoid what is being done there because their experiments result in a loss. I think it is radically wrong that we should not only keep up these stations on our experimental farms, but duplicate them all over the country. There is evidently a great leak somewhere, and it is about time that it was found out, because year by year this thing instead of getting better is getting worse. It seems to me it is about time to drop the business and come down to common sense.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I know something about the business in Prince Edward Island. Whether or not the stations there are pay-

ing, is not the question. It is true there is quite a difference between the receipts obtained from the chickens fattened and sold according to the methods followed at these experimental stations and the expenditure, but the stations were not established to make money, rather to educate the people in this line of business. I know that the farmers of Prince Edward Island, where these fattening stations are in existence, are now raising a better breed of chickens and making more money. The local market has been very much improved. The price in the Charlottetown market is now fully 100 per cent more than it was a few years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the price now ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. A pair of chickens last year was bringing in the local market from 80 cents to $1. A few years ago they would sell at from 40 cents to 50 cents. As to the receipts from these chicken fattening stations, I know that in some cases a breed of chickens was purchased for the purpose of showing that it would not be profitable to raise them. It was not intended to make a profit in every case. I know also that whatever may be said as to beneficial results from the fattening of chickens at the experimental farm, the farmers where these illustration stations are carried on have obtained very much benefit through them, and would be very much opposed to having them closed. Whether the expense is too great or not, that may be a question for discussion. But I have not the slightest doubt that, whatever the direct results, the indirect results in the way of benefits to the farmers are very marked, and as the farmers do not get much in the way of protection or bounties, I think that all they get in this way we should not begrudge them.

Mr. SPROULE. As the hon. gentleman is so sure of the beneficial results, can he tell us how many farmers in his section have adopted the cramming process ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I know that they are raising a better breed of chickens.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are they feeding with cramming machines ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. They are paying more attention to raising and feeding. The business is very much improved.

Mr. SPROULE. In the county from which I come there is not one of these stations so far as I know. Yet the quantity of chickens raised is about ten times as great as it was a couple of years ago.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. You do not want a station there ; you are getting along well enough without it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am showing that the development of the poultry trade is not due to the information disseminated by means of these chicken fattening stations, because where that information has never been acted upon the development is quite as great as it is elsewhere. The best evidence that this information is not acted upon is the fact that not many farmers have adopted the cramming process. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) if he can point to one man in his section who has adopted that process ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If the committee will bear with me for a moment and will permit a digression from the chicken question, I would like to refer to a statement with regard to Mr. Eastman, who is engaged at the St. Louis exhibition. The statement is made that he is an American citizen. I wish to correct that statement, and say that Mr Eastman has lived in the province of New Brunswick for upwards of thirty-five years, that he has been engaged in the lumber business, that he is a man of the highest character, and that he is a naturalized British subject.

Mr. SPROULE. When was he naturalized ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Within the last two or three years. I had to do with his naturalization papers myself and know the circumstances. I think it due to that gentleman and to the committee that the information should be given.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he get naturalized to vote for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) or to get this position ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He had neither object in view, I fancy. His family is established here, and he wished to claim all the rights of a British subject. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will not feel angry at the fact. I should think, rather, he would rejoice.

Mr. SPROULE. I am pleased to know that after thirty-five years Mr. Eastman was convinced that it was the part of wisdom to become a British subject. But the statement was made that he was sent out of a polling place and refused the right to vote because he was not a British subject by birth or naturalization.

Mr. EMMERSON. He could not be sent out of a polling place under those circumstances, because he never sought to vote until he was naturalized. I am familiar with his personal history and with his relations to the politics of the country. He is a man of the highest character ; treasurer for the province of New Brunswick of the High Court of Foresters ; known and very highly respected all over the province, and a prominent business man connected with the lumber industry.

Mr. SPROULE. Not a word was said against his character, and there was no desire to reflect upon it. The question was simply whether he was a British subject.

Mr. EMMERSON. He is not the man to seek to vote unless he had the right to

vote, and I contradict the insinuation or the statement made against him.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) has given us a lecture on the benefits to the farmers of his section resulting from the chicken fattening stations. He spoke of it as a protection to the farmers of Prince Edward Island. If it is a protection to the farmers of Prince Edward Island and it does not pay expenses that means that other parts of the country have to pay for the protection given to his constituents. Is there one of these stations that last year received enough from sales to pay for the chickens and the feed, to say nothing of other expenses ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the figures under my hand, but I am informed that several of them did.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. I would ask the hon. member for Prince Edward Island whether any of the stations in his section paid for the chickens and the feed ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I have not the figures.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. I am assured by those who have looked into the matter that not one of these stations have received enough from chickens sold to pay for the chickens and the feed that went to fatten them. This may be a protection to the people of Prince Edward Island, but is it fair to the rest of the Dominion ? It is surely unfair for one section to ask another section to pay for its benefits through a scheme that is established for the advantage of a few people who are supporting the party in power. This scheme has been a failure so far as making money is concerned, and if the people who are educated by these experiments follow the example of the people carrying on the experiments, it will certainly not add to our national wealth.

Why should they start any more ? We have in Ontario a splendid agricultural college and an agricultural farm for experimental purposes, and any one who wants to learn how to feed and fatten chickens can easily get the reports from that college, without it being necessary to duplicate these establishments all through the country. I think it is the duty of each province to start an agricultural farm and run it as its own expense. Now since the Minister of Agriculture has made a fair test of his business, I do not think it is in the interest of the farming community that he should continue it. Taking into consideration the cost of the test, the rent of the buildings, and all these things, he now knows for a certainty that chickens have not brought in any year the cost of their purchase and their feed ; and yet he wants to bleed the country to the tune of a good many more thousand dollars to establish these stations in other places. I know very well that where he starts a feeding station no Tory need apply for a position; but when it comes to paying the deficit each Tory has to pay his share. Now I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to drop these experiments since he has found them a failure. He acknowledged a while ago that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had struck the nail on the head when he said there was a leakage somewhere in giving out the fowl. I venture to say no Tory got those chickens at less than they are worth.

Mr. FISHER. Lots of them.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. If they were given away they were given away the same as appointments—to political friends.

Mr. FISHER. They were not given away, they were sold to anybody that came along.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. For less than they were worth ?

Mr. FISHER. For less than they would have fetched if we had tried to sell them for a high price. Our object was to disseminate the breed throughout the country.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. In Ontario all we have to do is to look up the records of what is done in the Agricultural College at Guelph, and we can certainly do as well fattening chickens there as the hon. gentleman. I would ask him as an honest representative of the farmers, after he has tested this business and found it a failure, to drop it.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice one thing peculiar about these experimental stations. There are three in the province of Ontario, and every one of them is in a Reform riding. One would imagine if they are to continue for the province of Ontario there should be some of these stations in Conservative ridings.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps the Reform members look better after their constituents.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. minister hears them better when they call. I see one at Bowmanville, in the county of Durham, represented by a good supporter of the present government. Another is in the county of West Huron, rather a noted county in western Ontario.

Mr. FISHER. A distinguished county.

Mr. BLAIN. The other is in Renfrew.

Mr. FISHER. Another distinguished county.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps they will be a little more distinguished after the next general election. But it does seem a little strange that these three establishments for the province of Ontario should be found in three Reform ridings. My hon. friend said he was selling these chickens cheap to the farmers, I hope he will not take advantage of

that practice when the election comes along. I think the minister will not deny that the chickens sold by the farmers generally in the province of Ontario are equal in every respect and bring as high a price as those from these establishments. For myself I do not think that these establishments so managed are in the interests of the people of Canada, but if the hon. gentleman thinks they are, he should distribute them more fairly, instead of confining them to Reform ridings.

Mr. LENNOX. I have the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Blain) and for the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but I do not share in the views they have expressed on this question. I am quite prepared to consent that in all these experimental matters we should pay out more money than we receive. If the minister could not account for the difference between the net receipts for the chickens and the expense for their food, I would have some hesitation in supporting the continuance of the experiment. But the minister has accounted for the deficiency. He has annnounced in the most definite way that this industry can be carried on in a manner that will make it ultimately profitable, and I believe that is the case. I do not think, however, the hon. minister has been as candid as he ought to have been, because the announcement he has made to-night he could have made last night when the same subject was before the House. I think we may now accept his statement that the shortage comes, not from the fact that a profit cannot be made, but from the fact that there has been mismanagement, and probably something worse than mismanagement in these matters. Now I suggest that the government shall continue these experiments. I believe there is an enormous demand for chickens. I believe that money can be made out of the business, and I believe in opening up all the avenues of industry and profitable investment in this country, and as this is one of those industries which is directly connected with the farm. I would like to see it continued. I want it continued in the future upon a proper business basis. The minister has admitted that there has been a leakage in this matter. He says that he does not believe it results from any favouritism. I do not care how it has happened, I think it should be prevented. This branch of the experimental work should be continued and in the future it may be made a profitable branch of the work. I think it is right to experiment in regard to this industry and I think that notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for Peel the farmers will approve of the expenditure of money upon this experiment but they will hold the government of course to an honest and careful expenditure of money even though it is for experimental purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. We are doing all this work at the farm and are sending out every year from 50,000 to 100,000 bulletins containing this information. I do not think we should duplicate any of this work. Why should these fattening stations be maintained, especially when out of every three dollars you put in them you lose two ?

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON. I can easily understand how the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) or any other member from a county where a fattening station is operated should be in favour of them. These stations provide a home market for these farmers for their chickens, and of course a home market is always the best. The fattening station takes up all the chickens from the surrounding country at a good price without any trouble to the farmers so of course they are in favour of it. But people who live in other parts of the country do not profit from the establishment of these stations as do the hon. member's supporters. In the county of Huron, of course, the station at Holmesville furnishes a home market for the chickens raised in that county and takes them off the hands of the farmers without any expense or trouble.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that the system of fattening chickens adopted by the Minister of Agriculture is rather getting away from the legitimate mode of farming operations. I think myself that the business of the farmer is to raise chickens, to raise as many as he can. In this the government can very materially assist him by having at all times a supply of the eggs of the best breeds of poultry not only for laying purposes but for food. Let the farmers be encouraged in every way possible by providing a full supply of eggs of the varieties that are most approved of, for the purposes of the fattening stations. I know in the section of country from which I come this process of stuffing chickens is not in vogue. I have not heard of its being adopted by any one, but I have known a person with a large poultry yard who desired to get rid of his whole flock to find no difficulty in selling them all, live weight, at 10 cents a pound. That I think is a great deal better than fattening and stuffing and selling them at 7 cents or even 10 cents a pound dead weight. I have an idea that it would be much better and more profitable to encourage the farmer to raise the chickens and sell them to professional chicken fatteners. You will find in large places such as Toronto, companies which will do this class of work. In Toronto I know there is a large company which will take all the chickens they can secure within a radius of some 30 or 40 miles of that city.

Mr. FISHER. At the fattening stations we do about the business the hon. gentle-

man speaks of, that is we buy the chickens from the farmers and fatten them. At the rearing stations we do that partly and we also raise them from eggs in order to compare the results from chickens raised on the spot and fed from birth and those which are picked up from farmers around. At the breeding stations we have been breeding birds which we think especially adapted for fattening purposes and also selling breeding eggs. That is the educational work that has been going on and largely as a result of what we have been doing the market in Toronto has vastly improved. I do not claim credit for the whole of it, but I do say that since we have commenced this fattening and preparing for market, and since attention has been directed to it, it has been constantly increasing and there is a very large market.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it is a matter that should be left largely to private enterprise. Are there any other fattening establishments throughout Canada such as I have described at Toronto.

Mr. FISHER. There are one or two others, but I think this is the best.

Mr. SPROULE. When the supplementary estimates come down we will want further information on cold storage, fruit, seed, and some other matters.

Mr. FISHER. I will be glad to give the information.

Mr. SPROULE. You had better not give it to-night, because it will take you till seven o'clock to-morrow morning. You can give it on the suplementary estimates.

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Mr. BLAIN. We will also want some information about this 'extension of markets.'

Mr. FISHER. Very well.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. The adjournment was rather earlier than I expected, and I had no opportunity to see the premier. I think I may safely say that we will continue in supply, and probably with the railway estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 25, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

TOBACCO COMMISSION.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the government, I would like to move :

That the report of Judge McTavish on the tobacco industry, the evidence taken by him and all documents filed, be printed forthwith, and that rule 99 be suspended for that purpose.

We have before us a very important resolution presented by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. L. P. Brodeur), the object of which is to remedy the grievances referred to in the commission with which Judge MacTavish was charged. Furthermore, the subject-matter is one which has attracted a great deal of attention, and I think it is highly desirable that the members of this House should be conversant with the results of this commission.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). I do not want to object to the motion, but I will suggest that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) wait until the Minister of Justice is present in the House. We will see that my hon. friend will have an opportunity of moving this resolution.

CANADIAN PRIZE WINNERS.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to refer to a matter which I think is of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the House ; that is, the fact that a Canadian, Private Perry, of Vancouver, B.C., has won the King's prize at Bisley camp. Private Perry, I believe, is the first Canadian-born soldier who has won this prize, although this prize was brought to Canada once before ; it was then brought by a citizen of Canada, but not by a man who had been born in this country. Private Perry also served with distinction in South Africa. I had the honour of sending a cablegram, as soon as the news reached Canada, to Private Perry through the commandant of the Bisley team, congratulating him upon his success. I am sure that this is a matter for congratulation upon the part of the militia of this country, on the part of this parliament and on the part of the people of Canada generally.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I can heartily endorse, on behalf of the opposition, the statements that have been made by the Minister of Militia, and I may say that I feel proud to know that the former winner of the King's prize was a Canadian citizen, even if he were not a Canadian born. I am not aware that it makes a difference whether a Canadian is born within the bounds of the Dominion or not, so long as he is a good Canadian citizen. We welcome all, they are

not strangers to this country, so long as they become good Canadian citizens. I was a little surprised to see the minister make that distinction.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, get out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Perry is an old Toronto boy, and has reflected credit on the militia force, both as a member of the Royal Grenadiers of Toronto, of the South Africa corps and of our Bisley rifle team.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I wish to remind the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that Canada has won even a larger share of honour, for a Canadian-born, although at present connected with the King's Colonials in London, Major Howard, the agent-general of the province of Nova Scotia, has won another of the great prizes at Bisley, the St. George's prize.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lou Scholes, a distinguished Canadian of Toronto, has shown himself to be the first oarsman of the world. Although many of our friends opposite come from the sea, we who live inland, on the shores of the great lakes, are expert in the matter of the oar, and we also are proud that our fellow-townsman, Lou Scholes, of Toronto, is one of a trio of Canadians who have distinguished themselves before the whole empire.

TOBACCO COMMISSION.

Mr. F. D. MONK. I may perhaps renew the motion I made in the absence of the right hon. the Prime Minister, as to which the Minister of Finance asked me to wait until the Minister of Justice arrived. It is a motion for the immediate printing of the evidence, &c., taken before the Royal Tobacco Commission. This evidence is of so much importance that I believe it should be circulated, not only amongst the members of this House, but among the large number of people outside this House who take a lively interest in this question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For my part, I can see no objection to the motion, but I do not see the necessity for immediate haste. I shall communicate with my colleague, the Minister of Justice, and when motion is made to go into committee my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will have an opportunity of renewing his motion.

QUESTIONS.

CANADIAN AND BRITISH POSTAL RATES.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What was the Canadian rate of postage in 1868 on letters, papers and parcel post ?

2. What was the rate of postage on letters, papers and parcel post to Great Britain in 1868 ?

3. What changes in rate of postage on letters, papers and parcel post have been made since 1868 for Canada and Great Britain ? And what are the dates of increase and decrease ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I find that the answer to this question is altogether too voluminous for the matter to be dealt with in the manner suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) in the way of questions and answer.

EXPERIMENTS WITH TOBACCO.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have any portions of the experimental farms been used during the past year for experimentation in tobacco-growing ? If so, what portions, and with what results ?

2. Have any bulletins been issued from the Department of Agriculture concerning the cultivation, curing and packing of tobacco since 1896 ?

3. Has the report made by Blaise Duguas on trade with Belgium been printed and circulated by the government ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance).

1. In 1903 about two-thirds of an acre at the Central Farm at Ottawa, was devoted to tobacco ; 51 varieties were tested in small plots, and three of the most popular sorts in larger plots. The very cool season of 1903 was not favourable for the tobacco and it did not fully mature. It was, however, cut and cured and has been used chiefly for spraying for the destruction of insect pests.

2. A bulletin on tobacco culture, No. 30 of the Experimental Farm series, was prepared by Dr. Wm. Saunders, Director of the Experimental Farms, and published in April, 1898. In this bulletin the following subjects were discussed : The growth of tobacco in Canada. the preparation of the soil, sowing of the seed, planting, cultivation, suckering, saving of seed, insect enemies, harvesting, drying, bulking and earliest and best yielding varieties.

Much information regarding tobacco and its cultivation has been given in the Annual Reports of the Experimental Farms from time to time since 1893, as follows :

	Page.
Report of Central Farm for 1893—	
Experiments with tobacco	121
Hints on tobacco culture	124
Analysis of leaves and stems	124
Harvesting and curing tobacco	125
Report of Central Farm for 1895—	
Experiments with tobacco	130
Report of Central Farm for 1896—	
Hints on culture of tobacco	179
When to cut tobacco	179
Growing tobacco for special purposes	180
Cigar wrappers and fillers	180
Report of Central Farm for 1897—	
Experiments with tobacco	131
Effects of fertilizers on tobacco	131
Transplanting experiments	131
Topping and pruning	132

Report of Central Farm for 1898—
Results of testing of 35 varieties of tobacco 118
(With particulars as to cultivation, also dates of topping, total weight of first grade leaves, weight of second grade dried leaves, weight of third grade dried leaves and total weight per acre.)
Report of Central Farm for 1899—
Results of testing 48 varieties of tobacco in small plots, 1½ acres being devoted to three of the most promising varieties 115
Report of the Central Farm for 1900—
Results of the tests of 56 varieties of tobacco, six of which were grown in field plots and dried and cured in the tobacco house 137
Report of the Central Farm for 1901—
Results of a trial of 46 varieties of tobacco, including particulars as to their growth and treatment, with the yield of the different varieties per acre for three years ; also a special report on the best six varieties under test 125

In all these experiments particular attention has been given to the relative earliness, yield and quality of the different sorts under test.

Similar experiments were conducted in 1902, and 1903, and are now in progress for 1904, and the results of these three years' trial will be given in the Report for 1904.

Experiments in the growing of tobacco have also been made at the branch experimental farms, one of which is located at each of the following points : Nappan, Nova Scotia ; Brandon, Manitoba ; Indian Head, Northwest Territories and Agassiz, British Columbia ; and the results have been given in the Annual Reports of the Experimental Farms. This information will be found in the Reports for 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900 and 1901.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—EMPLOYMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Did any of the members of the government receive a copy of a resolution passed by the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers at its annual meeting in Montreal on the 25th, 26th and 27th of January last, requesting that only Canadian engineers or British subjects be employed on the surveys and construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?
2. What members of the government received such copies, and on what dates ?

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

No record can be found of the receipt of such resolution by any member of the government.

AYLMER, ONT., CUSTOMS OUT-PORT.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

In what year was the customs out-port established at Aylmer, Ontario ?

Mr. FIELDING.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). In the year 1892.

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr INGRAM asked :

1. What was the total expenditure by the government on the harbour of Port Burwell from 30th June, 1891, to 30th June, 1896, including expenses in connection with engineering ?
2. What is the amount expended yearly since 30th June, 1891, to 30th June, 1896 ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. There was no expenditure.
2. Same as number one.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. What was the total expenditure by the government on the harbour of Port Stanley since the 30th June, 1891, up to 30th June, 1896.
2. What is the amount expended yearly since 30th June, 1891, to 30th June, 1896 ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. $9,593.42.
2. In 1891-2, $4,999.96 ; 1892-3, $1,879.01 ; 1893-4, $1,784.74 ; 1894-5, $929.71 ; 1895-6, no expenditure.

MANITOBA VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BOYD asked :

Has the King's Printer of Manitoba been asked for a copy of the voters' lists recently revised in that province ?

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

An official comunication was sent to the Provincial Secretary for the province of Manitoba calling his attention to the provisions of section 10 of the Frnchise Act and requesting him to forward to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certified copy of the lists as finally revised and inquiring whether revised lists had been printed.

The following answer has been received by telegraph Saturday, July 23rd :—'Additions to voters' lists will not be printed, but certified copies of additions, corrections and erasures are being made and will be mailed on Monday.' (Sd.) D. H. McFadden, Provincial Secretary.

PUBLIC WORKS AT GRAND BEND, ONT.

Mr. SHERRITT asked :

1. Were the plans for the public works at Grand Bend, Ontario, changed after the appropriation voted last year, or after tenders were asked for ? If so, when and for what cause ?
2. Is the contract let ? If so, to whom, and for what sum ?
3. What depth of water will be secured when the work is completed ?
4. If the plans were changed after tenders were received, were the several parties tender-

ing notified and afforded an opportunity of tendering again ?

5. Was the above contract let by tender ? If not, why not ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. No changes were made in the plans, but in March, 1904, in order to reduce the cost, it was decided not to build cribs Nos. 9, 10, 11 and 12.

2. Yes ; to Mr. John D. Warwick, for $21,388.

3. Eleven feet at outer end of crib No. 8.

4. See No. 1.

5. Yes.

EMPLOYMENT OF E. P. EASTMAN.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Is it true, as rumoured, that one E. P. Eastman has been appointed as a commissioner, or in some other, and what capacity, to the World's Fair at St. Louis ?

2. If so, is the government aware that the said E. P. Eastman is an American by citizenship, never having, though a resident of Canada for some years, become a British subject ?

3. What salary and allowances does the said Eastman receive for his services, if so employed ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Speaking for the Minister of Agriculture, I beg to say :

1. E. P. Eastman has been engaged to render such service as may be required of him by the Canadian Exhibition Commissioner at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis. His principal duties so far have been to assist in the arrangement of exhibits, and to give information to the inquiring public concerning the resources of the Dominion in general and certain exhibits assigned to him in particular.

2. No. The said Eastman is a British subject by naturalization.

3. Seven dollars per day in all, including expenses.

SIR ELZEAR TASCHEREAU AND THE DISMISSAL OF LORD DUNDONALD.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain whether Sir Elzéar Taschereau, Chief Justice of Canada, was accurately reported in the following cable interview, which appeared in the Canadian newspapers on Wednesday last, July 20th :—

'London, July 19.—Sir Elzéar Taschereau says he is indignant that political capital is being made out of the Dundonald affair. The 'Times' is loaded up by Ottawa Tory sources. A few Scotchmen are back of the whole agitation, and he cannot see how the British government, if alive to its own interests, can fail to recall Lord Dundonald before the end of the week' ?

2. If so, does the Chief Justice admit the accuracy of the interview in question ?

3. If no action has yet been taken by the government to ascertain the accuracy of the above interview, is it the intention of the government to take action ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The answer to this question is no.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not aware that the right hon. gentleman has answered question 3. Is it the intention of the government to take any action ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I answered no.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No covered the whole question.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps, and if so, of what nature, to ascertain whether His Lordship, Sir Elzéar Taschereau, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, sailed from Liverpool on Thursday last on the steamship 'Ionian' ? If so, what is his destination ?

2. Has any communication been received by the government from Sir Elzéar Taschereau, or from the Canadian High Commissioner in London, or from any other official or person, respecting the departure of Sir Elzéar Taschereau from England ?

3. Were all the Canadian cases pending for decision by the Judicial Committee of the King's Privy Council disposed of before the departure of Sir Ezéar Taschereau from England ?

4. Did the government give permission to Sir Ezéar Taschereau to leave England before the disposal of the cases above mentioned by the Imperial Privy Council ?

5. Has Sir Elzéar Taschereau tendered his resignation to the government as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The same answer.

PURCHASE OF TOW-BOAT.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the Department of Public Works, or any person for the government, purchased a tow-boat from Messrs. Laperrière & Frères, or from any other person at Pierreville, in the county of Yamaska ?

2. From whom was such tow-boat purchased ?

3. What price was paid ?

4. What value had been placed on it by the expert, or the experts, appointed for that purpose ?

5. Upon what basis did the department fix the price so paid ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works).

1. Yes.

2. From Mr. Conrad Daneau.

3. $13,000.

4. $15,200.

5. The price of $13,000 was asked by the owner, and upon the report of the expert, it was agreed to be fair and reasonable.

GRAND RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What is the appropriation for dredging the Grand river between Dunville and Port Maitland ?
2. How many hours did the dredge work at such dredging during the years 1903 and 1904 ?
3. What payments have been made for such work, and to whom were such payments made, and at what date ?
4. Who is the time-keeper or inspector in charge of or superintending and checking the amount of work done ?
5. Who is the person or firm doing the work, and when was the agreement or contract therefor made ?
6. Was the work advertised or let by tender, and if so, when ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. There is no special appropriation.
2. 1,857 hours.
3. Paid C. S. Boone, on January 14, 1904, $10,161.
4. Mr. Hugh Boyle.
5. Dredging done by Mr. C. S. Boone, under agreement of September 15, 1903.
6. By agreement made September 15, 1903.

PURCHASE OF THE CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. That it is expedient—

(a.) To authorize the Governor in Council to purchase from the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, and to authorize the said company to sell and convey to His Majesty, the whole of the railway and undertaking formerly belonging to the Canada Eastern Railway Company, but now vested in the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, the same having been sold, transferred and assigned to that company, pursuant to and by virtue of chapter 59 of the statutes of 1898, including the main and branch lines of the said railways and all buildings, fixtures and appurtenances appertaining thereto, together with all the rights, franchises, powers, privileges and property held or exercisable in respect thereof or in connection therewith ; and that upon such purchase being effected the said railways and its branch lines shall become and form part of the government railway system and be operated as such.

(b.) That it be made a condition of such purchase that the said railway and undertaking shall be conveyed to His Majesty free and clear from all charges, liens and encumbrances affecting the same under or by virtue or in respect of any mortgages, bonds, debentures, preference stocks, or other securities or otherwise howsoever.

(c.) That authority be given for the payment for the said railway and undertaking and other property as aforesaid, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the sum of $800,000.

Mr. HYMAN.

2. That whereas the Fredericton and Saint Mary's Railway Bridge Company has made default in payment of the advances of money paid to it by the Governor in Council under the statutes of 1887, chapter 26, and of interest thereon, which said advances and interest were made a first charge and lien and were duly secured by a mortgage on all the property, real and personal, of the Bridge Company, and by reason of such default all the property, real and personal, and all the rights, franchises, easements and privileges of the said Bridge Company became by virtue of the said last-mentioned Act and mortgage forfeited to the Crown, it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council, by his officers or agents, to enter and take possession of the said property, rights, franchises, easements and privileges on behalf of His Majesty, and operate the same or any portions thereof as part of the government railway system.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Commitee of Supply.

Steam service between Victoria and San Francisco, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman a question relative to another department. Is Mr. J. J. Jackson, formerly of Woodstock, now in the employ of the government, and where ?

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). He is, but I would suggest to my hon. friend to bring that up under the heading of commercial agencies.

Mr. BENNETT. When will that be reached ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope very shortly.

Steam communication between Halifax and Newfoundland via Cape Breton ports, $2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This steamer calls at a number of ports. It makes fourteen trips in the year.

Steam communication during the season of 1904, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between the Mainland and the Magdalen Islands, $15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This service was formerly weekly and is now semi-weekly.

Steam communication during the season of 1904, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, beween Prince Edward Island and the Mainland, $12,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This service is conducted by the Charlottetown Steam Navigation Company via Northumberland. It is the same vote as last year.

Steam communication from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, between Grand Manan and the Mainland, $5,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This boat calls at a number of points. It is the same contract as heretofore and expires 1906.

Steam communication for not less than 52 full round weekly trips between St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth and other way ports from July 1st, 1904, to June 30th, 1905, $10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The contractor is Messrs. Thompson & Co., of St. John.

Steam communication during the season of 1904, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between St. John and Minas Basin ports, $3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Fifty-two full round trips must be made every year. It is a weekly service.

Steam communication from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, between Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge, $1,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is with the Three Rivers Steamship Company. They call at each point in Murray Harbour.

Steam communication from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports, $7,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is with Bouchard Brothers. The steamship is the 'Gaspesia.' It touches at a great many ports of call, nearly thirty.

Mr. MONK. I have heard that this steamer is not a particularly good boat. Does the right hon. gentleman consider her fit for the service ? I would like to know also if there is anything in the contract to oblige the contractor to bring a steamer to Montreal. The steamers going from Montreal to the lower province ports, in the direction of Gaspé, which have good passenger accommodation, are at present overcrowded. There would be room for four or five more suitable steamers on that route, and it would be important that the 'Gaspesia,' if suitable, should come to Montreal for passengers and freight.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a trip from Quebec round to Gaspé Basin, calling at a very large number of very small places, and steamers of the class my hon. friend describes would object exceedingly unless very heavily subsidized, to calling at all these small places. The hon. gentleman will note that to call at all these places would be almost an impossibility for a steamer going to the lower provinces.

Mr. MONK. A steamer from Gaspé coming as far as Montreal would command a very large quantity of freight, for with these ports that my right hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has mentioned Montreal does a very large business. In the next place, for tourist or summer travel, I think the only suitable steamer we have from Montreal to the Gulf is the 'Campana,' and to go in this steamer you have to secure accommodation a long time in advance. That is why it seemed to me that without an additional subsidy it would be possible to have a good steamer go between Gaspé and Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have taken a note of my hon. friend's (Mr. Monk's) suggestion, and I shall be very glad to give these people better accommodation if possible. Of course it is under contract for this year. But next year we shall see if we can get a better steamer for the service.

Steam communication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain, $5,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That service was performed by the 'Manchester Trader' last year. I am afraid I shall have to ask the House for a small additional vote later on in order to secure this service.

Direct fortnightly steam service between Montreal, Quebec, and Manchester, England, during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax, and Manchester during the winter season, $35,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is known as the Manchester service proper. The contract is with what are known as the Manchester Liners, Limited, the vessels being the 'Manchester City,' the 'Manchester Commerce,' the 'Manchester Trader,' the Manchester Corporation,' and the 'Manchester Shipper.' It is a regular fornightly service. The amount is a little reduced. They used to charge us £8,000 sterling, but they have accepted $35,000 for the present year.

Direct monthly steam communication between Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the right hon. minister would give us some information as to the results, so far, of this service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As my hon. friends are aware, this has been a tentative service with a view to developing our trade with South Africa. Apparently a reasonable amount of trade has been developed and I think it will ultimately become a very useful adjunct to our commerce. At first this contract was with three different companies, each doing a portion of the service, Messrs. Allan, Messrs. Furness-Withy and Messrs. Elder-Dempster. The Allans have retired in favour of the Furness-Withy, the latter now doing two-thirds of the service. Our agents in South Africa report that there is a strong disposition to trade with Canada on the part of our brother colonists in Cape Colony and Natal. For a time, trade was very much hampered by the fact that at the close of the war a huge quantity of articles, many of which had been supplied from Canada, were dumped by the British authorities on the

market, and so our exportations to South Africa were considerably interfered with. They are beginning to get better now. The manifests sent to us show a very fair cargo going out. The trouble is we have very little return cargo.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How often is the service ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The trips are monthly and there is a special clause in the contract by which Canadians have preference ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In freight or in room ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In freight and in room if they give reasonable notice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What class of boats are used ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Boats of 5,000 tons with a speed of not less than 10 knots. I have here a return which I promised to prepare for the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and I shall send to the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) only asking that he send it to the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. minister carried out the promise he made some time ago to look into the matter of the freight rates from New York ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is some information on that subject in the return which I have just handed in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the government agents in South Africa ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Jardine is our commercial agent. He has a kind of a roving commission over the whole of South Africa from Cape Town northward.

Steam communication during the season of 1904, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie or Campbellton, $12,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That service was performed by the steamer 'Restigouche.' But she did not give satisfaction to the parties, and I have endeavoured to secure a new steamer. But it has not yet made its appearance. In the meantime the service is performed by the steamer 'Admiral,' the one that used to perform the service formerly. I trust to have a steamship specially constructed for the route put upon it next year.

Mr. MONK. The 'Admiral' was last year on the line between Murray Bay and River Ouelle. Does the present arrangement mean that there will be a new steamer on that line this year ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That service at Murray Bay is being performed by a steamer in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) proposes to have a new steamer built especially adapted to that service both summer and winter. That matter will be discussed when the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are before the committee.

Steam communication from April 1, 1904, to March 31, 1905, between Port Mulgrave and Canso, and Between Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, and from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1904, between Port Mulgrave, Margaree and Cheticamp, $8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the service we had last year the contractors being Messrs. Hugh Cann & Son. The vessels are the 'Malcolm Cann' and the 'John L. Cann.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How frequent is the service ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are three routes : Route A, from Mulgrave to Canso ; route B, from Mulgrave to Guysborough ; route C, from Port Mulgrave to Chéticamp, calling at Port Hastings, Margaree and Chéticamp Harbour. On the first, it is a daily service ; on the second, from Mulgrave to Guysborough there are four trips made weekly ; on the last, one trip weekly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a service of great importance to those who are engaged in the fishing industry in Canso, and I have had a communication on the subject from persons who have undertaken the business of forwarding fresh fish to Ontario via the Intercolonial, and who complain to me that in the case, I think, of at least fifty per cent of the shipments during one season, the boat failed to make connection with the train at Mulgrave ; I am not absolutely sure of the percentage, but to the best of my recollection it amounted to that. The result was that the fish were detained for twenty-four hours, persons who were to be supplied in Montreal and Ontario were disappointed, and of course there was a deterioration of the goods to be forwarded. I think some effort should be made to have that service improved in that regard. I understand thoroughly that there are perils of the sea and difficulties of navigation which have to be taken into consideration, but it would be better to have an improved class of boats and give them more subsidy rather than to have so important a business as that to which I have referred, injured and possibly destroyed altogether. The hon. gentleman is of course aware, as is every one in the business, that in order to carry on the business of supplying fresh fish they must be enabled to guarantee a certain supply daily to Montreal or to any other place to which fish are to be forwarded. If you cannot guarantee that, through lack of good communication or by

reason of an insufficient supply of fish being brought in by the fishermen, the result will be that the trade will go somewhere else. For example, the gentleman to whom I refer, who is largely engaged in this business at Canso, said that a certain fish dealer in Toronto told him that he would give him an order for only one-third of what he required daily, but he added, I would be willing to give you an order one-half or two-thirds if I were sure the supply of fish would be adequate, and if your means of communication were absolutely certain. I believe the supply of fish is getting better and better. Those who are engaged in the business are sending out more fishermen, some of them to one part of the coast, others to other parts of the coast, so that from one source or another the proper supply of fish will be brought in, and that part of the business seems to be put upon a fairly good basis. The other part, adequate communication, seems to be still lacking. Of course that may be supplied if certain railway lines now projected in the province of Nova Scotia are constructed at an early date. However, in the meantime we have to depend on a service of this kind. and it is of exceeding importance that that service should be made reliable, otherwise this business cannot be carried on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is not merely a desirable thing in itself, but it is of great importance as a feeder to the Intercolonial. My hon. friend is perhaps aware, as I am, of the difficulty we have had in getting decent fish supplied in Ottawa, and I should be glad to contribute as far as possible towards improving the service so that we may get fresh fish daily supplied to our breakfast tables in the west. I may say that we have altered the route with the purpose of helping this, Arichat is now dropped, and another service was authorized last session from Petit de Grat to Mulgrave that enables us to effect a great improvement. I understand from my deputy we had a good many complaints last year, but this present year the service has been better, and the complaints have ceased. However, I entirely agree, for every reason, both for the encouragement of the fishermen, for the benefit of the Intercolonial and for the supply of the western provinces, that it is highly desirable that all reasonable assistance should be given.

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope the minister will go a step further and urge upon his colleagues the support of the proposal I have made to put the express companies under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission so that their express charges may be regulated. In that way good will be accomplished, both in promoting interprovincial trade and the fresh fish of the maritime provinces and in the fruit of the west. Nothing will prevent an interchange of that trade so much as jurisdiction vested in the Railway Commission to control the rates of the express companies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am of the opinion that any improvement in that direction, on a large scale at least, would have to come from the railway companies themselves, through arrangements with the express agencies. My hon. friend is probably aware that the two great express agencies, the Canadian Company and the Dominion Company, are both parts and parcels of their respective railroads ; the Grand Trunk completely controls the one, and the Canadian Pacific Railway controls the other. As to the vexed question of meddling with the express rates, I would rather not enter on that controversy just now.

Mr. MACLEAN. But it is an essential part of the issue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It must be done by the action of the Intercolonial, and the Grand Trunk Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I should hope they might be able to see their way to run a fish train daily, as is done in some portions of the United States, through and through. I see no reason at all why a fish train should not be run from Nova Scotia or from the lower St. Lawrence, at any rate, as far as Toronto. I have more than once spoken of it and recommended it, and I will do so again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In this connection I may say that I brought to the attention of the House the other day the fact that upon the Intercolonial Railway only one express company is permitted to carry on business. I think my hon. friend from Toronto suggested that another company applying was to be regarded as guilty of impertinence because it insisted upon having absolute control of the business upon the line of the railway company with which it is associated. Still I do not know that this conduct should be regarded as more impertinent than that the company, retaining control of the railway which it happens to be associated, should also desire to have complete control of the Intercolonial. However, that may be, the object of my suggestion would be amply met if we could have applied to the Intercolonial a provision which I find in the Railway Act with regard to express companies, and it is found in section 278.

> Every company which grants any facilities for the carriage of goods by express to any incorporated express company or persons, shall grant equal facilities, on equal terms and conditions, to any other incorporated express company which demands the same.

The difficulty about the Intercolonial Railway is that that provision does not at the present time apply to it. It may be that section 278 is not very fully carried out by the great lines of this country which

have express companies connected with them. But nevertheless there is a law which apparently is capable of being carried out and if it were done under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission it night possibly—though there may be unexpected difficulties—afford some of the relief by way of competition which has been advocated very forcibly by several hon. gentlemen in the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. This clause has been appealed to on former occasions and it has not proved efficacious. As a matter of fact what I said before is true that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, notwithstanding this clause, have resisted any attempt on the part of express companies other than their own favourite companies which they own themselves to get upon their systems.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Can they successfully do that ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, one of the greatest lawsuits that has been tried and one in which the greatest amount of money has been spent was undertaken in an effort to force the Grand Trunk Railway Company to allow a rival express company, organized in the city of Toronto, to share the business of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The express company employed the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, an immense amount of money was expended, but finally the rival company was beaten out. In connection with the Intercolonial Railway my idea is that this government should have a first-class express system upon its own road and that it should undertake to provide for express business in fish and other trade as between the maritime provinces and the west. I take the ground that the Intercolonial Railway should not be given over to two rival express companies unless the railway companies owning the express companies are prepared to grant the same privilege which they enjoy on their respective lines and unless in some way provision is made for the loss of revenue that would be entailed upon the Intercolonial Railway according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals who does not happen to be in the House at the present time. My contention is that in the first place there should be a thoroughly equipped express system between the differnt provinces and I want to see everything done to facilitate that, but I also want the express companies who have franchises to live up to the conditions that they ask the government to live up to. They ask the government to allow them on the line of the Intercolonial Railway but they will not allow us on their lines. What I would prefer to see if the government is in the railway business is that it should be in the express business as well. Let it own a first-class express system. If it pays a private company to give $100,000 a year for the privilege of operating on the Intercolonial Railway it will pay the government to carry that business on its own account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, since any litigation has been undertaken under the provisions of this section we have had established a Railway Commission with a supposedly simple method of procedure. The object of this section is very plain. It is undoubtedly to prevent discrimination upon any railway line. I would think that the Railway Commission would be capable of enforcing that section and I do not see any reason why it should not. If the objects of the section are plain and if there is any omission in it which enables that plain object to be defeated, it will be desirable to have such amendment made in the section as to carry out what obviously was the object in the first instance. As far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned there is a good deal in what my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) suggests. All that I brought to the attention of the House the other day was that in the meantime it would be a desirable thing and I should imagine in the interest of the people of the maritime provinces that more than one company should have power to carry on express business on the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, that power could be given subject to the provision that it should cease at once, should the government decide to establish an express company of its own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a matter that will appertain more particularly to the Department of Railways and Canals but I may say to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that I think he will find that there are practical and physical difficulties in the way of operating two or three express companies on the same train. My idea about the fish matter would be that there should be special fish trains. I think that the trade is likely to grow to such proportions as to warrant that and I think, as regards the trade in the United States, that I am correct in saying that special fish trains are run without any reference to the express companies.

Steam service during the season of 1904, between Sydney and Whycocomagh, $1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is given to the Bras d'Or Steamship Company, Limited. There has been no alteration in the terminal point. They make two round trips each week.

Steam service during the year 1904, between St. Stephen, N.B., and St. Croix river points, Deer Island, Campobello, and the Inner Islands, Passamaquoddy Bay and L'Etete or Back Bay, $3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is as usual. The Deer Island and Campobello Steamship Company have the contract and the service is performed by the steamer 'Viking.' They make two round trips each week and they call at a great number of small points.

Steam service during the year 1904, between Quebec and Blanc Sablon, calling at ports and places along the northern shore of the River St. Lawrence between such terminals, $8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The contract is with Holliday Brothers and the steamer is the 'King Edward.'

Mr. MONK. At what ports does this steamer call? Was this service performed last year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the same service was performed last year. The vessel leaves Quebec and it usually makes no calls till it passes Esquimaux point. Natashquan is the terminal point to be extended as occasion requires to Blanc Sablon. The vessel makes very few calls in the interval.

Mr. MONK. Is there just one steamer?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The 'King Edward' is the only steamer employed. She makes semi-monthly trips.

Mr. MONK. How many trips were made last year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe all the trips they were bound to make; that is to say, semi-monthly trips during the season of navigation were made. There was no interruption, I believe, of the regular trips. What they may have done in the interval I am not aware, but the trips that were called for in the contract were completed.

Mr. MONK. I do not suppose they made more than eight trips at the most.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My deputy tells me that all the trips from the end of April were made semi-monthly. That would cover about six months, or five and a half months. They stopped only when the buoys were taken up somewhere about the 20th November.

Mr. MONK. Has the steamer passenger accommodation?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The 'King Edward' has. It is a superior steamer and was built expressly for the route.

Steam service during the season of 1904, between Sydney, C.B., and Bay St. Lawrence, calling at way ports, $1,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The contract is with the Bras d'Or Steamship Company and the steamer is the 'Weymouth.'

Weekly steamship service between Halifax and Canso, $4,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is done by the steamship 'Strathcona,' owned by the Halifax and Canso Steamship Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that the same 'Strathcona' that is used in the wrecking.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The other I am told is the 'Lord Strathcona'; this is plain 'Strathcona.' The wrecking steamer is a very expensive article and we could not possibly hope to get her for $4,000.

Winter steam navigation service during winter of 1904-5, between Quebec and St. Lawrence harbours, down to Murray Bay and River Ouelle, $12,000.

Mr. MONK. Was anything done last year towards establishing this service?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, we were not able to get the winter service performed. After a great deal of consideration I understand from my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he has come to the conclusion that it will be necessary to have a special steamer constructed and he proposes to apply to the House for power to have such a steamer put on. The problem of winter navigation of the St. Lawrence, as my hon. friend is aware, is interesting and important, but it is clear that if you are going to make a success you will have to have steamers of unusual strength and probably of unusual power constructed in order to enable the service to be carried on with any satisfaction, and therefore the minister thinks it will be better to have a steamer built expressly for that service. Later on we will be in a position to give the details about it.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to hear this announcement because it interests us greatly in Montreal. I think the experiment would be well worth trying because a steamer of that kind would not cost an extremely large amount and even if the experiment proved unsuccessful the steamer would still be of use. My hon. friend will notice that we take power to spend $20,000 a year on steamers going into the Gulf. We have just passed an item of $8,000 for the 'King Edward' service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a summer service.

Mr. MONK. And we have this past two years voted $12,000 for the winter service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MONK. We have to guide us the experiments made in Russia under the invention of the late Admiral Makaroff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You refer to the famous Kronstadt ice-breakers I presume?

Mr. MONK. They have been used in the Baltic Sea and on Lake Baikal. I see they

have broken through very thick ice, three, four and five feet or even more. There is no doubt I think that we can also navigate the St. Lawrence, at any rate to Quebec, all through the winter with a steamer of this description. I was surprised in reading a review to observe what a comparatively small amount an ice breaker costs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does my hon. friend know what such a one as he has referred to costs ?

Mr. MONK. I do not know the exact figure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the sum is large.

Mr. MONK. I read several articles in one of the periodical reviews on these ice-breakers. I have not any of the data here but I was surprised at the relatively small cost ; it is of course always a considerable sum. I anticipate that a steamer of this description could be used to very good effect in the spring in opening up the navigation to Montreal earlier than the river is naturally opened. There are one or two places in Montreal and Quebec where the bridge is maintained even after the ice is rotten everywhere else. If we had a steamer of the strength of the 'Ermaak' for instance, that ice could be easily broken up, and it has been considered by many that the navigation could be opened at least three weeks earlier than at present. That would make an immense difference to the people along the St. Lawrence, between Quebec and Montreal. We spend $20,000 to $25,000 a year on winter navigation from Quebec downwards, and I anticipate that a steamer of that kind would be available in summer as well as in winter. It seems to me it would be easy for us to get a steamer that would be able to obtain the same results as those which are secured in Russia. The government could easily obtain exact information as to the cost, &c., of those used in Russia and there is nothing which prevents us following the same course here as has been pursued in that country. I think this should be a matter for the earnest consideration of the government at the earliest possible date. These experiments in Russia date back several years and since reviewers and newspaper men have been able to obtain information pretty exactly it would be easy, I think, for the government to have these results for their guidance. Thus, without spending more than is now being spent very profitable results could be secured.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say that it will prove practicable to do pretty much what my hon. friend has been suggesting. I may say that the subject to which he refers, the extending of the period of navigation from Quebec—and of course if possible from Montreal—by several

weeks at the beginning and end of navigation, has attracted the attention both of my own department and of that of Marine, and I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I regret to say is not present will have certain projects to submit to the House having in view the carrying out of this idea. It is reasonably certain that with proper appliances we could extend the period of navigation from Quebec outward for a considerable period. As to the question of opening it earlier in the spring my hon. friend has stated what is no doubt correct that there are occasional barriers that could be removed by such a steamer, but whether you could depend upon that in view of the enormous masses of ice that are frequently encountered in the gulf to increase the period of navigation in the spring I am not quite so certain.

Mr. MONK. I refer principally to the inland navigation, so far as the spring is concerned, between Quebec and Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was rather referring to ocean navigation. That could undoubtedly be extended. Whether it could be extended all the year is another question.

Mr. MORIN. I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk). It would undoubtedly be useful and advantageous for the government to have a boat so constructed as to be able to open the ice on the St. Lawrence river above Quebec. I have been living there for upwards of sixteen years, and understand very well how the matter stands. Navigation is sometimes open in Montreal three or four weeks before it is open at Quebec simply because there are no boats at Quebec able to break the ice. Sometimes what is called the key is only about ten miles long in the Narrows at the Quebec bridge and if the government had a boat of the kind described they could open that channel for both local and the general navigation. The steamships from Europe very seldom come to Quebec before the month of May. Of course, they cannot come until the channel is open ; but the government could make preparations to have the channel open from Quebec to Lake St. Peter every year by the 15th of April. Does my hon. friend know what ports it is proposed to stop at from Quebec down to Murray Bay ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have not been able as yet to obtain any steamer capable of carrying on that navigation in the winter season, and that fact has led the Minister of Marine to consider the propriety of having a boat built for that express service. When that is obtained it will be at the disposal of the authorities to call at any point that may be thought expedient between Quebec and Murray Bay ;

but I cannot state at what particular points it will call.

Mr. MORIN. There are very few points at which it will be necessary for it to call. The principal point will be Baie St. Paul. On the north shore, from Quebec down to St. Joachim, there will be no need of a steamer, because the cars run there every day ; and on the south shore the country is served by the railway all the way down. Baie St. Paul is well served by a stage route. A steamship mail service on that short route could only be established at a very large expense. Then, in many winters the ice freezes from Quebec down three or four miles, and it would be next to impossible to open a channel through it. I have often heard the ferrymen and the men who handle the boats say that the ice is sometimes fifty, sixty or even one hundred feet thick at Quebec in the winter season.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). The points of call for this steamer are I think matters to be decided after the steamer is built and brought here. There are no steamers at present capable of doing the work except those owned by the government of Russia, and therefore a steamer must be built. When the ice is formed I think this steamer will prove to be successful to a certain depth of ice ; but when it comes to the drift ice in the gulf, it will probably have to be discontinued. But I think the experiment is well worth trying in the interest of navigation on the St. Lawrence.

Summer service between Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle, $6,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This service was done formerly by the North Transportation Company, and the steamer 'Admiral' was employed. It is now conducted by the Intercolonial Railway as a kind of subsidiary service.

Mr. MORIN. Is not the government paying too much for carrying the mail between these two places, especially in the summer time ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The parties we employed complained bitterly that it was not enough, and withdrew their steamer. We have had a great deal of trouble in getting anything to keep up the navigation there. Of course, a large number of passengers cross between these two points, and the steamer is in a sense a feeder for the Intercolonial.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend from Dorchester is perhaps right, that this amount is either too much or not enough. The government acted very wisely in establishing this service, which has been very useful, enabling people in Montreal whose families were at Murray Bay to go down on Saturday, and return to their business at Montreal or other western points on Sunday evening. At the same time, the 'Admiral' is a very old steamer, and the accommodation it provided was most inferior in every way, although a considerable sum, comparatively speaking, was charged for the trip across. For the sum of $6,000 there ought to be a better steamer provided, and the government ought to fix the rate at a more moderate figure. This steamer is a very important feeder for the Intercolonial Railway, and last year it had very large passenger and a considerable freight traffic ; so that its profits must have been considerable. With regard to the larger question of keeping that ferry going all the year round, my hon. friend knows that the ferry between Quebec and Lévis crosses very regularly the whole year round, and it is asserted by many that the crossing between Murray Bay and River Ouelle could be performed just as easily. I think the government ought to consider the advisability of providing such service, either by itself constructing a steamer, or by giving a larger subsidy for a better steamer than that which runs at present. If the opinion which I have obtained is correct, that service could be provided without any very considerable additional expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can say regarding the subsidy is that the party who got it complained very bitterly that he lost money and would not tender again, and we have had great trouble in supplying the service.

Mr. MONK. If my memory serves me right, the charge for crossing from Rivière Ouelle to Murray Bay, some eighteen or nineteen miles, is fifty cents, or a dollar for the round trip. In view of the subsidy of $6,000 and the kind of steamer that did the service last year, that seems to be a little excessive. It tends to prevent the extensive traffic that should exist, because that is the only means of daily communication between the north and south ; it would be the sole navigation in winter. This year the government should arrange that the fare should be more moderate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I found it impossible to get anybody to tender for this service. I tried several times, and sent out several applications. I tried to obtain vessels in the upper lakes since we could not obtain them in Montreal or Quebec, and finally the matter was taken in hand by the Departments of Railways and Marine at my request. At present the Railway Department have borrowed a vessel from the Department of Public Works, and are running it as a kind of ferry. I cannot tell what rates the department are charging, but they have great interest in encouraging the traffic, and am sure will make the charge moderate.

Mr. MONK. If the department is doing the service, they can control the rates. I strongly call attention to the consideration

that if that service were performed winter and summer and reasonable rates charged, there would be a great traffic indeed over that line, because it is the only outlet the north shore has. There is no communication between Quebec and Murray Bay except by water. I think that matter should engage the attention of the government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have taken a note of what my hon. friend says, and will call the attention of the departments concerned to it. This is quite a recent vote.

Mr. MONK. Yes, only since two years. It was a very meritorious innovation, and I think could be improved.

Mr. TARTE. What is the name of the boat that is running now ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the 'Eureka,' and belongs to the Public Works Department.

Mr. TARTE. I would ask the right hon. gentleman to look carefully into this matter. I know the boat very well. The department got it when I was minister. An upper deck has been added to it, which causes it to roll very much in a heavy sea. I think if the hon. minister will look carefully into the case, he will find it advantageous to change this boat for another one soon. I have been on board it many times, and while I would not like to say anything that would injure the line, because I am very favourable to it, I think that the boat has been raised by two decks, and it would be safer to change it for another. I do not want to throw any cold water on the line—very far from it. But I do not think the boat would be able to stand a heavy storm.

Mr. EMMERSON. The difficulty in getting a boat at all was so serious at one time that it looked as if that service could not be attended to this year. The matter is one of very great importance to the people in that section, especially those on the northern side, and it is a matter of prime importance to the Intercolonial.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have constructed, at considerable expense, the Rivière Ouelle branch for tourist traffic. If a properly constructed and properly kept boat were to run between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay, the traffic would be very considerable indeed. Last year it was quite an important factor in increasing the earnings of the Intercolonial. The matter is having very careful attention, and every activity was displayed during the past two months to procure a boat. There was no other boat available in the Public Works Department, and it was impossible to get one from the Marine Department. There have been negotiations with a view of getting a special boat, and I hope it may be possible to secure such a boat. I am informed by some parties interested in that section of the country, and particularly by my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Angers), that this boat is not quite large enough, but she is considered safe and satisfactory for the present. We are putting forth every effort to get a larger boat with a view of later service, and I have reason to believe that the efforts being put forth by the Marine and Railway Departments, in connection with the Public Works Department, will result in a service being established which will accommodate, not merely the summer tourist traffic, but the later traffic of the fall, and even of the winter months.

Mr. TARTE. The boat now in use is a very strong one. I went all around the gulf in it, but that was before the upper decks were added. She draws 12 feet of water. If the captain is a safe man, he will not take the risk of running during a storm, because the boat could not stand a storm, raised as she has been.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to hear the Minister of Railways anticipate that considerable business will be developed by this line. The Intercolonial is not paying so much that we would not be glad to see its traffic increase. It would be increased a very great deal if there was really good service there. The boat at present in use is, of course, inadequate for the traffic. I do not know who runs the ferry boats between Quebec and Lévis, but the boats are very strong ones, and the owners have no doubt acquired extensive experience in that kind of navigation. If one-half I have heard be true, we could navigate from Murray Bay to Rivière Ouelle almost continuously. The crossing might be interrupted a day or two, but could be carried on pretty regularly. Under these circumstances, I should think my right hon. friend might perhaps call for tenders for the construction of a suitable boat. It would not require a very fine boat, though that might be desirable for summer traffic, but it would require a good, strong, safe boat; and, the traffic being what I anticipate between the north and south shore and over the Intercolonial, it would require a boat of considerable size. I think the matter ought to be attended to without delay.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Newfoundland, $8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This was a contract with Messrs. Hugh McMillan and Henry Aitken.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. What will be the starting point in the province of Prince Edward Island for this service and what will be the port or ports of call in that province ? Also, what will be the port or ports of call in Cape Breton and the port of destination in Newfoundland ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Leaving Charlottetown, thence to Bridgetown, Annandale and Souris, Prince Edward Island; thence to Glace Bay and Sydney, and thence to St. John's, Newfoundland; returning over the same route.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. In any agreement that may be made with a company for this service, that will be one of the conditions, of course?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is our intention, of course.

Steam service between Canada and Australia, $194,666.66.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen probably will remember that we used to pay £25,000 for this service. he Australian government and ourselves have added £15,000 of which we may pay £9,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What steamers perform this service? What is the frequency of the trips; and what trade, if any, has been developed; also between what ports in Canada and Australia is the service conducted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The service is performed by the steamships 'Miowera,' 'Aorangi,' and 'Moana.' It is a four weekly service, and is carried on from Vancouver to Sydney.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this the same as the service to Japan?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, it is the same service except that we made last year the addition I have referred to, of £16,000 of which we pay £9,000, and the Australian government the balance.

Steam service between Paspebiac and Gaspé basin, during the months of December, 1904, and January, 1905, $3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is in the nature of an experiment to see if we can prolong that service during the winter months. We are now in negotiation and hope to obtain the service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We had an item in the estimates for this year; did the hon. minister utilize that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, we did not succeed in getting a boat to carry on the service during December and January. They were afraid to face the ice in the Gulf at that time.

For the service of a wrecking plant on the St. Lawrence for the year ending June 30, 1905, $10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is in the nature of a retainer. For this the wrecking plant must be held in readiness constantly to go to any vessel that may be in trouble.

Mr. J. D. REID. When did the government begin granting this subsidy?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was two years ago.

Mr. J. D. REID. As the hon. minister is aware this same firm has been in the wrecking business for the last thirty years. The same plant has always been kept in readiness. These people have been making a lot of money annually. About two years ago when Captain Leslie, of Kingston, whom the hon. minister knows well, removed his wrecking plant down to that district to take part in assisting these vessels that were wrecked, and spent an immense amount of money, the hon. minister immediately gave this other wrecking firm a subsidy. By this, of course, Captain Leslie is placed at a disadvantage. It seems most unfair that when a gentleman with the ability of Captain Leslie, a gentleman whom, I am sure, the minister will say is a most reliable man and whose wrecking plant is a very fine one, removes down there, he should be met with a subsidy to an opposition concern. This wrecking firm has been in existence for thirty or forty years without a subsidy, and I would like to know why this subsidy of $10,000 is now paid to it within the last two of three years. What is the necessity for it? They had their plant there, I saw the plant there ten years ago, they had an enormous plant of their own. They have some vessels, I think they sold the 'Lord Stanley,' but they have got the 'Strathcona,' a vessel of about the same size. There seems to be something wrong in this matter when a subsidy is given at this particular time, though another wrecking outfit has gone down there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as I remember, the subsidy was granted to the Messrs. Davis before Captain Leslie had gone down there at all. I think it is only within the last year or two that Captain Leslie has gone down the St. Lawrence.

Mr. J. D. REID. He has been there some time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the next place, the 'Lord Strathcona' is a very much more powerful boat and has much better appliances for wrecking than any that have been in the service before. I can only say that this was a request upon the government by, I think, the entire shipping interests in the St. Lawrence. An enormously large and influential petition was presented to us, and I remember that a large deputation called on myself and I think the Premier. The whole of the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence made a request to us that we would see that this service was kept constantly in the best condition. Unless this grant was given it would be optional with Mr. Davis to have taken his craft anywhere, and I believe he had been in the habit of taking it occasionally far

outside the St. Lawrence to assist vessels in distress to go to Boston and New York. I have no wish, as the hon. gentleman knows himself, to discriminate in favour of one against the other ; but when the whole St. Lawrence trade come to us and request that we should insist on this vessel being kept steadily in readiness, it seems to me a proper request to make, and everybody knows that at that time the St. Lawrence route was a little in disfavour owing to the number of accidents that happened and the great difficulty in bringing assistance to vessels in distress. Since this grant has been made a very considerable salvage of property has been successfully effected, which, I think, could not have been affected unless this vessel had been always in hand and ready to go out.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know that Capt. Leslie has effected quite a lot of salvage since he has been down there, and I know for a fact that his wrecking plant is just the same now as it has been for the last ten or twelve years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The 'Lord Strathcona' is a much better vessel than they ever had before.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the 'Lord Stanley' was the best steamer there previously. I have seen the 'Lord Stanley' and she was the larger vessel. They have purchased the 'Strathcona' since this subsidy was given and they are making a large amount of money there yearly. They never went to Boston, because there is a large wrecking plant at Boston which they could not interfere with. It is a very easy matter for Mr. Davis to get up a petition and every one of the vessel men will sign it ; they would not want to refuse for fear they might get into trouble themselves. As this wrecking firm has been in existence for the last thirty or forty years, and in addition the government have given them the Lévis dry dock,—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not aware of that.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that to be the case. This has all been given free, and if such is the case, it does seem strange that the government should now give this subsidy. In addition, by giving this subsidy, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is doing his best to get Captain Leslie and his fleet off the St. Lawrence. I know for a fact that he has saved vessels when the 'Strathcona' could not get there soon enough. I think it would be fair for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to divide this subsidy with Mr. Leslie, or else give him a subsidy as well, because he has rendered great services to the shipping industry. I think the minister should be a little easier with Captain Leslie and not give these people a subsidy that will have the effect of driving him out of business and thus leave the vessel men in that locality at the mercy of one firm.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This objection will apply, I am afraid, to a great many subsidies besides the present one. But I am advised that the 'Lord Strathcona' is very much the most powerful steamer that has ever been engaged in the wrecking business on the St. Lawrence. The first subsidy was granted to an inferior steamer, the one the hon. gentleman referred to, the 'Stanley.'

Mr. J. D. REID. When was that granted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A matter of three or four years ago.

Steam service between Petit de Grat and the Intercolonial Railway terminus at Mulgrave, $3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is for the purpose of facilitating the transport of fish between these two points, and it relieves the other vesels from calling at Arichat.

Steamboat service between Canada and Mexico, $50,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this vote I may say to the committee that contracts have been called for the purpose of ascertaining whether we can promote communication between Canada and Mexico. The Mexican government have agreed to give a similar sum of $50,000. We will receive in a little while, I hope, some communication on this head. The intention is, in the first place, to see if we can establish a service on the Pacific coast from Vancouver and Victoria, touching at various points on the Mexican Pacific ocean. If we succeed in that we will also see if we can establish a service on the other side, going from points in the Gulf of Mexico up to St. John and Halifax. As yet we are not in a position to say how far our negotiations will be successful, or what tenders we will receive. I trust in a short time that I shall be in receipt of the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were tenders issued in the first instance calling for a service on the Pacific side ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They called for both. But the Mexican government appeared to think that it would be better for them to have a service on the Pacific side, and they propose to devote the major part of their subsidy to that side. We are at a disadvantage no doubt in the Gulf of Mexico owing to the number of American routes that converge there. I should like myself to see the service established on both sides of the continent, but we may have to confine ourselves in the first instance to the western side. If the hon. gentleman remembers the geographical configuration of Mexico, he will see that our

chances are better on the Pacific coast than on the Atlantic coast at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of the trade that is expected to be done ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That nature of the trade that we will expect to do on the Pacific coast will be chiefly the export of coal, lumber, and possibly a certain amount of fish. Those I think, will be the staples and any general cargo that may be picked up from time to time. The difficulty there is, as in other places, that the Mexicans have not a great deal to send us back. They may send us hides and tropical fruits such as we receive from the West Indian islands on the Pacific side. On the eastern side we might have a better chance of obtaining a certain amount of trade in sisal via St. John and Halifax, and we could no doubt send down to the maritime provinces a considerable amount of lumber and fish. Mexico being a large fish consuming country. But, in this as in many other cases the most favourable circumstance is that the Mexican government are anxious to encourage us. This offer was volunteered by them. The Mexican government have made a proposition, or at any rate, they have shown the greatest willingness to encourage us and I think I may venture to assure the committee that the disposition of the Mexican people generally is very favourable to Canada. I presume my hon. friend is aware of the fact that Canadian capitalists have been entering into some very large enterprises in the city of Mexico and its vicinity and altogether the temper of the Mexicans towards us is very good. How far these commercial advantages will aid us in establishing a large trade remains to be seen but I do not think we can go amiss in meeting an offer such as we very seldom receive from any other quarter. They are contributing dollar for dollar.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the amount of our export and import trade ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Our trade with Mexico is very small at the present time but it is probable that a certain amount of our exports go to Mexico via New York and are classified as imports from the United States. The total amount of trade is very small at the present time. Whether we can develop a larger trade remains to be seen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is somewhat in the nature of an experiment ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is in the nature of an experiment but we have thought that when the Mexican government have displayed so much good-will we might better meet them. There are good reasons why we and the Mexicans stand particularly well with each other.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Trent canal—to complete west entrance pier at lock, $1,500.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This pier was completed for a length of about 175 feet. It requires about 125 feet of further extension and it is estimated that the cost will be $1,500. The same remarks apply to the next item for $1,500 for the pier at Burleigh.

Trent Canal—Dredging—Katchawannoe lake, $3,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. We require to deepen the channel between Lakefield and Young's point in a number of places as during periods of low water the boats ground.

Mr. LENNOX. Why is this charged to income ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because it is an old part of the canal that has been navigable.

Mr. LENNOX. We generally have to make a complaint the other way.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know, we are damned if we do and damned if we don't.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to object to this.

Trent canal—blasting and dredging channel above lock 1, Lakefield, $3,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The water here is very shallow and requires to be deepened at least two feet. This work is all done by contract except the dredging. We have a dredge and do our own dredging.

Trent canal—to provide one dredging engine, boiler and steel boom, $6,500.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that awarded by tender and contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We will ask for tenders. There was an item last year for the rebuilding of the hull of the dredge 'Otonabee.' That has been completed and it was intended to place the machinery of the old dredge in the new hull but it was found that the amount of repairs on the machinery would be so great that it is deemed more economical to purchase new machinery. We will ask for tenders from the trade.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you simply write to a few firms in the trade ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We advertise in the newspapers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that going to be the rule ? It has not been done for the last few years.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been doing it right along.

Mr. J. D. REID. You have not been there very long.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. There is an improvement already.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this to be advertised ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume that no change will take place ; I have not contemplated any change.

Mr. J. D. REID. There were a great many cases along the canals where tenders were not called for in the newspapers.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is only in the case where there are only a few manufacturers of certain articles in which case we send a circular to them and so avoid the expense of advertising, but with respect to cement and all other items of that kind in connection with the canal, so far as I have had any experience in the department and been able to observe, general advertisements are placed in the newspapers. I know that every newspaper in the country wants an advertisement.

Mr. J. D. REID. Prior to 1896 the government would advertise for tenders along the St. Lawrence in the local papers.

Mr. EMMERSON. So we do now.

Mr. J. D. REID. Tell me of one newspaper along the St. Lawrence canal in which there is given an advertisement for supplies ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not suppose my hon. friend reads some of the newspapers in which the advertisements are to be found or he would see them. We cannot advertise in all the papers. I know that we advertise in the Peterborough, Hamilton, Toronto and Ottawa papers. We are sometimes a little select ; we have to select one out of a great number.

Mr. J. D. REID. No tenders are called for locally by advertisement but letters are sent to a few friends of the government asking them what they will furnish supplies for, and the same thing applies to the building of scows.

Mr. EMMERSON. I say most distinctly with reference to the scows that we would not invite general competition all over the province. That would cost more for advertising than the amount appropriated. In the immediate vicinity there will be a general advertisement. There are three dump scows required in that section of the country for which we ask $2,500 in this vote and the public will have an opportunity of competing, but it would be unwise and unbusinesslike to ask for tenders all over the province owing to the expense of advertising.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know why tenders are not asked for along the St. Lawrence for supplies or for the building of scows. If the minister would advertise in one or two papers, one in each county along the St. Lawrence, I am sure that would not be asking too much. There are dozens of men there who can furnish supplies or build any scows required. The cost of the supplies for the maintenance of the canals has been almost doubled since 1896, and I do not believe one tender has been called for in the last seven years. The parties furnishing these supplies are outside of the county, and there are many people in the county friends of the government too, who would be glad to furnish these supplies. Therefore I think the government should adopt the system of advertising for tenders instead of distributing these orders without proper competition. It is understood that these shall be advertised for tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are these to be used for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In connection with the dredging along the Trent waterway.

Trent canal—to complete rebuilding dam at Peterborough, $4,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this the last item connected with the Trent Valley system ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the main estimates. I do not see my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward) here. He wants to speak on the subject, and I am going to arrange so that he will have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. MORIN. I wish to ask the minister if he is going to bring some more estimates regarding the railway, as I wish to ask some questions ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend want to ask regarding the Intercolonial or the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. MORIN. I do not know.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, I do not understand my hon. friend. If he wants information on either, he will have the opportunity when the proper items come up ; but in connection with canals, it would be a little irregular.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that my hon. friend wants to ask some questions in regard to the construction of a railway near Lévis. So long as the opportunity is afforded to him, that will be satisfactory, I think.

Mr. MORIN. The minister will know at once whose railroad it is, which is under construction near Lévis.

St. Peter's canal—dredging, $2,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. $1,500 of this is a revote. This amount is to be expended for removing a shoal at the south entrance of the canal and also for doing some dredging at the north entrance. At low tide there is only nine feet of water, and at times vessels cannot leave the canal until the tide rises. There was difficulty last fall in getting a dredge to do the work. It will cost ap-

proximately 60 cents a yard, as a dredge will have to be brought from a distance for a few day's work. The whole is expected to cost about $2,000.

Rideau canal—to rebuild bridge at Smith's Falls, $5,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to rebuild a bridge across the west channel of the Rideau canal, below the basin, at the town of Smith's Falls. The present bridge was built many years ago of timber, and has been repaired and maintained ever since. It is over twenty years old, and is beyond repair.

Mr. LAVELL. Has the minister made any arrangement for rebuilding the dam at Poonamalee ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will necessarily be provided later on, we could not in the main estimates, which were prepared before the accident occurred.

Mr. LAVELL. I hope some provision will be made for covering the damages caused by the breaking of the dam.

Culbute canal—damages by flooding caused by dams of the canal, $2,305.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this an annual charge ? What does it mean ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This canal is on the Ottawa river. The canal has not been much used, and very serious damage has been caused by flooding. For 1903-4 there was an appropriation of $2,315, which was paid. The damages were inquired into by Mr. Surtees, civil engineer, of Ottawa.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is a case of permanent flooding, one would have supposed that the land covered by the waters thrown back by the dam should be expropriated once for all. If that is not the case, I would like to understand just what the situation is. It seems unusual that a charge for flooding should be an annual charge.

Mr. EMMERSON. This canal is now abandoned entirely and by proclamation has been done away with. That was done within the last two or three months. It was built previous to confederation for the benefit of the lumbermen on the Ottawa river. There was only sufficient land procured for the purposes of the canal and none purchased to guard against flooding, and the result has been damages from year to year. An unusual damage occurred a year ago last spring near the township of Allumette Island and under the advice of the Justice Department we made the best settlement we could.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One would suppose that if the canal were no longer useful, it would be better to do away with the dam instead of paying $2,500 annually, which represents an interest charge on $75,000 at the rate the government pays interest.

Mr. EMMERSON. An attempt was made to do away with it. One-third of the dam was blown up but the lumbermen universally protested. They said that even though abolished as a canal and even though the government repudiated liability in connection with it, yet it should remain as it was, so that they might get whatever benefit from it they could. The government will no longer be liable for the value of the damage done.

Chambly canal—to macadamize towpath, $9,075.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to macadamize ten and half miles nine feet wide, twelve inches deep in centre and nine inches at the sides. It will be let by tender and contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Has any of the towpath been macadamized heretofore ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, this towpath was a number of years metallized with gravel from Lake Champlain. It is now almost impossible to procure this material, and as the metal is practically worn out, we must substitute macadam, ordinary macadam without delay. It is supposed to cost $3,000 per mile. The amount asked for will only macadamize three miles.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is not that kept in regular repair annually ? Last year quite an amount was spent.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in connection with the road and not the towpath.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is not the towpath kept in repair regularly ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. The towpath is on one side of the canal and the road on the other. Some portions of the roadway were macadamized last year, and a vote was given a few years ago to macadamize a further portion of the road.

Mr. J. D. REID. Surely $3,000 a mile is a very large amount to macadamize a narrow road.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give the estimate. The cost per mile for the material, labour and rolling is $3,025. That is the amount made up by the engineer. Of course we will ask for public tender and will then discover whether this is too high an estimate or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. What position can the government take in so far as the collection of tolls is concerned ? There are $34,068 paid for the collection of canal tolls and none have been collected for the last two years. There is no reason why the lockmasters should not be utilized to issue passes and thus save $34,000 per annum. Even though there were a mistake in the lockmaster issuing passes, it is easily recti-

fied. It seems to me that that amount of $34,068 should be saved.

Mr. EMMERSON. As my hon. friend knows, it was determined to try the experiment of abolishing the tolls on the canals for two years and see what effect that would have on the traffic of the country. It was also stated that these men, some of whom were long in the service, should be continued in order to keep an accurate record of the business done. After this year, the whole matter will be determined. It may be that the tolls will be permanently abolished, but we will know from the returns given just what the effect has been.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is the second year. What was the result of the year's operations? Did it increase trade? Are the results such that the government would continue the present free system?

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year there was some improvement. As to this year, judging by what has been done up to this date, it would be a question whether, taking the average into consideration, there has been an improvement in the trade.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think that the re-imposition of the tolls would be a good move. The abandonment of the tolls tends to bring more trade by the St. Lawrence route. But, for the very reason that I think the tolls should not be re-imposed, I feel very strongly that the government should at once reduce that expense. If the hon. minister will not do it this year, I hope that next year the government—whatever government may be in power—will put it right.

Mr. EMMERSON. Any opinion offered by my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid), or by myself, on that subject, could be only a casual opinion, and the government could not act upon it. It is necessary to have accurate information with respect to the trade. On the basis of that accurate information the government will determine what is the best policy. I know how difficult it would be to restore the tolls, even though in the judgment of the country it would be wise to do so.

Mr. J. D. REID. The lockmasters are quite capable of issuing the passes which would be the basis of the information. Of course, where money had to be collected—and it was collected in large amounts—the lockmasters, perhaps, did not wish to take the responsibility of holding that money, especially for the small salaries they are getting. But there is no reason they should not issue the passes. It does seem ridiculous and absurd that a man should be paid $1,000 for doing work that the lockmaster, who is already under pay, could do. And this work is done by the lockmasters on the Rideau canal. That being so, why cannot the lockmasters do it on the St. Lawrence canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would not do to do this work in a careless or haphazard way. This information was necessary. Quite a number of these men were in the service, and, to carry out the hon. gentleman's idea, they would have to be superannuated or dismissed; with the result, possibly, that at the end of two or three years it would be necessary to fill their places again. The extra expense is certainly not to be taken into consideration as against the importance of the information that these gentlemen are required to secure and furnish for the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister's statement is a reflection upon the men on the Rideau canal, who actually do this work.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nobody has been dismissed on the Rideau canal. The men who were doing this work before on the Rideau canal are doing it now just as on the other canals.

Canals, miscellaneous—surveys and inspections, $3,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is an ordinary annual vote. The expenditure under this head for the year ending 30th June, 1904, was $3,252.18.

Mr. J. D. REID. Since the death of the late Mr. Rubidge, the steamer 'Alert' has been in charge of the superintendent of canals in that district. Surely the government are not going to furnish the superintendent with a pleasure yacht to run up and down the canal. There has never been anything of that kind in the history of this country on any of the canals. This boat, in fact, is larger than the ordinary pleasure yacht; she is a steamer that costs $8,000 or $10,000 per annum to run.

Mr. EMMERSON. The steamer 'Alert' has been for years employed on the canals that were under the supervision of the superintending engineer, Mr. Rubidge. By the death of Mr. Rubidge the office became vacant, and it has not been filled. In the meantime the boat has been placed in charge of the superintendent of canals in the same way as the rest of the plant connected with the canals. At one time, in addition to the superintending engineer, they had a superintendent of the Cornwall canal and also a superintendent of the Williamsburgh canal. The present superintendent, Mr. Stewart, is now in charge of both canals. He has to go from one place to the other. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) is one that occurred to my own mind as to the necessity of continuing the steamer. If the dredging is to be done and the engineers—even though there is no superintending engineer—have to get out at the different points, and if the superintendent has to go to the different canals, it may be necessary, for the present at least, to continue the steamer. Meantime, I purpose taking into consideration whether some cheaper method

cannot be devised, and this steamer placed elsewhere or disposed of.

Mr. J. D. REID. I remember the way the 'Alert' first came on that route. A number of years ago the government had under construction the Cornwall canal, the Farran's Point canal, the Williamsburgh canal, the North Channel and the Galops Rapids. At each one of these works there was an engineer in charge. The late Mr. Rubidge was superintending engineer over all the works, and the government furnished him with this steamer to enable him to run up and down and inspect them. These works have practically all been completed, and there is nothing going on at the present time except at Galops Rapids and the North Channel, which are side by side. At that time there were two superintendents not very distant from each other. When a change of government took place it was decided to abolish their positions, and these two men were dismissed, and Mr. Rubidge was placed in charge of all the canals as well as of the work of construction. These two men that were dismissed were Dr. Hickey and Mr. Ross. Shortly after it was decided that it would be well to appoint two men as assistants, but practically they were in the same position as the others had been. One is Mr. Lally at Cornwall, just as able a man as Dr. Hickey or Mr. Ross. One was appointed for Morrisburg and one for Cornwall, with Mr. Stewart superintending the two systems. Now we have got the same number of men as before, though they are called by different names. Mr. Stewart is over the canal in the same way that Mr. Rubidge was, except that he has no construction work to do. I am satisfied that this expenditure of $8,000 or $10,000 per annum for this steamer running up and down, is waste of money. Suppose this man wants to go from Morrisburg to Cornwall, a distance of twelve or thirteen miles. In the olden times the superintendent hired a livery man to drive him up at a cost of $2 or $3 per day, while the cost in the whole season would probably be $300 or $400. But now this steamer is put on, with a crew, and it will cost a lot to run her up and down. A pleasure party will be brought on board of this steamer, and she will run up to Cornwall and on as far as Prescott, and then turn and head down towards Williamsburg probably at a cost of $50 for the trip; whereas the superintendent could drive along the whole system in a couple of hours and at very small expense. Now the government have put on a boat which is a laughing stock for the whole public, even strong Liberals cannot believe that it will be continued. It is such an outrageous thing that the government should drop it. I was told the other day that Mr. Stewart had started out with a great pleasure picnic from Morrisburg, simply going to Cornwall, I presume.

Mr. EMMERSON. I don't know as to that. I am satisfied that Mr. Stewart will not make any improper use of the boat, or any use that is not necessary in connection with the canal. My hon. friend knows that Mr. Rubidge had this steamer for all these years, and I do not know that my hon. friend made any serious complaint about the cost.

Mr. J. D. REID. I complained about this steamer every year, about its being kept up for Mr. Rubidge's service after the work was completed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Rubidge only died a month ago, and the matter came under my observation very recently. I have not had an opportunity of looking into it myself. I hoped the session would have been through before now, and that I would have an opportunity of going down there and studying the situation. In the meantime this boat has been placed under the charge of the superintendent of these canals, who is the proper man to have charge of her. Also there are some engineers engaged finishing up the work, and this boat is placed at their disposal the same as Mr. Rubidge used it in connection with the canal works. I shall determine what to do, and if we find that the work of the superintendent can be carried on by the use of a train or in any other way, the cheapest and best course will be adopted.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that when Mr. Rubidge died Mr. Rheaume was placed in charge.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, Mr. Rheaume has not been placed in any different position from that he occupied as assistant of Mr. Rubidge. He is kept on there, but the superintendence of the work is maintained at the head office here. Mr. Rheaume has no position analogous to that of Mr. Rubidge. There are three or four assistant engineers there, my hon. friend probably knows the number better that I do.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Stewart is simply using the boat to run up and down the canal. Mr. Rubidge had not done much with the boat during the present season because he was too ill, and the boat was lying at Cornwall doing nothing. I do not know why it should be taken out and put on a new service running up and down the canal. If it had been placed in Mr. Stewart's charge to be responsible for it, that would be a different thing. Every time she goes out it means a lot of money. Mr. Stewart goes down to Cornwall armed with a letter from the department, showing that this boat is handed over to him, is in his charge and that he can do as he likes with it because it is handed over to the engineering staff,

and Mr. Rheaume's responsibility for it has been taken away.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Rheaume was in no way responsible for that boat. Mr. Stewart, the superintendent of the canal is responsible for its proper use just in the same way as he is responsible for any other plant in connection with the canal. He is instructed to place the boat at the disposal of the engineers in connection with the work on the canal. He is now using it in connection with the work on the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is employing it for his own use on the canal. There is no work of any kind going on now. I hope that when this matter comes up again it will be straightened out in such a way that the public as a whole can feel that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals does not wish to put an expenditure upon these canals such as was never known or that no person, either Liberal or Conservative, would undertake to justify.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know why the vote is required. Is not this inspection and survey made by officers of the department? And if so, what is the purpose of the vote?

Mr. EMMERSON. Are you referring to the $3,000?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is in connection with the travelling expenses of officers. Officers of the department and resident engineers are sent out to different points from time to time and this is to cover their expenses.

Mr. FOWLER. How much did you expend last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. $2,252.18.

Mr. LENNOX. You are asking for $3,000 and this is a revote.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is an annual vote, not a revote.

Railways and canals—surveys and inspections, railways, $18,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for the same thing.

Mr. LENNOX. If the hon. minister will refer to the Auditor General's Report for 1903, pages W—48 and W—47, he will find an account of the expenses of the cattle-guard commission amounting to $6,942.83. Then it says:

Less charged to surveys and inspections, railways (page W—47), $1,946.61.

leaving an apparent total of $4,996.22. I want to know from the hon. minister what is the reason for taking off that $1,946.61? That is a portion of the expenses incurred in connection with the railway cattle-guard commission. Turning back to page W—47 we find, referring to that item of $1,946.61, the expenses of Mr. F. W. Holt, under the heading of 'Miscellaneous surveys and inspections; cattle-guard commission' showing that this is an item in connection with the cattle-guard commission and that alone. I refer to that because of the somewhat peculiar system of bookkeeping which seems to obtain and for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the commission actually cost us $6,492.83. In conection with the matter I had occasion to ask some questions a short time ago. The questions and answers appear in 'Herald' of the 13th July last. I asked:

Did the services of Geo. Robertson, Esq., as commissioner, from August 16, 1902, to February 13, 1903, 181 days, include a Sunday service as such commissioner?

The hon. Minister of Public Works gave the following answer to that question:

Mr. Robertson was paid $5 per day for days he actually worked, which did not include Sundays, and reasonable travelling expenses and living expenses when absent from home.

As a matter of fact the hon. minister will find, whether it is due to an error or otherwise, that, if he takes the dates that Mr. Robertson puts in his own account——

Services: Aug. 16, 1902-Feb. 13, 1903, 181 d. at $5, $905.

—it includes every Sunday. It surely could not have been the intention that Mr. Robertson should work on behalf of the country in connection with the inspection of cattle-guards and superintending the general conduct of that wall-eyed steer on Sundays as well as on other days of the week. I do not know how it is that the hon. minister gives the answer in the way he does saying that he was only paid for the actual work he did not including Sundays.

Mr. EMMERSON. I got the answer from the accountant of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not a matter of great importance but it is as well to be correct.

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly, I supposed the accountant to be correct.

Mr. LENNOX. If the hon. minister will add up the figures he will find that they include every day. I also find from the returns that have been brought down that there is a difficulty between Mr. F. W. Holt, one of the commissioners and the government. I have asked whether the difficulty has been adjusted but I have not received an answer. Probably the hon. minister will answer me and say whether the matter is settled or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can tell the hon. gentleman how the matter stands.

Mr. LENNOX. Probably I had better say what I have to say. While Mr. Holt got for his services $150 a month he is claiming a thousand dollars more, according to his correspondence. He gives reasons which I think ought to commend themselves to the minister although I do not know whether they would commend themselves to the farming community. I notice in connection with these accounts that the grievances which used to be urged against the Conservative Premier in regard to the charging of cab-hire are continued by the Liberal government. There are also charges here for the polishing of these gentlemen's boots which I suppose would have to be done if they were at home. They also include an account for the expenses of providing office room at St. John and so on. I find that Mr. Holt says that the arrangement made with him by the government was that he should get $150 a month and his actual expenses. He claims that he is entitled to more money. These expenses include not only items such as I have mentioned but they also include railway fare. If the railways are to be exonerated from the payment of any other sum I think they might at least have been asked to bear that part of the expense, to carry these parties from place to place. Mr. Holt further claims that he is entitled to extra compensation and in writing to Mr. Schreiber on the 7th of January, 1904, he puts in this very weightly claim. I want to call the attention of the minister to it, and indirectly the attention of the country, as indicating exactly what was done on behalf of the people in the matter of cattle-guards and the kind of investigation that actually took place in this matter. Mr. Holt says :

> When the tests were completed we had not then found a thoroughly satisfactory guard. . . . . It then became my duty to find out the reason——

I have some doubt about that, but that is what he says :

> —the only way to do this was to study the structure of the animal as a piece of mechanism. This has been done as to his anatomy by the veterinarian as a surgeon, but I have been unable to find an idea as to his capacity as a machine other than in his ordinary walk.

I suppose he means his ordinary walk in life.

> In emergency motions as in passing a cattle-guard.

It breaks off abruptly there. I do not know exactly what he means. I suppose he means that no special study has been made of the animal in emergency motions as in passing a cattle guard.

> And it was from this point of view I have had to treat it. In making this search, I have found that there is very little literature available to the general reader, &c.

And upon this basis he contends that he is to apply himself seriously to this matter, studying this question seriously from the standpoint of the mechanism of the animal and his action in cases of emergency and that he is therefore entitled to at least $1,000 more. I do not know how the government looks upon it, but he gives very good reasons, and I am sorry to say casts some doubt upon the bona fides of the government in this matter. He says : I went at it seriously, I thought the government were in earnest. He does not say that the government were not in earnest but he suggests that the government did not bona fide intend to find out a suitable and sufficient cattle-guard. I would be glad to have an explanation from the minister as to the position in which the account stands, as it does not appear to be closed.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to be generally admitted by Mr. Holt and all interested that he was employed in connection with this commission at a fixed rate of payment which was settled at the rate of $150 per month and all his actual travelling expenses and other expenses incident to the work of himself and his co-commissioner. He was paid in accordance with that agreement but subsequently he presented to the department a claim for an additional amount because he had been employed longer than he had anticipated when he accepted the position. Mr. Holt, is, I may say, an engineer of good reputation, and personally I would speak in the highest terms of him both as a man and, so far as I had experience with him, as an engineer. He was arbitrator with Mr. Walter Shanley and Mr. Surtees in a celebrated case in New Brunswick in connection with which I was employed as one of the counsel. Later on I appeared before a tribunal of which he was a member and I may say that on both of these occasions he distinguished himself by the care with which he considered everything and the attention he gave to the cases and the arguments presented before the court. As I knew him well professionally and personally as a friend, he, naturally, after I came into office, presented his view of the case to me. Although the matter had been determined by the department previous to my accession to office he thought I would review it. I did so ; I went into the matter very closely, and I felt that an agreement having been made and carried out both by himself and the department I could not recommend that the decision of the department should either be reviewed or set aside by action of the Council. I felt that the Auditor General too would not authorize any departure from an agreement which had been carefully entered into and acted upon by both parties to it. Under these circumstances, while I would have liked very much to have seen him get an additional amount I felt that by reason of the agreement entered into by

him it was impossible to allow him any additional compensation, even although the time occupied by him was longer than he had anticipated. Usually in such cases when men are willing to work for so much a month the more months the merrier, and I would rather argue it from that standpoint, but in this case a different view was taken by Mr. Holt. I am sorry that Mr. Holt was dissatisfied with the decision but I certainly could not reverse it and I think that the judgment of this committee will be that the decision arrived at by me was correct.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister think that Mr. Holt was required to spend as much time as he claims to have spent in this investigation? Has the minister satisfied himself as to the length of time he took in making this supposed investigation? I ask this because the prevailing opinion in Ontario, so far as I can understand, is that ten times as much time was consumed as was necessary and not one-tenth as much information was obtained as should have been secured. Any ordinary man, not claiming to be especially skilful can find cattle-guards that will turn cattle at a crossing. This gentleman seems to have spent month after month in accomplishing nothing, whether he was trying to accomplish anything or not I do not know but his effort seemed to be to find some defect in every cattle-guard which was submitted for his examination. I attended almost every meeting of that commission in Ontario and I know that a great deal of useful information was submitted to him and many models were shown to him but he did not find any of these worthy of consideration. He seems to have gone off to discover the structure of the animal and how he would walk in an emergency. I cannot understand for the life of me what Mr. Holt was getting at there unless he was trying to make a report to this government that the railways could not get an effective cattle-guard.

I repeat that at all the meetings in Ontario at which I was present, and I was at all but two, a great many good structures were offered to these gentlemen; and there were no two opinions that many of them were effective, and would turn back ninety-nine out of one hundred animals. The hon. gentleman, not expecting at that time to be Minister of Railways, probably did not go down to the fair grounds here, as I did, when Mr. Holt was experimenting, or he would have found that the situation which Mr. Holt was trying to deal with there was not the situation as it existed in the country at all. He did not have a highway, from which the animal would have to turn aside to the right or the left to get on the railway, but he constructed a railway, and put the animal on the track, and surrounded the track with human beings on both sides, and urged the animal along the track and over the guard to the open highway; and as the animal had no other way to go, he struggled across. Therefore, because the animal got over the guard, Mr. Holt said the guard would not turn back the animal. That was very different from the situation in the country which Mr. Holt was employed to investigate. Therefore I think Mr. Holt has been very well paid, particularly as he chose to make a bargain at $5 a day; but I wonder that the minister did not tell him that three-fourths of his time was wasted, and that the commission accomplished nothing. I do not know why the report of this commission has not been published and circulated through the country. I can only suppose that it is because it does not contain the information which the government thought it ought to contain. Perhaps it is not a work of very great literary quality; but I do know that when this matter was brought up in the House, the reason the late Minister of Railways gave for not making the railways liable was that he was going to have the matter investigated by a commission, and that when he found what was the safest and most effective guard—a guard which he might call the standard—he would pass a law to make the railways adopt it; and they would be liable if they did not adopt it and not liable if they did and it failed to turn back the cattle. But, like many things which this government has promised, that did not happen, and we got the law which was contended for by myself and others on this side of the House, making the railways liable in any event and allowing them to provide their own guard. We are now dealing with the cost of this commission. I understand that Mr. Holt got $5,000, and that he wants $100 a month more. I think the minister, when inquiring into this question, ought to see whether or not Mr. Holt earned the money he did get. The farmers of the country, who are paying this expenditure of $6,000, which they have always claimed through their representatives in this House who knew anything about the matter, was a useless expenditure, believe that the results of this commission have been absolutely nil to the country. I think the Minister of Railways owes it to the farmers who pay the larger portion of the taxes of this country, to see whether Mr. Holt earned the money he did get or not, and, if he did not, to have it refunded. The farmers do not know what particular instructions were given to Mr. Holt; but they have a right to suppose that he was instructed to do his best to ascertain what is the best guard that could be obtained. I understand that the report says that there is no guard that can be obtained that will turn cattle. Now, the farmers of this country will not swallow that; I may as well tell the minister that first as last, I may also tell him that at these cattle-guard meetings I saw models of a good many guards with which the commissioners could not find fault; but they did try to find fault with every guard presented to them.

Several questions were discussed at these meetings as to the structure of the guards; opinions were taken from the farmers and mechanics present as to what sort of mechanical contrivance should be used; and I have looked in vain in the commissioner's report for all that evidence. If it is so, as I gather from the hon. member for South Simcoe, that these gentlemen charged railway fares while travelling through Ontario, that is an imposition on the country, because I was on the train with them, and I know they travelled from one place to another on passes which were furnished to them by the railways. I know they did not pay their railway fares then.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend does not say that they charged for railway expenses which they did not pay out?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think they have charged all their railway fares, but they have charged some.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is, where they had not passes.

Mr. LENNOX. I might ask the hon. minister if it is the intention of the government to publish the report of this commission? It should be published unless that involves a large expense, because we might as well know what was done. It looks to me as if it could be published at an expense of a very few dollars, judging by the public accounts, where there is a charge for a typewritten report of the commission, 600 copies, at 5 cents each, $30. If it is a 5 cent report, I think we ought to have copies of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is not that 5 cents per folio?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see anything to show that it is 600 folios.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been asked by my hon. friend from Lincoln as to whether I thought Mr. Holt took up more time than was necessary. If I were to answer that question, I would say that if more time was taken than was actually necessary, it was not done intentionally or for any improper purpose by Mr. Holt. I have a sufficiently high opinion of him to reach that conclusion. There is a great difference between men in this respect. Some are quick in thought, in action and in speech. Some are slow in thought and in speech. Mr. Holt may have been slow in his methods to work out the ideas he had before him, but he claimed to me it was necessary for him to take that time, and that he was entitled to some additional compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because he was slow?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; he claimed that he did the work with great rapidity, and that the speed made by him in reaching a conclusion was a further reason why he should be paid more. I have decided against Mr. Holt, although he is a personal and, I believe, a political friend of my own. I am informed that Mr. Holt did not urge the cattle in any direction on this track. The Deputy Minister of Railways was there, and he said that the only thing that was done was to place hay on the track on either side of the cattle-guard, and the cattle were driven along and, seeing the hay, they turned in its direction. I intend studying the report, which I have not yet had time to do, but as the matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, I have felt that it was incumbent upon that commission rather than me to deal with it.

Mr. LANCASTER. In view of what the minister has said, I can only say that there must be a double sort of structure down at the grounds where these experiments were made, because I not only saw the animals forced over the guards, but remonstrated with Mr. Holt about the way they were treated. His answer was that he wanted to put each guard to the strictest possible test. I told him two or three times that it was not a fair test to force an animal over the guard. There was no way for the animal to escape except to struggle over the guard. As regards the printing and publishing of this report, the only reason I can see for publishing it would be to show the farmers what little value this government gives them for their money.

Mr. BLAIN. I am in favour of the government publishing the report. As I understand from the hon. minister, the cost will not be very great. The government has already expended about $5,000 in testing cattle-guards——

Mr. LENNOX. Almost $7,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I stand corrected. As the government has spent almost $7,000 in testing cattle-guards——

Mr. EMMERSON. No. I do not understand my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) to say we have expended $7,000 in testing cattle-guards.

Mr. BLAIN. The country has been expending $7,000 for the purpose of testing cattle-guards to find——

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has a right to choose his own language. I only wanted to know what he meant.

Mr. BLAIN. I only wished to state the case as it is. So, I will ask the hon. minister to explain it to me.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand the work of testing the cattle-guards to be that which was done out here at the Exhibition grounds, which was attended by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and in relation to which he disputes the declaration

of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals—another illustration that if half a dozen men attend a dog fight each will give a different account of it. The total cost of the commission is something over $6,000, but I should think that the work of testing cattle-guards was that done out here at the exhibition grounds.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not know that the hon. minister has made it much clearer. I made the statement that the cost of testing the cattle-guards was about $7,000, and I understand that the exact figure is $6,942. This money has been spent in the effort to find out whether a suitable cattle-guard had been invented. I think that some of the guards submitted for examination were very suitable and might be adopted by the railways in Canada. I know of one, patented by a gentleman from Cookville, Ont., and brought to the city at considerable cost to the inventor, to be submitted to tests. I understand that for more than an hour and a half in one case, and more than two hours in the other case, the cattle were unable to get over this cattle-guard. The inventor felt that it would be a suitable cattle-guard for use on our railways, and if the government were making the test for the purpose of recommending or prescribing a suitable guard this one, perhaps with others, should be most favourably regarded. Furthermore, the cost is very little—not more than $7. A practical engineer who saw it said that it could be manufactured in large quantities at $5 each. The government have not done their duty in regard to cattle-guards submitted for test. And I have no hesitation in saying that, as the government have spent $6,942 in testing and paying the officers to make observations in connection with the test, the government should spend whatever small further sum might be necessary in order to publish the report. So long as the government keep the report secret, people will imagine that there is something wrong about it. The people should know how their money was expended and what the results were. Whether those results are valuable or not valuable is a matter for further consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me unnecessary to publish the report of the commission. The evidence has been taken and typewritten ; the report of the commissioners has been made ; and the whole now comes under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission who are the ones to finally settle this question.

Mr. BLAIN. Was not the test made under the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Emmerson's) department and was not the report made to his department ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and the whole business laid before the Railway Commission. At the time the commission began its work the Railway Department had jurisdiction and they naturally reported to the Railway Department, and about that time this parliament transferred jurisdiction from the Railway Department to the Board of Railway Commissioners. I do not know that my opinion under any circumstances would weigh with hon. gentlemen opposite, but it certainly would not have the weight of authority even if expressed, because the individual holding the position of Minister of Railways at this day is not clothed with jurisdiction with respect to this matter. It seems to me that in discussing a matter of this kind, we can hardly hope to accomplish great good through the department of Railways.

Mr. LENNOX. When I called attention to this matter, I did not suppose that it would be discussed for so long a time. Certainly, I shall not take many minutes in what further I have to say on the subject. The amount of money spent is not so very important in itself.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will allow me : There was one thing he called my attention to—and very properly—the Auditor General's statement of the expenses of making a deduction. There was a deduction from the sum total because a proportion of the time of Mr. Holt was taken up in connection with the inspection of railways, and it was held to be properly chargeable, apart from the cattle-guard question, to the Railway Department.

Mr. LENNOX. So far as the $2,000 is concerned, I only called attention to that so that there might be no misunderstanding. Expense amounting to practically $2,000 by reason of the fact that the government had an investigation of the cattle-guard question on which there was a total expenditure of $6,942. I notice what the minister said as to Mr. Holt being a little slow.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to say that I said so. I am willing to accept Mr. Holt's estimate of himself that he was very speedy.

Mr. LENNOX. As to whether the minister considered Mr. Holt slow, I am not concerned about that, except that I think it right to call attention to the fact of the investigation that took place ; and I think that if we take his own estimate we get a good gauge of the investigation that, as a matter of fact did take place. When Mr. Robertson retired in February the House was sitting. I was instructed by the Minister of Railways that the investigation was then practically completed. So we find that for four months afterwards the investigation continued, and with no practical benefit to anybody. Now with reference to the report, I do not think the minister has taken pains to ascertain

how that matter stands. If this was a five cent report, being a matter of less than two folios, less than a page at all events, it might be well to have a copy. I have gone to the trouble of going over the matter, I find there is a lot of interesting matter in it but none that is very valuable. There are 988 pages of this stuff, and I think four-fifths of it is absolute rubbish. It is a repetition of letters, of copies of letters, of letters original and so forth. There is nothing in it of the nature of a report. You cannot tell where any report begins or where any report ends. The commissioners reported the evidence, but they have made no finding. If there is no report worth five cents a copy, there is no report at all that I could conscientiously recommend to have published because I would say that three or four hundred pages of evidence are reported but no finding as a result. I do not think the minister is right in the conclusion that this is a matter for the Railway Commission. I think it is a matter for his department. Mr. Robertson appears to be of no particular value in the matter, because he was allowed to leave before he had completed his duties, before he had made any report. We paid him for six months time, including Sundays, $905 and $843.42 for expenses, and we got nothing from him in return. The other gentleman spent ten months, and complains that his salary was not large enough.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much was expended last year on account of this item ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $11,277.77.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was it expended for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In connection with the surveys and inspection of subsidized roads.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why were the commissioners, to whom reference has been made, paid before they made their report ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As a matter of fact, they were paid by the month, as they went along.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That seems an unusual way of doing business.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is the usual way with these commissions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One of the commissioners, apparently, not only broke away from the commission, but he ceased operations and did not make any report. The House does not enjoy the advantage of appreciating his opinion on the subject of cattle-guards. How is that serious defect ever to be remedied ? Does the hon. Minister of Railways think it ever can be remedied ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Robertson was chiefly appointed for the purpose of taking evidence ; he was not a scientific man at all, only an ordinary common sense business man.

Mr. LENNOX. Very common sense.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I like to see good, genuine common sense men on such a commission, with the emphasis on the common,' and Mr. Robertson is such a man.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not reflecting on either of these gentlemen, I am discussing the methods which were pursued. If the only duty of the commissioners was to take evidence, it would strike one who was not familiar with the technical way of dealing with these commissioners, that perhaps one could have done it as well as two—that would seem to follow from the minister's remarks. Might I inquire whether any marked difference was found in the efficiency of the commission after Mr. Robertson had ceased to co-operate with Mr. Holt ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Robertson only ceased when Mr. Holt started in to draw up his report from the scientific point of view ; he studied the question from the scientific and mechanical side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have we not been robbed—I trust 'robbed' is not too strong a word—of the aspect of the question presented from the common sense side to which my hon. friend has drawn attention ? As I understand it, Mr. Robertson was the common sense man of the commission, and the other gentleman was the scientific man. If we are to have presented to parliament only the scientific side and not the common sense side, how are we to understand the latter side ? Is it likely that at any time in the near future the common sense side will be presented to us by Mr. Robertson ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I may explain to my hon. friend that the people of the country and parliament can draw their own deductions from that common sense presentation of the evidence. I do not wish to have it crystallized here ; parliament is supposed to have a great amount of ordinary common sense, and I do not suppose we need it to be crystallized in a report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then do we understand that Mr. Robertson gave evidence himself ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He took the evidence and arranged it. I want my hon. friend to understand me. Mr. Robertson arranged who should give evidence at the different points where the commission sat. Mr. Robertson attended to the business side of the commisssion and the other gentleman was as the scientific member of the commission, having scientific knowledge as an engineer. Mr. Roberston arranged where and when the meetings should be held, he was practically the chairman of the commission. They went from place to place taking this evid-

ence, and he has reported that for the benefit of parliament as I think for the benefit of the Railway Commission, because that is the tribunal which will have jurisdiction in the settlement of this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty seems to be that although the common sense to which my hon. friend refers may have been crystallized in the case of Mr. Robertson, parliament does not enjoy the advantage of having the crystals placed before it.

Mr. EMMERSON. The evidence has been reported to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know. My hon. friend says that Mr. Robertson's common sense was valuable in connection with this evidence. To what can that amount unless Mr. Robertson is possessed of some intuition which enables him to select the proper persons to give the evidence? I suppose that any man possessing an ordinary knowledge of the difficulties that surround the construction of a cattle-guard could have taken this evidence in about one quarter of the time and at about one-tenth of the expense that has been incurred. As far as I can see the whole commission has rather degenerated into a humbug. The only advantage that the country enjoys is that of paying the expenses of these gentlemen during a very considerably greater period than one would reasonably have expected to be occupied in making this inquiry.

Mr. LENNOX. There is one question which the hon. minister did not answer. I did not notice it at the time but this 'common sense' discussion has brought it up. Mr. Holt in claiming compensation does not present the same view as that of the hon. minster in regard to the common sense of the other commissioner. Mr. Holt claims that the whole weight of the matter fell on him, that he was the chief person engaged in the inquiry and that therefore he is entitled to greater compensation. That is a matter that we will have to leave to be decided later on when we get more light upon it. But, the hon. minister has not said whether he agrees with the suggestion which is more than once repeated in the correspondence of Mr. Holt, that the government were not in earnest, that the government did not want the work to be done, that the government were not serious in the matter and that he was serious. As to that I would like the hon. minister to answer. Does he agree with Mr. Holt in his suggestion that the government were not serious, or is he able to say that the insinuation that they were not serious has been repudiated by the government? I object very decidedly to this expenditure considering that we have nothing in the nature of a report from Mr. Holt or from Mr. Robertson. Mr. Robertson did not pretend to make a report. He performed a service for the party in another capacity by dropping out of the commission entirely to contest an election in the interests of the Liberal party and for that service I suppose he is excused from making a report.

Railways and canals—Miscellaneous—railway statistics, including clerical assistance, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,500.

Mr. MACLEAN. Are these statistics required to be collected under the new Railway Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the usual vote from year to year. These statistics are provided for in the Railway Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. In connection with these statistics I would urge upon the hon. minister that the Railway Commission and his department should be more active in getting statistics. It developed here only the other day that while the Railway Act requires railway companies to file their standard passenger rates—

Mr. EMMERSON. They have until November to do it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know that because the commission gave them an opportunity as a result of my calling attention to their dereliction in connection with the matter. All these statistics that are called for under the Act should be made good immediately. I also want to point out for the information of the Railway Commission that all statistics bearing on railway questions and especially on railway tariffs ought to be in the hands of the commission and available for the public. Anything I desired to ascertain in connection with railway operations I have had to go out and collect myself at very considerable expense. I have had to send out my own commissioners to find out these things and I think the time has arrived when the Railway Commission ought to collect these statistics and that they ought to be available for the public. I would also say that the Railway Commission should see that its clerks assist those of us in the House who desire to get information and the information when obtained ought to be available for every one.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before this item passes I would like to bring a matter to the attention of the hon. minister and I might as well bring it up on this item as upon any other. I want to ask the hon. minister if he will be good enough to tell the committee about McLaren's Creek. Last year and the year before there were items in the estimates for the construction of a roadway across McLaren's Creek but the work was stopped. I do not find any item in the estimates at all this year. Last year the department sent up an embankment

about half way across the creek, but the dredge was taken away and no more has been done since. I understand that a gentleman in the Senate who claims to exercise patronage in that riding interfered and had the dredge taken away. This was not done in the hon. minister's time so that if he does not know anything about the matter he can give me the information at a later stage.

Mr. EMMERSON. My information is that the department offered to pay one-third of the cost of making the roadway providing the municipality, or interested parties, paid the remainder. The department started in to do their work and they were ready to do it but the others would not and the department has delayed matters until those interested are willing to perform their part of the work. That is my information.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume I know as much about this matter as any person but I never heard a hint once before that the municipality were supposed to do something. The understanding was that the road was to be left in such a position that the municipality could finish it up. This is the first time that I ever heard that the government were to pay one-third and the municipality two-thirds of the cost. The municipality have no right to do any of it at all. Owing to the construction of the government dam at Bobcaygeon teams have to go two miles west and two miles back to the east again to reach Lindsay. If it were not for the government dam, the creek would be readily accessible. I do not know where the hon. minister's information comes from. If there is any correspondence in the matter I would ask the hon. minister to bring it down or I will go over to the department and see it.

There is another matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. minister and it is in regard to Pigeon river bridge at the mouth of Pigeon river. It was taken away by the ice last winter. Inasmuch as the Pigeon river will be open to navigation as soon as the Trent canal is completed I would ask the minister to have his engineer look into it and consider the advisability of having a swing bridge at that point.

Salaries of extra clerks, copyists and messengers other than those who have passed the civil service examination, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the usual vote in connection with the department. Last year the full amount was expended.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the minister give a list of these people ?

Mr. EMMERSON. During the season these extra clerks are employed ; they are Ottawa people, but I have not the list here.

Mr. FOWLER. That is very vague information.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the list ; it is the usual number of people, but I could very readily get the list ; there are some three or four.

Mr. FOWLER. I think we ought to know what this is for, and who gets it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I find I did not go far enough in my explanation. There are two stenographers in the minister's office who are paid out of this vote.

Mr. FOWLER. Extra ones ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; employed continuously outside the civil service. They are paid $600. They are Miss Scott and Miss Quain. Then we have temporarily employed for the session Miss Helmer and Miss Stewart, who are paid at the rate of $500 a year for the session. Miss Scott and Miss Quain are employed in the office of the private secretary of the minister, doing the typewriting all the year around, and I know that they are very hard-worked officials, because they have no holidays on Saturdays, and their day's work is not concluded at four o'clock as in the case of appointments under the Civil Service Act.

Salaries of engineers, draughtsmen, extra clerks and messengers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $29,450.

Mr. EMMERSON. During 1903-4 we had employed and paid out of this vote Thomas Ridout, consulting engineer ; R. C. Douglas, hydraulic and bridge engineer ; E. B. Johnston ; J. B. Spain, chief draughtsman ; Mothersill, auditor of the engineers' accounts ; Leslie, draughtsman ; T. L. Simmons, inspecting engineer ; Mr. Lawlor, assistant law clerk ; the photographer and extra clerks, who are not on the permanent staff under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FOWLER. What proportion of this goes to the extra clerks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are 15 extra clerks, in addition to the messengers. About $18,000 of it goes to the higher officials, the engineers, &c., and the balance goes to the extra clerks and messengers.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you have the same clerks every year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have been described as the permanent temporaries. They are not on the civil service list ; they are employed temporarily, but they are permanently there.

Mr. FOWLER. I would suggest that the minister bring in a short Act to put them on the permanent list.

Mr. BLAIN. How many officials were engaged in the minister's department last year who had not passed the civil service examination ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Since I have been in the department no additional ones have come in. A new assistant law clerk came in, Mr. Alward, but he is not required to pass any examination. Mr. Alward simply replaced Mr. Hansard, who was the former assistant law clerk, who was promoted to the position of law clerk on the resignation of Mr. Ruel, who has taken a position at Toronto.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose that we are to understand that the minister will not employ any one who has not passed the civil service examination for positions for which an examination is required ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Only temporarily, as the work requires.

Governor General's car, repairs and alterations, $2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the minister how many of these so-called government cars there are. I see it stated in this morning's paper that the Minister of the Interior left in his private car on Saturday for Winnipeg. I remember seeing in one of the prominent newspapers last winter that one of the government cars had arrived in Winnipeg to bring a relative of the Minister of the Interior to Ottawa for Christmas.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was a mistake.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—it was not a mistake. One of the government cars left here and went to Winnipeg to bring a relative of the Minister of the Interior down to spend Christmas.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Brought his father down.

Mr. BENNETT. What I want to know from the minister is for what degree of relationship may the cars be sent ? What is the extent of the consanguinity, and how many of these private cars are there ? It will not do for the minister to say that these things are not done. I myself saw two government cars standing in the Union Station at Toronto, and there was not a minister in one of them. It was a party of ladies.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A pleasure excursion up the line ; and when an hon. member of this House dies, and his fellow members wish to attend his funeral, they have to pay for their own Pullman's. The government would not even provide a private car to take the body of the late Mr. McCreary to Winnipeg. I thought it was simply disgraceful. These cars can always be got by any of the ministers or their friends who want to make a junketting trip through the country, making exhibitions of themselves, and laughing at the poor farmers sweating in the fields. And yet when a member of the minister's own party dies, his body is sent in a baggage car to the Northwest.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. gentleman' language is not within proper bounds. The use of private cars is to-day just what it has been since there have been private cars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. I happen to know something about that. When a minister applies to the Department of Railways for a car, it is assigned to him and the department knows nothing about the purpose for which he wants it. The ministers do not own private cars. The Department of Railways and Canals has, I think, five official cars, of which two are at Ottawa, and if a minister wants one in connection with any business he may have in hand, and if it is in the yard here he gets it on his requisition. Beyond that the department has no knowledge. I am sure the statement made by my hon. friend about junketting is simply a figure of speech. He wishes to convey an idea of a condition of things which does not exist, and I am sure that on reflection he will feel like withdrawing the statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My language is not at all overdrawn. I say to the minister that it is a scandal in his own party. Hon. members sitting on his own side of the House have objected to it in much stronger language than I have used. I may not repeat the language because it was in the shape of personal attacks on the ministers and their friends.

Mr. INGRAM. They used to call them small potatoes. I do not know what they call them now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will not repeat the language which was used by members of the minister's own party, because it would not be parliamentary. If it comes to a vote, they will fall into line, but in their hearts they condemn the misuse of the cars ; and on the occasion of the death of Mr. McCreary, when one of these cars might properly have been used to remove his body to Winnipeg, members of the hon. minister's own party were indignant when they learned that the body had been sent, in a baggage car ; and some of those who went with it came very near being left behind and not reaching Winnipeg at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to the statement of my hon. friend I would say that this is the first time I have known that there ever was a request made to the Department of Railways for a car to go to Winnipeg on the occasion of the much lamented death of Mr. McCreary. I never heard of it before. If any such request had been made. I am sure the Department of Railways would have been only too pleased to have met the wishes of Mr. McCreary's friends.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me very strange that the minister should require a request for a car under such circumstances. A prominent member of the Liberal party died practically in the House while in the service of his country, and his body was carried in a baggage car instead of one of the government cars being used for that purpose. As a matter of fact, several ministers were approached on the subject by the member for North Victoria, and each one said it was not in his department. It should not have been necessary for any request to have been made at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a wonder the hon. member did not mention it to the head of the Railway Department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rang up the office of the Minister of Railways half a dozen times at the request of some of his own friends. I was told that the minister was not there, but was at Council. Then I rang up the Privy Council office. The message was sent to the Prime Minister while the cabinet was in Council, and I do not know what became of it. I also rang up the office of the Minister of the Interior, and spoke to the deputy minister and several other officers of that department; but nobody seemed to care enough about the matter to do anything. I spoke personally to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he declined to interfere. The sum and substance of it is that they had no more use for the late member of Selkirk, and they allowed his body to go to Winnipeg in a baggage car, while they kept the private cars for pleasure trips up and down the side lines.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the minister to say that the statement I made about a private car having been sent to Winnipeg to bring down a relative of the Minister of the Interior is incorrect?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, because I have no knowledge of the matter.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman said before that it was a mistake. He gave the statement a point blank denial.

Mr. EMMERSON. Because I did not understand what it was.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the rule as to the extent of relationship governing the sending of these cars across the country? Has the minister any policy on the subject?

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I made myself quite clear, that any minister asking for the use of a car can get it if there is one available. This is the custom that has prevailed for a great many years, long before this government came into power, and it continues. The department does not have a record as to the use to which a car is to be put. That must be for the judgment of the minister getting the use of the car.

Mr. BENNETT. How many of these government cars are there?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are two here for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. How many at other points?

Mr. EMMERSON. At Moncton there are three official cars. Then there is the Governor Generals' car, with which the Railway Department has nothing whatever to do.

Mr. FOWLER. That makes five outside of the Govenor General's car?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it true that some time last year one of these cars was sent from Moncton to California? If so, for what purpose was it sent?

Mr. EMMERSON. What time does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. FOWLER. Say within the last two years. I think it was some time yast year.

Mr. EMMERSON. Sir William Mulock had one of the cars to go to Mexico.

Mr. BENNETT. What—Sir William Mulock, the farmer's friend?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it the same gentleman who was sympathizing with the farmers in Ontario the other night, who was rolling over the country to Mexico in a private car?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend had such a quantity of sympathy to express that I do not know how Sir William Mulock could find opportunity to get a word in.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If Sir William Mulock were to die, his body ought to be sent home in a baggage car the same as Mr. McCrearys. I would be quite satisfied to see him sent home that way.

Mr. BENNETT. How much money is invested in these private cars?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are practically the same cars as have been owned by the government since the early days.

Mr. BENNETT. No, the hon. gentleman is quite wrong in his history of these government cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not tell you the amount of money invested for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. There was only one government car in the old days and that was the 'Jamaica.'

Mr. EMMERSON. They began with one.

Mr. BENNETT. And these magnates have five now. I suppose that is because the ministers have always lived in private

cars of their own. What do these cars cost on an average ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can tell my hon. friend that he is very much mistaken when he says the late government had only one private car. I remember at the time of the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson, down at Halifax, there were four different ministers who had private cars at the time, each one having a car of his own.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the hon. gentleman sure that those four carriages were owned by the government at the time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Quite certain.

Mr. BENNETT. What were the names ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not tell you that. One of the cars now in use cost $4,500. Another one cost $9,500. The one bought for the Duke and Duchess cost $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you not building another private car ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is something in the estimates for the Governor General's car and I was going to explain that when I got the opportunity.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there not an item of $18,000 to build a new car ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Railway Commissioners will require a car if they have not already purchased one.

Mr. FOWLER. That is ordered now.

Mr. EMMERSON. Whether they have actually ordered it or secured it I do not know.

Mr. MACLEAN. How much is it to cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister has not answered my question about that trip to California.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no trip that I was aware of to California except the one to Mexico.

Mr. FOWLER. This private car was sent to Moncton in connection with Mr. Tiffin.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Tiffin is the general traffic manager and has an official car in which he travels on business. Whether he went in it as far as California or not, I am not in position to say.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Tiffin was away on leave for six months, and it was during that time he had this car. My information is that during those six months he had this car with a party of friends, and went to California in it at the expense of the people of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would not be at the expense of the people.

Mr. FOWLER. The government own the car.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but if he took the car away on such a trip it would not be at the expense of the government.

Mr. FOWLER. Would he pay for haulage ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a courtesy extended by railways.

Mr. FOWLER. What would he pay ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He would pay his living in the car and all the expenses connected with it.

Mr. LENNOX. Which of the cars went to Mexico ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it was car 109.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it not a fact that when private cars are used by other ministers than the Minister of Railways, the railway companies generally charge for the haulage ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is paid by the individual minister and not by the government. All the expenses are paid by the individual and he simply has the use of the car.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the charge per mile ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon friend will find that the courtesy is extended by railways to a minister even on American roads. They extend the courtesy of haulage. I know they do in Canada. I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway never charge any of the ministers for transportation and the Intercolonial does not charge railway directors. Unfortunately these railway magnates do not go down over the Intercolonial often enough, or they would realize better what a fine country we have down there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would not say a word about private cars. If the minister goes off on business, it is his duty to travel in a private car, but what irritated me was that at the very time when poor McCreary's body was sent away in a baggage car, I heard from Liberal members in this House——

Mr. EMMERSON. I am only sorry my hon. friend did not state the matter to me. All that would have been necessary would have been to mention the fact to me. I never heard a whisper of it. I regret that the suggestion did not occur to myself.

Mr. MONK. What is the name of the car built for the Duke and Duchess of York ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. 109.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the one the minister uses for his own private use ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Do not put it in that way. It is the car that has been used by

the Minister of Railways, and I have the temerity to use it now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perfectly right.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood that the hon. minister went to Nova Scotia with a party of friends. I presume he had car No. 109 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the car I had.

Mr. INGRAM. What private cars were there in connection with the government railways and used by the ministers in 1896 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A return was brought down about that during this session. I have not the papers here.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister might ask his deputy for the information.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is one additional car now over those that existed in 1896 in connection with the Department of Railways.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there a Governor General's car previous to 1896 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes ; that is the one that has cost so much to repair. It is called the 'Victoria.' It was provided for the use of the Governor General. His Excellency has reported time and again within the last two or three years that it was much out of repair. It seemed to be cheaper to purchase a new car than to incur this annual expense for repairs. In a few minutes I shall ask the committee to vote $18,000 for a new car for the Governor General.

Mr. FOWLER. Then what is this $2,000 for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For the changes necessary to make it into some other kind of a car.

Mr. J. D. REID. As a private car ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; it is not so intended.

Mr. INGRAM. We have one car now in addition to those we had in 1896, and when this $18,000, to which the minister refers, is voted, that will make a second additional car.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; that will put the 'Victoria' out of commission, so that there will not be an additional car.

Mr. INGRAM. Then why spend this $2,000 ? If that amount is spent on a car, it must be in order to keep the car in use.

Mr. EMMERSON. This item was put in last February, of course, before the determination had been reached to build a new car. Since then, talking with His Excellency and others who are interested, it seemed to me it would be better to vote money for a new car ; and my idea is to utilize the old car in some way in connection with the Intercolonial. If that cannot be done the money will not be spent.

Mr. LENNOX. Then it is not true, as was said a few minutes ago, that this will make an additional car which will become available for the Intercolonial or officials of the government ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My idea is to make it into a passenger car in connection with the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOWLER. The government is going to provide an additional car for the Governor General and also a car for the Railway Commission. Besides this they have one additional car since 1896. That makes three new cars since 1896.

Mr. BENNETT. In the four cars which he says were owned by the government prior to 1896, does the minister include the Governor General's car ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BENNETT. What were the four cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My memory is not good enough to give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not expect the hon. minister to be able to remember details of that kind. But he has his officials beside him, and surely they can tell him.

Mr. EMMERSON. They do not remember.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister tell me that the deputy minister does not know how many private cars there are on the road ? Why, any school boy living along the road can tell that.

Mr. BENNETT. I may tell the hon. minister that as long ago as 1892 there was an old car that stood down here on the siding that was used by the ministers of that time during an election tour. I think it was the only car around here. I do not think the minister can be allowed to make the statement that there were four cars at that time unless he gives us the names.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was the 'Ottawa,' the 'Cumberland,' a car known as No. 24, and another car whose name or number I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Where were the four cars kept ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Two here constantly—the 'Ottawa' and the 'Cumberland.'

Mr. FOWLER. And where were the four in commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the exact information to answer that question, but I have not the notes at hand, and I cannot remember.

Mr. FOWLER. I think we ought to be able to get the exact number of these cars, there are not so many of them. The min-

ister says that in 1896 there were four cars ; I want to know whether those four are still in commission, and if so, where are they used. For instance, at Moncton—as I understand it, Mr. Pottinger, the general manager, has a car of his own, Mr. Tiffin also has a car of his own. Are there any other cars kept at Moncton belonging to a particular official ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have two cars at Moncton, one No. 75, used by the general manager and the general superintendent, the other, the number of which I do not know, is used by the traffic manager. Then we have one used by the deputy minister, which was also used by the deputy minister previous to 1896 ; that is known as the 'Ottawa ". Then we have the car known as the 'Montreal', I do not know her number. In addition we have the car No. 109, the one that has been used by ministers. That makes five, and as I stated there were four previous to 1896 ; the sixth is the Governor General's car.

Mr. FOWLER. The 'Ottawa', used by the deputy minister, is that also used by members of the government ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is still known as the deputy minister's car, and is used largely in the business of the department. When it is not engaged on that business it is used by members of the government. When ministers want a car and send in a requisition to the department, if the other car is not ready that one is taken. On the occasion this last winter when the Postmaster General was ill car 109 was used by him in going to Mexico.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand it is the intention of the minister to condemn the present Governor General's car and use it as a passenger car on the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my idea, to convert it into a passenger car.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that these cars are made with compartments, and it would seem to involve a good deal of sacrifice to make that change. But I would point out that we have this condition of things, that the estimates are brought down with a vote of $2,000 to repair the Governor General's car ; we have no objection to that, if it is necessary.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may explain that we put that item in the estimates when it was supposed that the car would continue to be used as the Governor General's. Since then I have changed the estimates and put in an additional amount of $18,000 for a new car ; and I have decided to change the present car used by the Governor General into a passenger car for the Intercolonial, probably a parlour car.

Mr. LENNOX. That appears to be a second thought on the part of the minister, we must follow events as they have occurred.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is no second thought at all.

Mr. LENNOX. We discussed this item at considerable length before the minister made this intimation, we are discussing this $2,000 item for the repair of the Governor General's car, and just now the minister announces that it is not for that purpose at all. Then I think I am justified in assuming that probably it is an afterthought when he says that it is to be turned into a passenger car. Now I venture to predict, having regard to circumstances as they have occurred, that it is highly probable that the minister will again change his mind, and that the car will be devoted to the same class of service as the other cars that are denominated official cars, and that it will make one more car available for members of the administration. It seems to be impossible to ascertain just how many official cars we have. It is remarkable that it should be impossible to know clearly by name and number their proper official designation, and how many cars we have. An inquiry was made a month ago upon this question, it was referred to several times in the House, and the minister has sitting at his elbow the deputy minister, and yet we cannot get explicit information as to what cars we have in the service of the government. So far as I understand, we have the Ottawa, the Montreal, the Cumberland, we have No. 109 for the Minister of Railways, we have No. 75 and No. 34. I think we can now safely conclude that after the purchase or construction of another official car for the Governor General, we will have seven or eight cars at all events.

Mr. MACLEAN. Are these two new cars to be built in Canada ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is only one car to be constructed, the Governor General's car, which is to be constructed in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think he said the commissioners had ordered a car for themselves.

Mr. EMMERSON. They purchased a car. I think they got it for immediate use, from the Pullman Company.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are they going to have this new car built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think I should tell my hon. friend at this moment. I have an offer from people in Canada, but I am not prepared to accept it until the vote is passed. However, I have stated that it will be built in Canada. I have an offer that will enable us to have it built in Canada within the sum mentioned in the item.

Mr. FOWLER. Was this car 109 built in Canada ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Did the minister authorize this expenditure on the part of the Railway Commissioners ? On what authority did they order it or purchase it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the authority of a vote. It was necessary for them to have an official car for the Railway Commission. They were obliged to go to Toronto and other points in the west, and there was no car in the service of the Department of Railways and Canals that would accommodate them. There are three commissioners, and they have their officials with them. It is quite a large party. They require at least three rooms, one for each commissioner. There is no car at present available, not one of the cars has that number of rooms and it is therefore necessary to have such a car for the Railway Commissioners. Efforts were made to purchase one from the railway companies in Canada if they had any available but none could be found that would at all suit the requirements. The Railway Commissioners have assignments for holding meetings in the west at very many points and they require to leave here at a very early date.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the hon. minister has answered the question as to where their authority came from. Is there a sum of money placed at their disposal to be used as they see fit ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not at their disposal, but, at their disposal with the authority of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the amount ? Is it unlimited ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. There was an amount placed in last year's estimates for the expenses in connection with the Railway Commission. The expenditure of that had to be authorized by the Governor in Council and they have received authority to purchase a car for $20,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. The authority of the Governor in Council ?

Mr. FOWLER. We never anticipated that the item of $20,000 passed last year would go without the authority of parliament for the purpose of purchasing a car. It was for incidental expenses, and the purchase of a private car was scarcely contemplated. I would think that it would cost them at least $20,000 to provide a private car suitable for their purposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will admit that they should have an official car.

Mr. FOWLER. Is not this car, which I understand is so beautifully fited up, sufficient for them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not large enough.

Mr. FOWLER. How many officials do they carry with them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have at least one engineer and they have a number of secretaries.

Mr. FOWLER. Does each one have a secretary ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not each one. They have one secretary and they require a stenographer, and I think they will require a legal assistant.

Mr. FOWLER. Have they any yet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think they will have one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will they take a chaplain with them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Is my hon. friend open for such a position ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I think this commission ought to have a car but I think it is a reflection on Canada and the industries of Canada that that car should be built outside of this country. Some arrangement should be made whereby the car should be built in this country. They require a first-class car as far as accommodation is concerned. I do not begrudge them that, but it is a reflection on our country and on our manufacturers that we should not be able to build that car in this country. Some provision surely could have been made until such time as a Canadian built car could be placed at the disposal of the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. When I asked tenders from Canadian car builders for the Governor General's car there was only one concern in Canada that was willing to undertake it. All the car men were written to and asked for prices and the firm to which I have referred were not in a position to undertake it until next autumn. That is the position and it is necessary to have the car for these people at once. If you hired a car from the Pullman Car Company you would expend in their exorbitant charges for rental in a few months almost enough to build a car. Therefore, in the interest of economy it was deemed advisable and necessary to buy this car elsewhere.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Governor General's car—repairs and alterations, $2,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand there are five of these government cars besides the Governor General's car which makes six altogether.

Mr. EMMERSON. I explained that there are two cars here, two at Moncton, and the

one generally used by the Minister of Railways No. 109, although it is not exclusively used by him at all times.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then there is one now to be supplied to the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that car has been arranged for and that they are going west within a day or two.

Mr. J. D. REID. That then makes six cars, besides the Governor's car.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend wants to include the Governor General's car that will be six. Let us understand it; I do not wish to hide anything in respect to it. I am speaking of government cars here and at Moncton under the charge of the department. There are five of such cars. The Governor General's car and the Railway Commissioner's car are not under the control of the Railway Department.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then there are seven private cars used by the government and the Railway Commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you not think you had better say official cars, offices on wheels ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Very well, official cars. Do I understand that there are only two of these cars used by Ministers of the Crown ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are none of them assigned to Ministers of the Crown. Ministers occasionally require the use of a car and they make application to the Department of Railways and Canals, and if there is one available it is assigned to their use for a particular trip.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could the minister give me any information as to the cost to the country of maintaining each of these cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave that information to the House in answer to a question.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to enter my protest against the government sending Canadian money to the United States to purchase a private car to be used by the Railway Commission. The minister stated that last year $20,000 was voted to be expended by the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not name that amount because I did not have it before me.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman say what the amount was ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot from memory.

Mr. BLAIN. There was an amount voted last year to be placed at the disposal of the Railway Commission. As I understand a request was made to the Governor in Council for a private car to cost $20,000 for the use of the Railway Commission and the Governor in Council gave their sanction to that amount being expended.

Mr. EMMERSON. In last year's estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it was the duty of the Governor in Council to stipulate that the car should be purchased within the limits of Canada. My hon. friend has said that an advertisement was published asking for tenders for the purchase of a car and that the only reply——

Mr. EMMERSON. Not for that car. I said that as respects that car an effort was made to find out whether such a car could be secured in Canada at all. It was impossible to get it in time or in fact before next fall or winter. So far as the Governor General's car was concerned, it was not required immediately. I have received an offer from one Canadian manufacturer to furnish such a car to be delivered sometime during the present fiscal year, but the car required by the Railway Commissioners, could not now be furnished at all in Canada and it was necessary to get one that was already constructed.

Mr. BLAIN. We accept the minister's explanation. But I say that a car which is good enough for the Governor General and which can be constructed in Canada is sufficiently good for the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. So it would be if we could get it.

Mr. BLAIN. The government should have stipulated when voting $20,000 for a car for the Railway Commission that that car should be purchased within the limits of Canada. The minister says that one could not be secured before the fall or winter. Even if that be correct—and I accept the statement and say it is correct—I say that the Railway Commission should have used one of the cars that is at the disposal of the government now. There is a car for the Governor General, a very expensive car, which was constructed by the government a short time ago at a cost of $20,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have explained to my hon. friend that that car is not large enough for the Railway Commission. They require for their purpose a car containing three rooms. I think my hon. friend will take that statement as being correct.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement; I am not disputing that at all; but the Railway Commission is not travelling through this country all the time, but only occasionally.

Mr. EMMERSON. They want to be away two or three months in the west, and they need a car. They should have gone at an earlier date than the present.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the commission appointed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In February last.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister and the government knew full well that the commission would require a car. I am not saying whether the car already constructed is suitable for the requirements of the commission or not; but I do say that a car that would have been suitable could have been ordered, and if the commission had to wait five or six or even twelve months to secure the construction of that car in Canada, they should have done so and they could in the meantime have used one of the cars already at the disposal of the government. I do not think the people of Canada will sanction the expenditure of money in this way. Here is a Canadian Railway Commission travelling through western Canada in a car on which is written, 'manufactured in the United States,' when they should be travelling in a car on which would be written, 'made in Canada,' which is the popular term now. I say the government did not discharge their full duty to the people when they voted that $20,000 should be spent on a car without stipulating that the money should be spent in Canada. The hon. minister says they could not wait. Well, there are a good many people in Canada who have to wait, and if the Railway Commission do not meet any greater obstacle than that of having to wait five or six months for a car, they will get through their duties very easily. I object, and I think the Canadian people will object, to the government setting this example by passing an Order in Council placing at the disposal of the Railway Commission $20,000 of Canadian money to be spent in the United States.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has referred two or three times to the fact that an appropriation was made last session for the use of the Railway Commission. I ask him now, what was the amount of the appropriation placed to the credit of the Railway Commission last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. $40,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I venture to say that not one dollar of that appropriation was intended to be used for the purchase of a car, and I call the attention of the minister and the members of the government present to that abuse of their power. There was absolutely no excuse for it. The minister says none of the cars owned by the government are large enough. I am not prepared to say that is not correct. It may be, and I think very likely is so, that some different accommodation may be required in the end from that furnished by any cars at present owned by the government. But we have five government cars, and if one of these cars was not sufficient to accommodate these gentlemen, two of them would have been sufficient, and should have been assigned to their service for the time being rather than that this large amount of money should be devoted to this purpose without the sanction of parliament, and the money sent to the people of the United States—the manufacturers of Canada deprived of that money, and, a great deal worse than that, the fact advertised throughout Canada and the United States that such a car could not be manufactured in Canada. The minister has brought forward no reasonable justification for the action of the department or the government in this matter. It was not necessary for these gentlemen to have absolutely convenient accommodation upon this trip to the west. They are not going to take evidence or hold investigations in any unfrequented places along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or other railways. They are going to hold investigations at the large centres, and it was not necessary that they should be able to lodge upon their car during the time of those investigations. It would have been reasonable for these gentlemen for the present to have had one official car at their disposal. Others could very well have been accommodated in a state-room upon a Canadian Pacific Railway pullman car; and the other officials, the engineer and others, could have obtained very fair accommodation upon the pullman cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Therefore there is no justification whatever for the government having appropriated this money to this purpose. I submit in the first place that it is absolutely unconstitutional because the money was not voted by parliament for that purpose; and, in the second place, even if it had been voted for that purpose, it is a very poor principle on which the government has acted, in diverting the money to the United States, to the pecuniary loss and the great detriment of the people of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. How does this car compare with the car built for the Duke and Duchess?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a larger car, and has more accommodation.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the difference in length?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot tell, because it is the Railway Commission which sees to the dimensions of the car and the arrangement of it. It has better accommodation for a greater number of people than the car purchased for the Duke and Duchess. The car purchased for the Duke and Duchess is not a car that surpasses every other.

Mr. LENNOX. A very comfortable car.

Mr. EMMERSON. As my hon. friend says, it is a very comfortable car, and I have no wish to decry it.

Mr. GANONG. By whom was this car built?

Mr. EMMERSON. By the Pullman Car Company. There is no concern in Canada

at this moment in a position to take an order for a car of that character. They are not fitted up for the purpose. There is only one concern which contemplates doing that business, and they are not in the position to do it now. They do not furnish pullman sleepers in Canada.

Mr. GANONG. They may not furnish pullman sleepers, but they can build a car plenty good enough for the class of railway commissioners we have.

Mr. EMMERSON. They will not undertake to do it.

Mr. GANONG. They are not given much opportunity.

Mr. EMMERSON. Surely my hon. friend will not make that statement in the face of what I have just said. I have said to my hon. friend that they are not in a position to do it, and I say that from their own statement. I hope my hon. friend will not show me the discourtesy of insisting that they have not had the opportunity.

Mr. GANONG. Who are these people to whom the hon. gentleman refers ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Crossen Company, of Cobourg ; the Rhodes, Curry Company, of Amherst ; the Rathbun Company, of Deseronto. These are the only three concerns that make cars in Canada.

Mr. GANONG. Did they give any statement as to the limit of time they would take ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were asked whether they could tender for any cars. One said they were not in a position ; the others said they would not accept the order at all. The Rhodes, Curry Company said they were not now in a position, but that they would place themselves in a position so that by next fall they could undertake the construction of such cars.

Mr. GANONG. Evidently if the government had not been in such a hurry, and the ministers been willing to make a little sacrifice and travel as ordinary people do, we would have sufficient cars to accommodate the commission. There is another question I would ask. This car has been made by the Pullman Car Company, of Chicago. I presume that the company will have a travelling advertisement on it. Will their name be on this car, and where it was made and the date ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume so. I have not inquired, but I observe that on cars throughout the country the name of the maker is always painted somewhere.

Mr. GANONG. I would suggest that the minister should have that painted in black, as a sign of mourning for the poor Canadians who cannot build a car for the commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the $20,000 come out of the $40,000 voted last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a copy of the Railway Act. Subsection 4, section 21, refers to the expenditure of money. I see under this subsection that :

> The salaries or remunerations of all such officers, clerks, stenographers, messengers, and appointees, and all the expenses of the board of, and incidental to, the carrying out of this Act, including all actual and reasonable travelling expenses of the commissioners, secretary, and of such appointees or members of the staff of the board as may be required by the board, to travel, necessarily incurred in attending to the duties of their office, shall be paid monthly out of moneys to be provided by parliament.

Does that clause cover the expenditure ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think so. It is to be paid out of the vote last session of $40,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Under this particular clause, does the hon. minister think the government are justified in making that payment ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the government is justified in paying for the car as an incidental expense connected with the Railway Commission, and it has already been provided and paid for.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the item passed the Auditor General ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not say.

Mr. BENNETT. The only words I see in the clause that possibly could attach to it are these : 'travelling expenses incurred in attending to the duties of their office.' Surely he will not contend that under those the government are entitled to take $20,000 out of the $40,000 voted by parliament and use it to build this car. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that last year the government stated that $20,000 of this vote was intended to be for the purchase of a car, does the hon. minister assume that it would have gone without protest ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure I would not assume that. I do not know of anything that would go without protest, but I assume it would have gone all right.

Mr. BENNETT. I do congratulate the minister on his frankness. He says anything will go with the majority of the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. Any reasonable proposition which ought to go.

Mr. BENNETT. In the face of the fact that the government have five private cars for which the people have no use, is it not the height of extravagance to buy another one ? When one minister wants to bring a relative from Manitoba, he sends a private car for him. Another one takes a private

car on a jaunt to California. Another minister takes a private car for a trip to Mexico.

Mr. EMMERSON. No minister took one to California.

Mr. BENNETT. When the mnnister was asked about one of these private cars being sent to Manitoba to bring the relatives of one of his colleagues down here, he knew nothing about it. When he was asked with reference to one minister or his family taking a private car to California, he knew nothing about it. The people are long-suffering, but there must be a limit to their endurance. Had the minister stated last year that five of these private cars were standing on sidings not being used at all——

Mr. EMMERSON. I do no think the hon. gentleman is justified in making that statement.

Mr. BENNETT. I mean for the purposes of the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. Three of them are in use by the officials of the Intercolonial.

Mr. BENNETT. One was used by the Postmaster General to go to Mexico on a trip ; another was handed over to the tender mercies of a government official to go to California ; while another was used for one of the ministers to send for one of his relatives to come to Ottawa. There were times probably, when these gentlemen did not travel in this style ; when they were pleased to take the ordinary cars of which the train was made up. An hon. gentleman behind me suggests 'first-class'; but they did not always get up to that even. perhaps. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) laughs. I was in this House when that hon. gentleman was on this side. I will give him credit for not having been so blatant about the use of private cars as was the present minister the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and some others. But those hon. gentlemen scorned the use of private cars. We remember how, when the present Prime Minister attained office in 1896, he was offered a private car to come to Ottawa, but he said he preferred to travel in the ordinary car as a plain democrat. And this was heralded all over the country. This will all be interesting and amusing to the people of Ontario. And we remember that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said that so far as the Conservative party were concerned they could not elect a man in Quebec at all——

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) will permit me, I made no allusion——

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister allow me to finish the sentence ?—and if one of them did get here it would be through an accident or a mistake.

Mr. FIELDING. That is right.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister lost his head as he was applauded vociferously by his supporters. And perhaps that statement will be heard of in the province of Ontario and other parts of this Dominion. The people of Ontario will be called to listen to the remarks of the junketting Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) who used to go about the country reviling the ministers who used private cars, even though half a dozen of them travelled in one coach. And when the people remember that he took one of these cars belonging to the country—and, forsooth the best one, the one impregnated with the air of royalty—and, as 'a democrat to the hilt' junketed off down to Mexico, while another car is sent by one of the ministers to bring his father from the city of Winnipeg, they will realize where these 'democrats' are to-day. And, so far as the statement of the Minister of Finance is concerned, if he will refer to 'Hansard' he will find there in black and white—that if a Conservative were elected from the province of Quebec, it would be the result of an accident or of a mistake.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That applies to all the provinces.

Mr. BENNETT. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be making a tour of Ontario within the next two months. He will have all the influence of this government behind him ; he will have all the influence of the local government behind him, and he will have all the influence of the Grand Trunk Pacific behind him ; and I think he will come back from that province with the same stinging rebuke of defeat that was administered to him in 1900.

New car for the Governor General, $18,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Mr. MACLEAN. Provided that it is made in Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. We understand that the minister tells us that this eighteen-thousand dollar car is to be made in Canada ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that the Governor General's car was to be built in Canada. I hope it is not necessary to repeat it more than once.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister say where it will be built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to make a statement on that point until the offer is accepted. Perhaps my hon. friend may infer from what I have already stated.

Railways and canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—canals—staff and repairs, $789,562.

Mr. LANCASTER. I propose to bring up again the question of the payment of the

employees of the Welland canal which I brought up last session and, on their behalf to try to find out some reason from the government why it is that they have not been paid an increase. Last session, when this item or a similar item was under discussion, I took some trouble to place before the House and the government the position of the lockmasters and tenders and the bridge masters and tenders upon the Welland canal. We received a promise from the then Minister of Railways that the matter would be given attention and that a supplementary estimate would be brought down. A supplementary estimate was brought down, and a statute was passed which provided for an increase of twenty-five cents a day on the canals throughout Canada. Yet, strange to say the employees of the Welland canal have been told that they are not to get the increase and tney have not yet received it. Though it is a repetition of what was said last year, I propose to state the position of these men, who, I think, are entitled to their increase in an additional way to that in which they were entitled to it last year. Last year they were entitled to it on the merits and this year they are entitled to it technically as well, if I understand anything about the meaning of a statute. These men earn from about $360 to about $400 a year. Last year I pointed out, and I may now repeat—as we have done a good deal of business and the matter may have been forgotten—that the salaries of civil servants, who make about as many thousands as these men make hundreds, were increased on the ground that the cost of living had increased and that they needed more to support themselves in the scale of living to which they had been accustomed. To-night, I have pointed out, and I repeat, that you are beginning at the wrong end. If the cost of living has increased and you are going to increase salaries, you ought to begin with the men who get three or four hundred dollars and not with the men who get three or four thousand. At all events if you do not begin there you should finish there—the men who make only three or four hundred a year certainly should be increased if increases are to be made on any ground. Now the circumstances of these men on the Welland canal have not been well understood by this government, I fancy, or they would have increased the wages years ago. I find that these men have not had an increase —though it seems to have been supposed that they have had—since what is called the New Welland canal was built twenty-five or more years ago. The officers, men who get from $1,500 to $2,000 and so on, have had their salaries increased.

This government appears to think that when a man gets a good salary it is a sufficient reason for increasing it, whereas the man who gets a mere pittance of a few hundred dollars a year must remain at that figure. I find also that these men are required to have a certain amount of skill in locking these vessels through the canal, and that they do have skill is shown by the fact that there have been very few accidents on that canal ; Still they get less than ordinary labourers do. The question was asked this session by some hon. gentlemen opposite, what wages were paid to the labourers on the Soulanges and Lachine canals and on the St. Louis lock, and the answer, as found on page 5582, made by the Minister of Railways, was, that the ordinary labourers are getting $1.50 a day on these canals. These labourers however do not require any skill or any knowledge about the mechanism of the locks and no particular fitness for that position at all. Now what do the Welland canal employees get ? The labourers get $1.50 for nine hours work. I am not finding fault with that, that is about the same as labourers get on other canals. But I am speaking about lock tenders and bridge tenders upon the Welland canal, those men who are not employed the year round, and still are prevented from getting any other lucrative employment outside the canal. They work only about eight months in the year, and they get $45 a month.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some of them take their turn at employment during the winter season.

Mr. LANCASTER. They get very little that way. I am safe in saying that their average salary does not exceed $360 a year. Now these lock tenders and bridge tenders are paid 14½ cents per hour, while the ordinary labourer gets 16⅔ cents per hour. In other words, men who have no skill get two cents an hour more than lock tenders and bridge tenders who are required to have skill. Now I do not wish the minister to think that it is only these men who are concerned ; the whole country is concerned in having properly qualified and therefore reasonably paid men upon these locks. The other night when we were discussing railway estimates, the Postmaster General saw fit to interject the remark that the Welland canal employees were appointed for political reasons and that I might expect these men would vote against me. Now I want the minister to understand that I don't care anything about that. If a man votes against me I still want him to be paid a fair wage while he is working for the King. I don't want the minister to think that he is pleasing me if he does not raise the salaries of these men, even if every one of them voted against me. No matter how they exercise their franchise, as long as they are kept in the service, I want to see them paid a reasonable price for the work they do. The whole country is concerned in these men being properly

paid, because if you do not pay men reasonably well you cannot expect reasonably good service from them. These men lock and unlock not only bridges for railway trains, but bridges over highways for vehicles of all kinds; therefore they are entrusted to a certain extent with the lives of many people, and the travelling public upon both the railways and highways as well as ships are concerned in having this work properly done and these men properly paid.

Now the wages of workmen on the Intercolonial are higher than those on this canal. During this present session the minister took good care to tell us on the 7th of June, in introducing his estimates, that he had increased the wages of the Intercolonial Railway employees, and he took to himself much credit for doing so. He also increased the wages of the men on the Prince Edward Island Railway, giving as a reason that living expenses have greatly increased. Now the canal employee getting $45 a month for a day of twelve hours, only gets 14½ cents an hour, working twenty-six days in the month. If they do a little extra work on Sundays, they get paid for that, so it is fair to leave that out of the discussion. I don't think anyway that they ought to be called upon to work Sundays. Now if they work twenty-six days in the month for eight months, and they have no chance to earn anything extra worth speaking of, that means from $360 to $400 a year. But their living expenses have increased just as well as they have increased for the man who is getting $2,500 or $3,000 a year. If the latter suffers from increased cost of living he only has to economize in luxuries, he does not need to economize in the necessaries of life. He may have to buy less opera house tickets, he may have to take a shorter vacation or a less expensive vacation in summer, and forgo a few little pleasures of that kind. But the man who gets $360 or $400 a year has got to forego probably shoes for his children to go to school in, he has got to forego perhaps fuel and clothes to keep them warm in winter; he has to economize in the absolute necessities of life. Last year I made a plea on behalf of these men, and the then acting Minister of Railways said he would consider it. An estimate was brought down, that estimate was made a statute, and now I am curious to know, and so are the lock tenders on these canals, why that statute has not been carried out, because it has not been carried out by the government. We know of this government having made pledges and having broken them and apparently thinking it was not a serious thing. We have got a step further now. We have a statute of the Dominion passed last year providing that these men should have an increase of 25 cents a day and they have not received it. I refer the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to chapter 4 of the statutes of 1903 which is the Appropriation Act (No. 4) of last session and page 92 of this statute where he will find under the heading of 'Collection of Revenue—Railways and Canals' and under the sub-head of 'Canals" the following:

> Generally—increase of 25 cents per diem to the wages of lockmasters, lockmen, bridge men and ferry men of the various canals, $37,000.

There is the statute providing that the increase shall take place. These men have been told, that, notwithstanding the fact that the Act came into force in October last, they are not to get this increase, that this government are not going to give it to them. I do not know where this government stand upon this matter. We got a statute passed providing for an increase of 25 cents a day to lockmasters, lockmen, bridgemen and ferrymen on the various canals. None is named. If that money is paid to the men on one canal it must be paid to the Welland canal employees. I am told that it had been stated by the superintendent of the canal, or at least it was stated on the streets of St. Catharines, that the government had said that this increase was not intended to apply to the Welland canal. If the government meant that they should have said so in their statutes. After I went home last session and told these men that this statute had been passed they were entitled to believe that they were going to get that 25 cents a day. If they are not going to get it no one should get it. There is no canal mentioned; there is none excluded. There is no authority on the statute for paying that 25 cents a day to anybody if there is no authority for paying to the lockmasters, lockmen, bridgemen and ferrymen on the Welland canal. These men knowing that this statute was passed, knowing that this is the law of the land, knowing that this is the only way you can make a law that is binding on this government, surely had a right to expect that they would get the benefit of it. But, it seems that this government are not going to be bound by a statute although this is the only way in which we can bind the government to anything. This statute provided that these men on the various canals should receive an increase of 25 cents a day, yet, notwithstanding the fact that this statute has been passed, they are not getting the increase and they are told by the authorities that the statute does not apply to the Welland canal. On behalf of these men I urge their claim for a twofold reason. To begin with, on the merits of the case, they should have an increase. They are getting the same pay that they had twenty years ago and they so forcibly brought their claim to the attention of the government last year that this statute was passed. If the statute gave them 25 cents a day they ought to get it. I stand for the whole of Canada although I am speaking

particularly about the men of the Welland canal because they are the men who are complaining to me about this matter. I say they should have the same rate of pay as men on the other canals. Men who do the same work on the Soulanges canal or on the Sault Ste. Marie canal should get the same pay. I do not say that a man should get higher pay simply because he is on the Welland canal. Not at all. I want to give every Canadian workman the same increased pay wherever he may happen to be in Canada. I think it is fair to suppose that the expenses of living has increased in the same proportion in all parts of Canada and I therefore say that all these men are entitled to an increase of 25 cents a day. Whether it has been paid on the other canals or not, I do not know, but I do say that if this increased rate of pay has been given on the other canals and not on the Welland canal the government are doing something which the statute does not authorize them to do. The statute, as I have said before, applied generally to all of the canals and this increase of 25 cents per day should be paid upon all of them. The case of these men is certainly meritorious and I believe that the government would be in a very difficult position if one of these men who had worked on this canal since last session proposed to sue the government for this increased pay. I do not know how he could get a stronger contract than the statute. I cannot understand why the benefit of this statute has been withheld from them. It may be that the government—I hope not in the face of the meritorious case which they were able to present—intended to make an exception of the Welland canal, because of the political stripe of the representative who comes here, but I do not think this government would punish these men in that way. These men do the work just the same. It is not their fault that a supporter of the Conservative party comes to this House and I do not believe until I receive better advice that such would be the reason for excepting the Welland canal. I do not know whether the government intended to except the Welland canal, but if they did they did not draw their statute properly. If they did not intend to pay the increase to the men on the Welland canal, and if they did intend to pay it on the other canals they should have made a different law, while, if they intended that all these men should be entitled to the benefit of the statute then the statute certainly carries out their intention. These men have a right to expect that the government meant what the statute says. Some of these men, when I got home last autumn —not my political supporters—told me that if they had not got that increase they would have resigned because the pay was altogether too small, and they could not support their wives and children upon it. I told them that they had the increase, that the statute said so. Was I correct in that statement? If the government intended to except the Welland canal they should have worded that statute differently. These men are not the drawers of the statute, they are not in parliament, they cannot discuss these things with the government; they can only go by the phrase that is in the statute and assume, that, this statute having been passed providing for an increase of pay generally, they would get their increase. I could not imagine any reason why the government should have not paid them. The failure of the government to pay them has resulted in my promising that when the House did meet and when we got the right item in the estimates I would question the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, or whoever happened to be in his place, and give them the answer that the government might make as to why this increase has been withheld from them and I shall await that answer with a great deal of curiosity.

Mr. EMMERSON. The explanation of that is that for twenty years, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has said, or at least for a number of years, the employees on the Welland canal and on the Sault Ste. Marie have enjoyed the privilege of drawing $1.50 a day for their services. On the other canals they only received $1.25 a day.

Mr. LANCASTER. Those are the labourers. I am talking about the lockmasters, lockmen, &c.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that is the class of men to which the hon. gentleman has been referring, so I am informed by the deputy minister. I get my information from him as to what occurred in the past. Provision was made in the estimates of last year to equalize to make uniform the payment to the classes of employees named in this item to which my hon. friend has made reference. I have a great deal of sympathy with all that my hon. friend has said as to the desirability of paying the employees on these canals the highest possible wage consistent with the compensation that men under similar circumstances are getting from private corporations. Of course it is difficult to make a comparison as between canals and other employments, because we have no precisely similar occupations. In the railway branch of the department the Intercolonial Railway can equalize the pay received by the men to that received under similar circumstances on other railways in Canada. That rule has been followed. This class of employees all over the canal systems in Canada receive the same pay. Whether that was right or wrong, that was made uniform and I am informed by the deputy that that was the object of the vote of last year. I am not just as familiar with the appointments of the men on the canals as I have been with regard to the railways,

but I shall make it a point to look into the matter. I admit that the cost of living has increased not so much by the increase in the cost of material as by the fact that what were the luxuries of a few years ago have become the necessities of to-day. That applies to all classes and all conditions of men in Canada to-day. My hon. friend says the labourers are paid 2½ cents per hour more than the lockmasters. That is perhaps not making as fair an argument as my hon. friend wished to do. The labourers work nine hours per diem and get $1.50 per day. The others are on duty 12 hours it is true but they get $1.50 per day. I am not prepared to deny the contention of my hon. friend that men in that position should receive a higher wage than labourers employed elsewhere on the canal. It may be that they should ; that is a matter which I shall investigate personally, and I shall be only too glad to have a readjustment made so that the men will get what will be a fair compensation for their services. That is the principle adopted on the Intercolonial Railway and that course will be followed while I am in charge of the department in regard to the canals. When this matter was under discussion last session the Minister of Finance said :

> If they are now receiving less than $1.50 per day, they will be increased to $1.50. This applies to all the canals except the Welland and the Sault Ste. Marie canals, the men on which had previously received an advance.

Thus it was explained at the time that this $37,000 was required in order to bring the standard wage on the other canals up to the wages on the Sault Ste. Marie and the Welland canals. This explanation of it accords with the explanation given me by the deputy minister and chief engineer who is more familiar with the details than I am. However, while that entirely refutes the argument of my hon. friend that any unfair action was taken by the government against the men on the Welland canal the other contention of my hon. friend that these men are worthy of a higher wage will certainly have consideration. I had intended to do it ; I have had many applications along this line from the employees of the canal and I have promised myself an opportunity of personally scrutinizing the pay-lists of the several canals and looking thoroughly into the question.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid the minister does not yet understand. He seems to think they are paid $1.50 a day. They are paid $45 a month.

Mr. EMMERSON. And they work 30 days.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is all right as an argument. They are paid $45 a month, and are paid by the month, that would be $1.50 a day if they worked 30 days. I was quite correct in what I said. Assuming that they work 26 days they get 14½ cents an hour. If they work 30 days, they would be getting a little less per hour and my argument would be all the stronger.

Mr. EMMERSON. I pointed out to my hon. friend that in that item the Welland and Soo canals were especially exempted.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is no answer at all. These locktenders make an application, and a statute is passed. Does the minister intend to tell this House and the country that he can explain away a statute by something said in this House. Does he think any judge will overrule a statute because of something which appears in 'Hansard ?' The minister is shirking the question ; there is a statute providing for an increase of 25 cents a day for a different set of people altogether from those with whom the minister is dealing. I thought I made it clear that I was not talking about labourers. They get the same wage all over the canal system. The minister wants to make this House believe, perhaps he himself believes that it is for the labourers I am making application. I think I said distinctly that it was for the lockmasters, the locktenders and the bridge keepers, those mentioned in the statutes that I was applying. No one disputes that the labourers on the Welland canal had their wages increased a few years ago, but the wages of the lockmasters, locktenders, and bridge tenders were not increased, and these men are now getting the same wages as they got on the very first day the new Welland canal was opened. They have never had an increase in that period of some 25 years. The labourers having obtained an increase a few years ago were getting a better rate of pay last year than on the other canals and that was equalized. But that is not the statute. This statute deals specifically with the very men on whose behalf I am applying. It deals with the lockmasters, bridge tenders and ferry men, not the labourers at all, unless under the general acceptation of the word that all men who work are labourers. These men get $45 a month as they have done ever since the new canal was opened.

That statute provides for an increase of 25 cents per day in the wages of lockmasters, lockmen, bridgemen and ferrymen on the canals of Canada generally. The minister has not told us how he gets round that statute. I do not care what 'Hansard' may show that anybody said as to what the intention was. Here is the statute which we have to go by, passed after the supplementary estimates were brought down, and it is worded exactly as the supplementary estimates were. I was satisfied that if the supplementary estimates went through as brought down, these men on the Welland canal would get what they wanted ; and the minister will not say that I was foolish

enough, on behalf of these men, not to let well enough alone. The statute was passed, it became the law of the land, and the minister has not attempted to tell me yet how he can justify his failure to pay those men the increase mentioned in that statute. The statute applies to all the canals in Canada ; the Welland canal is one of those canals, and if the increase is not to be paid to the men on the Welland canal, there is no more authority for paying it on the Soulanges canal or the Lachine canal. The ordinary labourers on the Welland canal had their pay increased a few years ago. They are not included in the item of the statute, and they do not come within the description of the men on whose behalf I have been pleading for the increase for two years, and to whom the statute applies. I can assure the minister that his saying that it was never intended to be given to these men will not satisfy them. The statute has been passed to apply to them, and if it does not apply to them, to whom does it apply ? I suppose the increase of 25 cents a day amounting to $37,000 has been paid to somebody. I do not suppose it was appropriated by this parliament to be withheld. If it has been paid to anybody, I want to know, on behalf of these men on the Welland canal, why it has not been paid to them. If that money has been paid to other lockmen on other canals, the minister must give some better explanation than he has yet given as to why he has not paid the increase of 25 cents a day to the Welland canal employees, who, it seems to me are entitled as a matter of law to have that increase from this government by the terms of last year's statute.

Mr. MONK. Has the Minister of Railways done anything towards granting the request as to which I have had considerable correspondence with the department, in reference to the old canal bank at Lachine ? The citizens have requested the government to give them a lease of the bank in order that they may convert it into a pleasure ground. The government cannot lose anything by acceding to their request and I believe my hon. friend was favourable to granting it. Some time ago I mentioned the matter to him and he said it would be attended to in a few days. That was nearly a month ago and the summer is far advanced, and I hope he will see his way clear to granting this request. It is a small matter for the government, they do not stand to lose anything by it, and it will be a considerable advantage to the locality.

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter has been under consideration but is not one that can be settled off hand. There must of necessity be a lease, and that lease must be authorized by the Governor in Council, and there is such a congestion of work before that body that this item has been lost sight of. However, I hope to be able to state shortly, as representing the department, the position in which the department is placed as regards that matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. What are the lockmasters getting on the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $45 per month.

Mr. J. D. REID. The other evening we had a dispute as to the number of locks on the Farran's Point canal. I wrote a gentleman at Farran's Point, and he replied that there was only one lock. I also inquired from a pilot who came through the canal the other day, and he gave the same information, but on page W—74 of the Auditor General's Report I find that on lock 22 there is a lockmaster and three men. I would like to know where that other lock is on that Farran's Point canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a new lock, and right alongside of that is the old lock. Personally, I know nothing about it, but I am informed by the reports of the department and the officials and the chief engineer that there are two locks there. Some body is under a wrong impression, and I would be sorry to think it is the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does this item cover the salary of the ornamental gentleman who is supposed to be superintendent of these different canals ? I am referring to a gentleman named Stewart, who was a short time ago the Liberal organizer in the county of Glengarry.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is very much to his credit.

Mr. PRINGLE. It may be to his credit, but I do not know where he learned anything about canals when organizing the Liberal party in the county of Glengarry.

Mr. EMMERSON. He must have been watching the other side.

Mr. PRINGLE. Although he had no experience, he was put in a position over men who have had a lifelong experience in that work. What is he receiving now ? I would ask also whether the government have given him possession of the little steamer called the 'Alert,' formerly controlled by Mr. Rubidge, late engineer in chief of canals ? Mr Stewart is now moving about the river from canal to canal with this steamer. I think it has only a crew of half a dozen men, and probably does not add to the expenses of the country over $50 a day, but it does seem a little expensive for Mr. Stewart, who formerly could take a horse and carriage and go along the banks of the canals. Has this boat been handed over to him for his pleasure travel during the season of navigation, or is it to be retained for the engineer in chief ? Or for what purpose is this steamer to be used ? I have yet to see that it has ever served any useful purpose. Its only purpose seemed to be to give

pleasure to a very worthy man, the late chief engineer.

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter was discussed very fully this afternoon, and had my hon. friend been present I would have been spared the necessity of repeating what I then said. The steamer 'Alert' has been under the superintending engineer, Mr. Rubidge. He used it in connection with his duties on the canals. Unfortunately, that gentleman passed away and, pending a final decision as to whether the steamer was necessary on the canal or not, it was placed superintendent of the Cornwall canal who also has charge of all the other plant and material in connection with the canals. If it was necessary for the engineers on those canals before the death of Mr. Rubidge, I assume it would be necessary for them to use it now. I have not had opportunity of personally finding out what is necessary there, but when I do have that opportunity I will determine whether it is necessary to continue the boat at all in connection with the canal. If the facts be as stated by my hon. friend, who probably has coloured them somewhat, it would not be wise to continue it. The superintendent has charge of the Cornwall and Williamsburgh canals, which are separated by quite a number of miles, and the engineers are still there. They will be required, probably, in connection with certain works not yet completed, to visit different points, and the steamer is at their disposal for that purpose.

Mr. PRINGLE. Why is it necessary to have half a dozen superintendents at present when these canals were formerly managed with a far less number? Take the Cornwall canal, which is one of the largest. In former years there was a superintendent receiving $1,400 a year. To-day we have a superintendent of the Cornwall canal who is called an overseer. Then we have an overseer of the Williamsburgh canal and an overseer of the Edwardsburg canal, and above them all is Mr. Stewart as superintendent. The expenses have practically trebled in the last few years. I would also like to put another question. We have another gentleman down there called O'Callaghan. I do not know just what his position is, but I know he is a farmer, and he spends all his time on his farm. He has a very nice little farm a short distance from the town, where he spends all his time except when he comes in to draw his salary from this government.

He is of no assistance whatever to the party whom he is supposed to assist, for he is never there. From early morning till late at night, I am informed, he is engaged attending to his farming duties, and only comes up to draw his pay. That is only one instance. I find signs there of an approaching election. When I go home I find men by the score employed on the banks of the canal. All a man has to do is go to the gentleman who has received the nomination as standard bearer of the Liberal party, and he gets employment. I do not know what these men do, but I am told that they are engaged in pulling weeds and drawing their salaries. I assume that they are supposed to vote right when the election comes on. But, seriously, I would draw attention to Mr. O'Callaghan's case. I am speaking from information given me by reliable parties.

Mr. EMMERSON. What position does he hold?

Mr. PRINGLE. I cannot just tell.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman's information must be very inadequate.

Mr. PRINGLE. All I know is that he is engaged in farming and drawing his pay from the government. What particular position he is supposed to hold or what he is supposed to do, I have no means of knowing. I suppose the deputy minister could tell the hon. gentleman what he is supposed to do. For my part I never saw him do anything. Surely, the hon. minister might tell me——

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not wish to be discourteous and interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle).

Mr. PRINGLE. Very well, tell me what he is supposed to do.

Mr. EMMERSON. One man is employed there as collector for the day service. Mr. O'Callaghan is the night man, and the reason my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) does not see him there is because the hon. gentleman is not there at night. I am afraid that my hon. friend's remarks are tinged with extravagance and not altogether free from bitterness, due to the fact that Mr. Stewart and the other gentleman were at one time identified with the Liberal party. He should not harbour resentment against them on that account. I think it is to their credit that they were Liberals and I do not think that they should be misrepresented in the House because of that fact.

Mr. PRINGLE. Perhaps the hon. minister will allow me to say that Mr. O'Callaghan was always supposed to be a Conservative.

Mr. EMMERSON. That shows how fair we are——

Mr. PRINGLE. It shows how fair I am. He was appointed at the instance of the late Dr. Bergin.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is an example of our fairness. Were we actuated by the bitterness shown by my hon. friend, if this man does nothing but draw his pay how quickly we could get rid of him. And surely my hon. friend does not wish the committee to understand that the men employed on the banks of the canal are employed in pulling weeds. Surely he knows—what is the fact—that these men are employed on the stone lining of the banks of the canal.

The hon. gentleman admits that his information is very inaccurate. It is shadowy, so to speak. He is depending entirely upon hearsay, and somebody has been telling him things that were not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. PRINGLE. Will the hon. minister tell me how many of these men are employed on the rip-rapping at the present time? The number has increased very largely during the last three weeks.

Mr. EMMERSON. The number of men varies. My officers cannot tell me the number of men.

Mr. PRINGLE. I suppose the number varies as the election approaches.

Mr. EMMERSON. If that were in mind, it would be better to 'bide a wee.'

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister will see that there are others along the St. Lawrence canal who have noticed the fact of Mr. Stewart having taken possession of the steamer 'Alert.'

Mr. EMMERSON. He is the superintendent of these canals, and the steamer 'Alert' has been placed in his charge as has the rest of the plant. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) says there are three overseers. As a matter of fact there are only two, one on the Williamsburgh canal and one on the Cornwall canal. These canals are ten or twelve miles apart, and it is necessary to have officials of this class at each canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. Now, let me tell the minister the position. In the old days there was a superintendent at Cornwall and one at Morrisburg.

Mr. EMMERSON. And the superintending engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. And the superintending engineer, the late Mr. Rubidge. These superintendents made out their reports themselves and sent them to Ottawa. They had plenty of time to do it. They had only to drive up and down the canal, one day east and the next day west. Shortly after this government came into power they passed an Order in Council abolishing the position of superintendents of canals, so as to get rid of these men.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is imagining that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not at all. One of them was Dr. Hickey, for many years a member of this House, and the other was Mr. Ross. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) can corroborate what I state. And shortly after the government decided to have overseers. And they not only have two overseers but they have another gentleman whom they call clerk to the overseer. I think the hon. member for Cornwall will say that there is an officer of that kind there.

Mr. EMMERSON.

At all events, we have one on the Williamsburgh canal. So, instead of having two men they have three and I think even four men on this canal, besides Mr. Stewart. Now, this boat has been given to Mr. Stewart to run up and down the canal. The minister states that she will be used by the engineers on the different works as heretofore. But is it not a fact that all these works are completed, and is it not also a fact that even if these works existed, the engineer on one of these works would have nothing to do with another? There is no way that they can use this boat. It is a well known fact that this boat is absolutely of no use, yet it involves an expenditure to this country of $8,000 or $10,000 per annum. But on account of Mr. Rubidge having been connected with the canals for thirty years or forty years, there was not the same general fault finding that there is now since it has been handed over to Mr. Stewart to be left in his charge without being used.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is there any jealousy in connection with it?

Mr. J. D. REID. No jealousy whatever; but the people of this country expect the Minister of Railways to manage their affairs as economically as they ought to be managed, having due regard to the country's interests.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think the Minister of Railways should talk of jealousy. It is public money that he has control of, and not his own. I want to tell the minister that the editor of the Brighton 'Ensign' announced that this government steamer was up at Twelve O'Clock Point in East Northumberland, and Mr. Stewart's family was on board the steamer. I suppose the country is paying the board of that gentleman and his family on board the steamer while they are on a pleasure trip to Twelve O'Clock Point, at the head of the Bay of Quinte. There was not any jealousy in the breast of the editor of the Brighton 'Ensign' when he announced that fact; neither is there any jealousy in my mind because I object to the government paying out the people's money for the board of this gentleman and his family on that steamer. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it comes with bad grace for him to talk about jealousy in view of the fact that every man was turned off the Murray canal when his party got into power. I give as much credit to Liberals of the county of East Northumberland who represented that riding in past years, as I give to Conservatives, because up to the time this government came into power no government official was ever turned out of his position in that riding by Mr. Biggar, the Reform representative. Men died in their public positions who were appointed by Mr. Mackenzie's Liberal government. But when this so-called Liberal government came

into power they were so low in their minds that they turned men off that canal because they were Conservatives. Every man who was a Conservative was turned off that canal. They turned men out of houses that they built themselves on the authority of the government, and this fact can be verified by the deputy minister who is now sitting by the hon. gentleman; and they put their Grit friends into their positions and into these houses that had been vacated, and gave them $6 a month, whereas they had only paid the men who owned the houses $3 a month. That is the way they conduct business in East Northumberland. What does the superintendent of that canal want with an inspector over him? The superintendent of that canal was a purchaser of cheese, and knows nothing about canal work. The minister is paying the superintendent a salary, and giving him $6 a month for a house, and $6 a month for office rent, and he is paying him $1.50 for each one of 255 trips to the Murray canal. That is the way they work it, Mr. Chairman, and I know your soul must be grieved in hearing of the extravagance of your party. Just think of the superintendent of the Murray canal living in Brighton in a house that the government pays rent for and an office that the government pays rent for, and then they give him $1.50 each for 255 trips to go down to the Murray canal to attend to his business. Then they give him $2 a trip to go down to Trenton at the eastern end of the Murray canal, and when he takes a jaunt into the country they pay him $2 or $3 a day for that. And the Minister of Railways talks about jealousy! I want to tell him that I am here to look after the people's money and the way it is expended, and that is the venom that was in their bosoms when they turned poor men off that canal and put in their own friends.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before that item is carried I want to draw the minister's attention to another matter that I think is a grievance, and that is in regard to the pension of these lock tenders and lockmasters upon the Welland canal. I think in common fairness the minister ought to revise the system of superannuation as it is applied to these men on the Welland canal. As the minister mentioned a few minutes ago, these men are employed sometimes on extra work on the canal; by virtue of their being lockmasters they are given the first preference when this extra work presents itself. Now they get that money just as much because they are lock tenders as they do their $45 a month salary; but they are not allowed to include that in the computation of their superannuation. It seems to me that their contention that they do not get the right amount of superannuation is a fair and just one. Take for example the case of Mr. Henry Hare, whose case I think his deputy is acquainted with. I have in my hand a letter from Mr. L. K. Jones, the secretary of the department, to Mr. Hare, written on the 29th of January last, and here is what Mr. Jones writes:

> I am directed to inform you, as desired, that your pay for the three fiscal years preceeding your superannuation, as returned in the pay sheets upon which you paid deduction was as follows: 1900, $350.10; 1901, $351.35; 1902, $353.07, making an avrage for three years of $351.50.

The minister will remember that I was quite within the mark in saying that the locktenders did not get more than $360 a year and there is the case of a man working all the time who only got an average of $351.50. Now Mr. Jones goes on to say:

> Your view that you are entitled to further superannuation allowance on the amount paid to you for certain services in regard of water level record during the winter, and the superannuation reduction should have been made from it, is a mistaken one.
>
> The department could, had it seen fit, have employed any parties outside of the ordinary canal staff to do this particular work, and you surely would not contend that such parties would be entitled to superannuation allowance on the pay given therefor.
>
> As a matter of convenience and advantage to the lock-tenders, they were allowed to look after this work of level taking, and were paid for it as any outsider might have been. It has nothing to do with their regular employment or regular pay, which last is a clearly defined monthly rate.

What I submit to the hon. minister is that it is because the men are lock tenders they have this extra work for a few weeks in the year. They are employed as any other persons might possibly have been but they are given the preference over an ontside party because they are lock tenders. I think it is a fair contention that if a lock tender got that amount of money which he would not have got unless he had been officially in the capacity of a lock tender the government should take that into consideration in making their computation as to his superannuation. These men would not have got that money but for the fact that they were lock tenders and they did get it because they were lock tenders. They are given the preference and I think it is reasonable to suppose that these men who for eight months in the year are in the employ of the government will do better work in level taking than an ordinary labourer casually picked up and who would not take as much interest in the government service. I think in striking the superannuation allowance, as Mr. Hare contended, the fact of his having received this money should be taken into consideration, because, although it is true that this money is not part of his lock tender's wage, he would not have received this extra money if he had not

been a lock tender and it is therefore fair to take the three years added to his lock tender's wages in computing the amount of his superannuation allowance. He gets it from the government the same as he receives his wage as an employee on the Welland canal and he receives it because he is a canal employee. He would not have received it had he not been in a permanent position and I submit to the Minister of Railways and Canals that this fact should be taken into consideration in the future. The case which I am now instancing has been dealt with and I will not ask the hon. minister to overrule what has been decided. In this particular case it would do no good because Mr. Hare died since this session began. He died two or three months ago. His case is common to all of these men and I am using it as an illustration. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether it would not be reasonable to include in the amount that you strike for superannuation all that these men receive for the three years from the government whether it be their regular salary as lock tenders or any additional amount.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a matter that is controlled by the treasury board and it is decided in accordance with the interpretation of the Act. It is the permanent pay which the men get which is taken into account. It is true that it has been deemed advisable to give these men extra pay. That perhaps is an Act of grace but it is not in connection with their permanent employment. However, this is not a matter for the department. It is a matter that is determined under the law by the Treasury Board.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like an answer to the question that I brought the hon. minister's attention to. What is the hon. minister's idea about paying a man for 250 days to attend to his work at $1.50 a day when he gets a salary for doing that business ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers is paid in the usual way for the travelling that he does in connection with his duties on the canals. I think perhaps my hon. friend is looking at the matter through a glass darkly.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think the hon. minister is looking through a glass darkly. Are we to understand that this government employs a man, bring him up from another part of the riding altogether and instead of insisting on him living where it is not out of the way at all, because there are beautiful residences all along the canal, residences that a good many of us would be very glad to have, pay for the rent of a house and office in the village of Brighton for the use of this official ? Are we to understand that the government are willing to pay out the people's money for this official if he wants to run down the canal to attend to his business ? If he wants to go to Trenton they give him $2 a day and if he wants to go out into the country on an excursion to the old village where he used to live they give him $2 a day of the people's money.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to say one word with regard to this ornamental gentleman—Mr. Stewart. I am a little surprised at the attitude which the hon. minister takes in standing up for Mr. Stewart in connection with the use of his pleasure yacht. I find in the accounts of last year many items charged by Mr. Stewart. They are only small items and I do not care about taking up the time of the committee by reading them all—$106 for travelling expenses and so forth. I find that last year he was in the habit of charging the government for tips, wines and hotel bills at the Place Viger. This is a purely ornamental official of no use at all, who knows no more about the canals than a mere schoolboy and who has simply been put over the heads of the men who have been employed for years upon the canals because he rendered good service to the Liberal Party. I would like to see this man treated generously, but I draw the line when he has a yacht placed at his disposal and has four or five men to take him up and down the river and who runs up hotel bills at the Place Viger and charges his wines and tips to the government. I think the line should be drawn and that Mr. Stewart should be called down and instructed to perform his duties if you sent him away a hundred miles from the canal it would be better for the canal and for the government. But, if you are going to keep him there let him conduct his services without imposing such an enormous expense upon the country. It is time to cut off the steam yacht and these extra expenses which we see here in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister how it is that the pay of the men employed on the Lachine canal was delayed until the 18th July. My hon. friend cannot imagine what a very great inconvenience and hardship it is for these men to wait eighteen days for their pay. These men in the city of Montreal and along the whole length of the canal are poor men, they work hard and that they have to wait for eighteen days for their pay, seems to be a very great injustice if it cannot be absolutely explained. While the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) was giving us a tableau of Mr. Stewart living like a nabob, and this other gentleman Mr. O'Callaghan, leading the life of a gentleman farmer, issuing from his house only on pay day, it seems almost a sin that those who are really at work, who are not, to use my hon. friend's expression, ornemental political employees, the hard-working men employed in and near great

cities, should have to wait eighteen days for their pay. I refrained from calling the minister's attention to this earlier, but I have since July 18th many complaints and I think it is only due to these men that my hon. friend should give some explanation of this delay.

Mr. PRINGLE. A number of men have been employed lately in connection with the Cornwall canal. Their pay is long overdue and some of them came to me in reference to their pay, asking when this government were likely to pay their wages. I told them it was impossible for me to say, that probably after the session was over they would find time to attend to the payment. These men can ill-afford to wait for months for their pay. There should be some means by which they would be paid at once.

Mr. EMMERSON. Before replying to these questions I wish to call attention to the way misstatements are made in this House and circulated. My hon. friend stated as a rumour that a certain gentleman worked in the daytime on his farm and drew his pay. I called his attention to the fact that that man was employed at night and that that duty required him to attend to the canal at night and that he was paid for that.

Mr. MONK. Collecting when there is nothing to collect.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not the collection. His duties require him to attend at night. The daytime is free to him and he can be at his farm. That is the first misstatement I corrected, and my hon. friend repeated it as if it had not been corrected. There was a delay in paying the men on the Lachine canal during the month of June. The pay lists came up, they had to be checked over and had to be sent back to be corrected. They came back again and then they had to be checked over and then sent to the Auditor General who also had to check them over. By the time all of this wheel has revolved, it is generally the 15th of the month and that is the time these payments are usually made. With respect to the Lachine canal, there has been an extra delay for three days. That has been the procedure for a long, long time ; it is not peculiar to the present.

Mr. MONK. I do not agree with my hon. friend as to that. The delay on the Lachine canal could not have been as short as that or I would not have had these representations made to me. As to the collectorship, the minister said, in answer to the hon. member for Cornwall, that this singularly fortunate individual whose name is O'Callaghan, had night work as a collector, but we all know the collections on the canal have been abolished since last year—that is one of the boasts of the government—and if Mr. O'Callaghan is as busy collecting as the officials on the Lachine have been since the tolls were abolished, he must work at night to have such a defence as the minister has set up for him.

Mr. GANONG. The minister has not explained one item, the wines for Mr. Stewart. I am sure it will harrow the soul of that apostle of temperance, the minister of Agriculture the late general of the Canadian army, and I am sure the minister should state who the parties are who allowed Mr. Stewart to be furnished with wines and will prevent its being done in the future.

Mr. EMMERSON. I asked the deputy about this and he said there could not be any such charge, that it would not pass the department. I know nothing more of the circumstances than that.

Mr. PRINGLE. I did not make the charge in ignorance of what I was talking about. If the minister will take the accounts of the Place Viger Hotel as against Mr. Stewart at the different times Mr. Stewart has been attending to Cornwall canal business in the Place Viger in Montreal he will find that Mr. Stewart was charged for wines, that he paid for them and that the government recouped him for them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am free to say that if such a payment was made it was improper and incorrect, and was not in accord with the wishes of the department. I have spoken to the deputy who said that it was not possible and if anything of the kind has been allowed, is was through the inadvertence of the accountants.

Mr. PRINGLE. It is a very, very small item and probably I should not have called attention to it, but the item goes with the man. Mr. Stewart has been putting in bills year after year including all the expenses he could have at the hotels, charging his tips, wines and everything, and the government have been paying them.

Mr. FIELDING. I have an understanding with my hon. friends opposite and I now desire that the committee would be good enough to suspend operations for a short time in order that I may bring down some important documents. With the understanding that the committee will return to its labours by consent in a few minutes, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Some resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the message as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further supplementary estimates of sums required for the services of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1905, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, July 25, 1904.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Canals—salaries and contingencies, collectors' offices, $35,835.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is an increase in this item over last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a net increase of $110, which occurs in contingencies.

Mr. J. D. REID. How does the minister increase this expenditure when it has been stated that there are no collections on the canals ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have to keep the officials just the same, in order to keep the record and pending the two years experiment.

Galops Rapids—to complete channel, $40,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I brought down to the house last week copies of the contracts relating to the Galops rapids. The documents were placed by me on the table, and some of the hon. gentlemen opposite got them. I would like to ask if any hon. gentleman has them ? I thought they were obtained by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox.

Mr. J. D. REID. I may say that I have been trying all afternoon to find out where they are, and no member on this side of the House acknowledges having seen them, the clerk says he never saw them, and they are not upstairs, where papers of this kind are generally to be found. For that reason I think it would be most unfair to press this item until we have an opportunity of seeing the documents which my hon. friend promised.

Mr. EMMERSON. If we pass this item, it will finish the main estimates, and there is an item in the supplementary estimates for the Galops rapids on which the matter can be fully discussed, and I will have the information copied again and furnished to my hon. friend to-morrow morning.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course, I think it is unfair to ask that this item pass without my having an opportunity to see the papers. The minister may bring the supplementary estimates on at some moment when I am not here, and I may not have the opportunity of discussing this matter again.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend can rest assured that as long as I am in this House I will not take any course of that character with respect to the estimates under my control.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. minister will state that there is an item in the supplementary estimates for the Galops rapids, and that it will not be pressed through without my having an opportunity to discuss it, I am quite willing to let this item go.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is in the supplementary estimates an item for the Galops rapids, and my hon. friend will have that opportunity, and I will put myself out to accommodate him as to the time when it will be discussed.

Building a spur line of railway from Intercolonial station at Rivière Ouelle to wharf on the St. Lawrence—balance, $6,300.

Mr. MORIN. How long is that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Seven miles.

Mr. MORIN. Is that built specially for the use of the government road or some other purpose ? Has not somebody built a mill there, and does he not require that road to haul lumber ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; it is to connect the Rivière Ouelle wharf with the ferry at Murray Bay. It is built for the benefit of the Murray Bay traffic.

Intercolonial Railway—St. Charles Junction —bore hole for water supply, $4,750.

Mr. EMMERSON. We had to get water there. The Intercolonial was very much inconvenienced last year for want of water. This amount was expended because of the depth.

Intercolonial Railway — Campbellton—siding on wharf at, $1,250.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was necessary to put in a siding there. There is a large wharf at that place.

Intercolonial Railway—Sussex—platform extension at military siding, $950.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is where the militia drill. They have their permanent military establishment there, and the platform was furnished for the benefit of the military.

Intercolonial Railway—Spring Hill Junction— —bore hole for water supply, $2,800.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could no water be got there without boring for it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; this was absolutely necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there not a number of hills there?

Mr. EMMERSON. There may be, but this boring for water was the last resort.

Intercolonial Railway—siding at Pictou Landing, $14,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This work was given under contract after tender, and the lowest tender was taken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the matter about which there was some discussion last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think not. This arises out of the shipment of coal. The wharf had been raised by the coal companies and there had to be a different grade, so that the grades go down one way and up the other. This siding became necessary on account of the grades.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A sort of switchback?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is on the New Glasgow side, opposite the town of Pictou?

Mr. FIELDING. It is Pictou landing, where the coal is shipped from the Acadia mines.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the minister if it is time now to talk about the question I asked this afternoon?

Mr. EMMERSON. Item 91 of the main estimates has been held over, so that my hon. friend will have an opportunity to discuss the question on that item. I did not press it, because the hon. member for West Toronto said that when it came up he wished to be present.

Lachine canal—electric generator, electric cables and shafting, $5,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that a new machine?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the balance on the work of the new gates put in on the Lachine canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the total cost of all these?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the figures just now.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister seems to be rather short of information.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have sent for the information, and I shall have it in a few minutes. Let the item stand in the meantime.

Item allowed to stand.

Railways and canals—chargeable to income—Lachine canal—repairs to old locks, 1 and 2, $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister please give us some explanation of this?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have had to repair the old locks 1 and 2 of the Lachine canal, and this $25,000 is required to meet the expenditure made for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1904.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was this work let by tender?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who had the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. Quinlin & Robinson.

Mr. J. D. REID. By the yard?

Mr. EMMERSON. By schedule. The contract was let to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was it publicly advertised.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, generally advertised.

Lachine canal—tail race, Cote St. Paul, $3,956.10.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was anything ever done about that basin near Montreal that the government own and that was used for a dry-dock?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Tate dry-dock. It is leased to Mr. L'Etand for $1,000 a year he making the ordinary repairs. But it is found necessary to rebuild that dry-dock, and there is an item in the supplementary estimates for that purpose.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it understood that this gentleman will have the lease still at $1,000 per annum?

Mr. EMMERSON. If we continue the lease the terms will have to be arranged? It may be that the terms will have to be increased.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the amount in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. EMMERSON. Speaking from memory the estimate of the total cost is $10,000. If we get $1,000, that will be 10 per cent on the investment.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think there would be any trouble in leasing it for $1,000 a year now, and let the lessee put on the repairs. It is a nice dry-dock for vessels running on the Lachine canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is small.

Mr. J. D. REID. It takes in small canal boats and it is the only place at which they can be docked, unless they go to Quebec.

Mr. EMMERSON. We can discuss the matter when the item is before us.

Lachine canal—water service for protection against fire, $1,800.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where is that?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to lay an eight inch pipe from the city water works

main on Mill street to the north side of the dry-dock, 650 feet where a hydrant will be placed. The canal fleet is put in the dock each winter and there are a number of buildings and also a considerable quantity of material for lock gates &c, without protection against fire. The value of the fleet dredges, tugs, &c., is about $100,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. They are placed in the dry dock you have just leased ? I would like to know also if the government have to pay any charges for their vessels being taken out in the dry-dock, or if that point was reserved in the lease that was made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, we do not pay anything.

Lachine canal—raising shed No. 1, St. Gabriel Basin, $10,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is done to meet the shipping requirements. The work was advertised and put up for tender.

Mr. MONK. Who got the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A man named Quinlan. I would like to reduce that amount to $8,000, because we will not spend more than $8,000, and the balance is provided for in the supplementaries for the current year.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount of Quinlan's tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give the exact figure.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many tenders did you receive ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Three tenders and this was the lowest.

Mr. J. D. REID. In every other department when we ask for this information it is generally given. I think we should know the names of the tenderers and the amounts, because the public in that vicinity are curious to know these things, and to see whether the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. EMMERSON. In other words, whether I was telling the truth or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not for that reason, but because they like to know the difference there was between the tenders.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would be sorry if, when I stated that a certain tender was the lowest, any doubt would still exist in the minds of the committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not wish the minister to take my request in that sense at all, I do not dispute his word. But I think it is fair that we should have this information. It has been shown in this House that the lowest tender has not always been accepted.

Mr. EMMERSON. I should be sorry if that were the case. If the lowest tender had not been accepted in this case, then I think it would be desirable for the minister to come prepared with a detailed statement showing why the lowest tender was not accepted. But I fail to see why it is necessary to bring forward voluminous information to show why the lowest tender was accepted. Tenders were publicly asked, a certain number were received, and the department accepted the lowest.

Mr. J. D. REID. In items of this kind it is generally expected that the minister will have the names of the tenderers and the amount. Here is a vote for $10,000, and the minister says he has no information whatever as to who the tenderers were and the amounts, and he asks us to vote it blind.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will allow the item to go through I will furnish him with a statement in the morning. I agree with him that the information should be furnished.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Sometimes these promises are not very well fulfilled after the item goes through. The hon. gentleman will be good enough to see that the information is produced. There is nothing to spur a minister's memory after the item has gone through.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has not occurred in connection with my estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not speaking of the present minister, I am speaking of all ministers. They do not take so much interest in getting the information about an item once it has passed. Therefore, if this item is passed we will expect that full information to-morrow morning without fail.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will bring it to-morrow morning without fail.

Lachine canal—lock gates, $30,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This amount is required to build four new lock gates, they were to have been completed before the 30th of June, 1904. This is a supplementary vote. They are being built by employees of the department under the direction of the superintendent.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does this come under the head of repairs ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is for repairs, it is not a capital expenditure. These gates are for locks 1 and 2, which are being rebuilt.

Chambly canal—to complete waste weir at electric power house, $2,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for a waste weir at the electric power house. The present weir is a wooden structure built twenty years ago. It is proposed to make one of concrete. Most of the materials are on hand having been purchased out of the appropriation voted last year for this work and another weir at Ste. Therese island. When the present one is completed it will only

leave a couple of wooden weirs on the canal. It is the intention to build them of concrete entirely.

Mr. MONK. Has the government a power-house there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MONK. This is in connection with a government owned power-house and has no reference to any electrical power company there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. None whatever.

Chambly canal—damage by flooding, $1,736.

Mr. MONK. In connection with this item I would like to ask the hon. minister who are the parties to be indemnified and what is the amount to be given to each ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The award was made by Marcelin Robert. This was for damages caused by the overflowing of a culvert under the canal. The persons to whom damages have been awarded, and the amounts are as follows :

Francis Xavier Gervais	$100
C. W. Coupal	50
Joseph Dupois, père	200
Octave Poirier	200
Julien Audette	25
J. B. Many	300
Lewis Dupuis	350
Jean Baptiste Sapaline, dit Gaboriau	310
Leonie Chartier	40
Edward Chartier	400
Marcelin Robert (valuator)	61

Mr. MONK. Is this amount intended to cover all the damages caused by flooding ?

Mr. EMMERSON. All the damages caused by flooding from the culvert under the canal.

Mr. MONK. Has this sum any reference whatever to damages caused by flooding by the building of a dam there for the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. Two items stood over in regard to which there will be no discussion but in regard to which some information was wanted and while I have it here possibly there will be no objection to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Bring it down to-morrow.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are only these two items, and if there is to be any discussion I certainly will accede to the hon. gentleman's request.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are they ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is item 27 :

Lachine canal—electric generator, electric cable and shafting, $5,000.

Mr TAYLOR. Carried.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, there is the item :

Lachine canal—enlargement and improvement, $24,000.

I want to take that out of the estimates for 1903-4 because it will be found in the supplementary estimates for the current year. I therefore beg to move that the item be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON. The next item is :

Lachine canal—construction and equipment (revote), $62,000.

I beg to move to reduce that item from $62,000 to $57,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is it for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to provide for the construction of workshops at Cascades Point. The work is under contract and was completed in June, 1904. It is also to pay the balance due on the final estimates of R. McDonald and of the Canadian General Electric Company under their contracts. The whole amount is $62,000 but as there are only $57,000 of it paid out of the 1903-4 appropriation we are asking for that sum to be voted and the balance of $5,000 will be provided for in the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Motion agreed to.

Soulanges canal—land and land damages, $650.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to indemnify landowners for past damages for land taken at Bissonette's Gully. There are $3,000 in the main estimates for widening and deepening this gully and there will be no further damage by flooding.

Cornwall canal—strengthening and protecting north bank, &c., $5,600.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg to move to reduce that item to $2,600.

Mr. LENNOX. That had better stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is by arrangement.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood that the Cornwall canal item in the main estimates stood. Is that correct ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. It was rearranged that those items were to be passed through in order to expedite the business of the House, and that the discusssion would arise on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. LENNOX. I have been here most of the time, and I have heard nothing of the kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was this evening ; my hon. friend could not have been in the House.

Mr. LENNOX. With whom was the arrangement made ? There are certain members who have charge of that matter and it was very distinctly understood that the

Cornwall canal item was to stand for discusion of the Davis contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. So it does.

Mr. LENNOX: It should not have been passed to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not passed.

Mr. LENNOX. There is confusion somewhere.

Mr. EMMERSON. The understanding was that there should be an opportunity for the discussion of that contract, and in the Supplementaries for this year there will be found a further amount and the discussion may be had upon it.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have been here all evening and I did not hear of any such bargain.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that the two items, the Cornwall canal and the Galops Rapids, were to pass with the consent of hon. members and that the discussion which was desired in connection with the Davis contract and also upon the contracts in connection with the Galops Rapids should take place under the supplementary items referring to those two canals.

Mr. LENNOX. We can shorten this matter easily. It was distinctly understood the other day when the matter was partly discussed by the Minister of Justice that this item would stand in order to get certain papers and unless the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) or myself had made an arrangement it should not have been passed. We have charge of this matter and we do not propose that the main item for the Cornwall canal shall pass until after that item is discussed. We have our own reasons for not wishing it to depend on supplementaries and I would ask to have that item considered as standing over as arranged the other day.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. leader of the opposition was in the House when the matter was talked over and I made the statement I am now making. Of course if there is any objection I want to be reasonable.

Mr. LENNOX. It was understood before the hon. the leader of the opposition left to-night that we had come to the end of the day's work and I think it is well to carry out our understanding of the matter. The item should certainly stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. This item of the Cornwall canal ?

Mr. LENNOX. This whole thing.

Mr. EMMERSON. The other was passed.

Mr. LENNOX. It should not have been passed.

Mr. EMMERSON. If an hon. member is out of the House he cannot come back and complain of what has been done. I do not think that is treating the House fairly.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose my hon. friend understands that a member cannot always be in the House. In the absence of those who were known to have charge of this matter this item should not have been passed, and if it has been passed by mistake it should be reopened now.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister will remember that the hon. leader of the opposition was not in the House when the item passed. He came in just as we finished the discussion of the Galops, and the discussion was that if we allowed that item to go through we could discuss it on the supplementaries to-morrow.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were coupled together in my remarks. My hon. friend knows that all the papers he asked for were brought down. Very recently he made a request for some other papers and they are being prepared and will be ready for him in the morning.

Mr. LENNOX. Some papers which were not on the file but were referred to were asked for by us, and this morning when we came to look over them we found that certain papers were not included.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps we might go to the next item.

Mr. WILSON. I think it is an open violation of the understanding reached the other day. It was well understood that this whole item should stand and that there should be a regular discussion.

Mr. EMMERSON. We cannot allow the one to stand that has passed already.

Mr. LENNOX. The one that has been passed accidentally should be re-opened.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friends' intention was to have a discussion might I suggest that we have an opportunity for that in the item of the later supplementaries touching the Cornwall canal. If the intention is to have a motion to strike out the item I realize that my suggestion would not meet his view.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not meet my view because in the discussion of the Davis contract we should be absolutely at large and at liberty to take whatever course we choose. Of course I am now speaking subject to whatever decision the leader of the opposition who I am glad to see has entered the chamber, may take and I shall be glad to concur in any suggestion he makes, but I myself think that we should be left absolutely at large in regard to that item and not confined to any particular course.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The item should not have been proposed at all until the papers were printed and furnished to the House. A great many demands were made to the

House that the papers should be brought down.

Mr. EMMERSON. If there is any misunderstanding, I am perfectly willing that it should be left over.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister suggested that the file was an enormous file, that it would be a great expense and waste of time to print all the papers, and he asked me to name three gentlemen to look over them. I did so, and these gentlemen spent a good deal of time going over the papers, collecting at least a few of them to be printed. I suppose they are being printed now. I suppose that it was by inadvertence that the item was passed, and I think it should be re-opened.

Mr. EMMERSON. I knew it was the desire to have these papers; and, in order to expedite the business, I made the suggestion that these items of the main estimates be allowed to go through, and that the discussion would come up under the supplementary estimates of this year, which contain an item relating to the Cornwall canal. If there has been any misunderstanding, I am willing to let the item relating to the Cornwall canal stand.

Mr. J. D. REID. We might as well let the other stand also, because I intend to divide the House on the Galops Rapids item.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will have an opportunity to divide the House on the other item.

Mr. J. D. REID. I will let the item go through, but I wish to point out that it is an item which the Minister of Railways and Canals is trying to press through without giving due justice to the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry my hon. friend is so uncharitable. My suggestion was only with a view of expediting business, not with the view of cutting off any discussion, or to prevent my hon. friend from saying what he pleases with respect to it. I move that item 93 in the main estimates—Cornwall canal, enlargement, $26,000—be reconsidered.

Motion agreed to.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the business for to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Justice will take up the Railway Bill, after which we will resume supply, with the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 26, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday:

That the report of Judge McTavish on the tobacco industry and the evidence taken by him and all documents filed, be printed forthwith, and that rule 99 be suspended for that purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection to this motion. I may inform my hon. friend that the order has been given to have the papers printed. My hon. friend refers to the documents filed, I understood that he wanted yesterday to have the evidence printed also.

Mr. MONK. The motion includes the evidence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The evidence is very voluminous, and the printing will involve a good deal of expense. It would make quite a pile if placed on the table. At all events I have no objection to the motion.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it is possible to appreciate the report without the evidence.

Motion agreed to.

DUNDONALD FAREWELL.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, might I ask the government if it is their intention when the House rises at six o'clock to-night to allow it to remain adjourned until nine o'clock. I understand that a very distinguished gentleman, who occupied a prominent position in the life of the empire is about to leave our country and I am sure that both sides of the House would like an opportunity to bid him farewell. I refer to Lord Dundonald.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are now in the fifth month of the session and I think the best way for us to serve the country now is to attend to our business here.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—HON. WM. ROSS—DENNIS EAGAN LETTER.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I would ask the indulgence of the House while I make a personal explanation in connection with the charge that was made against me by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). The hon. member read from the Journals of the House and he had my denial before him when he made the charge. I am not going to read the whole of that denial. I said that I was in a position to give the

strongest and most emphatic denial the English language would enable me to do. I shall not, however, trouble the House with the whole of my personal denial which I made thirty years ago in this House. The hon. gentleman had my denial before him on the same page from which he read and we know what is thought of the man who conceals the truth. The same charge was made against me in a Tory paper in the year 1878 in the island of Cape Breton and I replied to it, also in a Conservative paper, as follows :

I did not think that out of some self respect, the old infamous charge that I wrote the 'Dennis Eagan letter' would be repeated, particularly as the most learned of the proprietors of the 'Advocate' stated, 'we know now that Mr. Ross did not write the Dennis Eagan letter.' A more dishonest and disgraceful accusation was never made by one man against another. I stated in my place in parliament, as I now repeat in the strongest and most emphatic language, that it is possible for me to use, that I never by pen, pencil, or by any act of mine wrote the said letter, and that I never saw it. I was promised that it should be placed in my hands, but that written promise was never fulfilled, but thinking it would, I had copies of it lithographed in pencil and ink as if written by me, so that they could be compared with the original, and I now send you the said copies and ask the editor of the 'Advocate' if he has any regard for honest and truthful inquiry to compare it with the real letter which he still unjustly repeats was written by me. Why was this letter never produced in parliament and shown to those who are familiar with my writing ? In Victoria Dominion officials wandered about canvassing against me, and though asked, I never would so far forget my position as to write or use anything against them, and it would be folly to imagine that I would have followed any other course in Cape Breton. When the statement was made in parliament that I wrote the said letter, I telegraphed to North Sydney for information, and received the following reply from John Vooght, Esq. : 'You are at liberty to state in your place in parliament that I can prove that you did not write the Dennis Eagan letter.' I therefore, hurl back this vile slander, to the source from which it emanated, as the most unfounded and false accusation that it was possible to be made against me. If the editor of the 'Advocate' could be moved to that sense of honour that should characterize noble minded men, instead of reiterating this slander, he will express his regret that he was entrapped and seduced to write what he must now know, was pure and unfounded.

The editor of the paper also then a warm Conservative, wrote the following :

In the spirit of fair-play that has always characterized our paper, we have published Hon. William Ross's letter knowing that many of his friends in Victoria are our friends and subscribers. It is also due to Mr. Ross that we state that we have full and ample proof that the 'Dennis Eagan' letter, of which such public use was made, was not written by him. A regard for truth and justice compels us to make this fact known to our readers, were it necessary we could here write the name of the author of said letter, having the pleasure of seeing him almost every day. Nothing can indeed be gained by this unfair abuse of one who has retired from public life, and who has left a record behind him in Victoria and Cape Breton, for honour, justice, and integrity in all his public career, which it would be well that others of greater sound and pretensions would follow and imitate.

Sir Charles Tupper made the same charge against me, and I wrote him giving an explanation. Sir Charles Tupper, acting as a man of honour and a gentleman, made this public announcement, which will be found on page 1077 of the 'Hansard' of 1887 :

I wish to make a very brief statement to the House before the orders of the day are called. The House will remember that, on a recent occasion, when the question arose of the policy of various governments in regard to the action of subordinate officers, I read a letter to the House which was handed to me by an hon. member who sits behind me, from a printed paper published at the time, which was some time ago, and which I had no idea was not authentic. It purports to be a letter written by Mr. Wm. Ross, then a member of this House, and at one time a member of the government ; and when I read that letter to the House I had entirely forgotten when it was originally produced, its authenticity was challenged. That statement was made by an hon. gentleman opposite, and I think it is right that I should say that I have received a letter from Mr. Ross calling my attention to the fact of his having denied the authenticity of the letter, and assuring me that the letter was a forgery. I take this opportunity of stating to the House that I accept that statement. I have not the slightest doubt of the accuracy of the statement made by this gentleman, who at this moment holds a very high and important office under the government. I have very great pleasure in making the fullest amend to the hon. gentleman, and in expressing my regret that I should have forgotten, what I now remember, that at the time the letter was produced, its authenticity was denied.

There is the statement of a gentleman. When I placed the matter before him, he gave a public denial of the charge he had read. I think that that is an example which should be followed by men who would like to be called gentlemen in this House, and who should regret having brought a false accusation against another hon. member. This false accusation was publicly denied by me thirty years ago and my denial was accepted, but to-day we find an hon. gentleman who would stoop to revive this old calumny. A more disgraceful accusation was never made in this House by one member against another. It was due to myself and my constituency, to my friends in Halifax and in this House—and I have friends on both sides ; so much so that gentlemen on the other side express to me their regret that this old disproved accusation should have been revived—it is due to all parties, I say, that I should take this occasion to again

show up the falsity of this charge, and I trust we will hear no more of it.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to say that as the hon. gentleman did not give me any notice that he would bring this matter up, I have nothing to say at present, but will answer him in the course of a few days if necessary.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). The hon. gentleman never gave me any notice when he brought that accusation against myself, and I am treating him just in the same way as he treated me.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved third reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Railway Act of 1903.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I beg to move in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time but be referred back to the committee of the whole House for the insertion of the following clause :—'Section 3 of the Railway Act is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'persons' in the first line, the words 'and express companies.''

I do not intend taking up the time of the House in going over this question again. What I would like now is to have a division, so that the public may ascertain what strength there is in the proposition I am making. This amendment will bring express companies under the jurisdiction of the Railway Act. These express companies are really owned by the railway companies and carry a large portion of freight. The freight they are carrying is increasing every day ; and, as the Railway Commission are given authority to prevent discrimination by railway companies, they should also be given authority to prevent discrimination by express companies. These companies have it in their power to discriminate and are doing it, and I wish to put them in the same position as the railways. This proposition has been endorsed by a considerable number of commercial bodies and a number of members of this House, and it is to test the matter that I make the amendment now in your hands. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, that if I only speak once, may I move other amendments, as I have other amendments to offer ?

Mr. SPEAKER. According as each amendment is disposed of other amendments may be moved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do I understand that it is the intention of my hon. friend to move several amendments to this Bill on the third reading ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, but to different sections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if he can move more than one amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman himself cannot move more than one amendment, but I understood him to ask whether other amendments could not be moved by other members.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have amendments dealing with different principles of the Bill, and should like to have them come before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If one hon. member can move several amendments on the third reading, we went to a great deal of unnecessary trouble on the third reading of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. We had many amendments and had to distribute them among all the available members.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I will pass the amendments round.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will appreciate the reason of the ruling that a member can speak only once on the same question. If he were allowed to move amendment after amendment there would be no end to some debates.

Mr. MACLEAN. I understand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) who has said that there is no good purpose to be served by prolonged discussion of these amendments as they come up. They were fully discussed last year when they were up in this House, and this session in the Railway Committee, to say nothing about the discussion in the committee of this House. So far as this particular amendment is concerned, I do not see why I should depart from the opinion I expressed before, when I said that it seemed to me there were doubts as to whether we had the power to deal with this amendment. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will remember that when the question was up on a former occasion, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) concurred with me in the opinion that there were these doubts. I believe that if we adopted this amendment. the Railway Act would have to be recast in many particulars to make it workable.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the House object, Mr. Speaker, to the name of my hon. friend from Peel, (Mr. Blain) being substituted for mine as the mover of this amendment ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment is in the hands of the House and the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Maclean's) name cannot be withdrawn except by unanimous consent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) was under a slight misapprehension as to the rules of the House, I think this concession ought to be made to him without question. Before the amendment is put, I desire to say that I agree absolutely with the view expressed by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that it is proper that express companies should be

controlled. The subject was discussed last year when the Railway Act went through. The express business, however, it must be noticed, is somewhat different from the ordinary railway business. The goods sent by express are collected sometimes from street to street or from house to house. The work involves cartage, and it also involves arrangements with steamship lines, stage lines and so on. It is a more complicated subject, so far as dealing with the rates is concerned, than the control over railway rates exercised by the Railway Commission. I have looked carefully over the Railway Act and I find that there is no provision of special importance with regard to express companies except section 278 which reads as follows :

> Every company which grants any facilities for the carriage of goods by express to any incorporated express company or person, shall grant equal facilities, on equal terms and conditions, to any other incorporated express company which demands the same.

That is designed, I suppose, for the purpose of preventing a monopoly by any company of the express business over any particular railway. It has been said in this House that that section has not fulfilled the purpose for which it was designed. I have been referred to litigation which was instituted for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this section before the present Railway Commission was established. So far as my opinion is concerned, I should think that that section is capable of being enforced. Our commission has power of enforcement of that section differing somewhat from the powers of similar tribunals in the United States of America. Of course, it would be some relief to establish competition, if competition be possible. I have heard it stated by those who have studied the matter somewhat that it is not very easy, upon a single line of railway to have competing express companies. If that be so, and if, as a matter of practice, the purpose of section 278 cannot be carried out, that affords all the more reason why there should be in Canada some effective control of the rates charged by express companies. I believe that the express rates in this country, in many departments of business at least, have been very materially reduced within the last eight or ten years. I have been so informed by those who are in a position to know, and I believe the statement is correct. The express companies are doing a very large and very important work. I was surprised, on making some investigations into the question to learn how large the amount of traffic carried by the express companies has become. But that is a further reason why there should be control of rates. On looking over the statute, I concur in the view expressed by the Minister of Justice that to merely insert the words 'express companies' as proposed by the amendment of my hon. friend,

would not only result in uncertainty and confusion, but would probably render the Act absolutely ineffective so far as any attempt to control the express companies is concerned. Therefore, my position with regard to the matter is this : I believe in the control of rates of the express companies. I recognize the fact that control must come, and that it ought to come at the earliest possible date, but I do not believe that it can be attained by the insertion of two words in this Bill. While I sympathize with the motive of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) and am absolutely in favour of some control being exercised upon the rates of express companies, I do not think that purpose can be effected in this way. I will be prepared, however, to support a bill with proper conditions, which, I hope, will be brought in for the purpose of exercising over the rates of express companies a control similar to that which at present is exercised by the board of railway commissioners upon the rates of railway companies. It is for that reason, and that alone, that I could not support the amendment of my hon. friend. I think it will be ineffective and will only end in confusion. At the same time, as I say, I absolutely sympathize with the motive which actuates him in proposing this amendment and I will be prepared to carry it into effect in the proper way.

Mr. WM. ROSS (South Ontario). I am heartily in sympathy with the proposal to put express companies under the control of the Railway Commission. I do not see why an off-shoot from the railway companies such as express companies, doing a business probably, of $2,000,000, as near as I can find out from the report of the Minister of Railways, should not come under the control of the Railway Commissioners. But, while I am heartily in sympathy with this idea, the matter has come up in such a way that it seems impossible for us, if we are well advised by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to vote for the motion now standing in the name of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). I shall have to vote against it, considering that I am legally advised that it will be of no use. But my opinion is not changed. I am still heartily in favour of the control of express companies by the Railway Commission, and I hope that the government at an early day will bring in a measure to effect that change.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN. As my name has been substituted for that of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) as mover of this amendment. I wish to say a few words. When this question was before the Committee of the Whole House a few days ago, I expressed myself as in accord with the principle of the amendment. I have not since changed my opinion ; I am still in favour

of the motion that I propose to ask the House to vote upon. I am of opinion that the people of this country believe that the express companies should be controlled by the Railway Commission as the freight rates of railways are controlled by this commission. Hon. members, of course, are aware that a considerable proportion of the goods now consumed by the Canadian people, especially in the older provinces, are carried by express. In the central part of the province of Ontario the farmers are devoting themselves to the cultivation of such products as must find their way to the market in large centres by means of express carriage. The farmers in the immediate vicinities of the larger cities are almost compelled, these times, to send their products by express to the consumers. Indeed there are many farmers in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec the larger portion of whose products are carried by express to market. The House must remember that the farmers are particularly interested in this matter ; and while it has been said by the Minister of Justice that possibly this motion will not cover all that is required, and will not place the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission, yet the House must bear in mind that the government had distinct notice of this proposition one year ago. One year ago my hon. friend from East York brought this matter before the House, and called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that it was desired that the express companies should come under the operation of the Railway Commission. I am of the opinion that the government since last year has had ample notice, and I think the people of Canada will consider it to be the duty of the government at this session of parliament to introduce such legislation as will place the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission. I shall support this amendment. If it does not measure up to the requirements of the people on this question, then I think it is the duty of the government, who have power to legislate, to substitute for this amendment, if the House so expresses its will, such legislation at this session as will bring the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER. I wish to give my reason why I think this amendment ought to prevail. The objection of the Minister of Justice, as I understand it, is that this amendment alone will not cure the evil and provide the remedy that is sought for by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). Now I will point out to the Minister of Justice that if this amendment prevails and the House goes into committee on the Railway Bill for the purpose of carrying out this object, the Minister of Justice can move as many amendments as he likes in order to give full effect to the amendment of the hon. member for East York. I shall vote for the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Blain).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Kaulbach,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Bell,	Maclean,
Bennett,	McGowan,
Blain,	Morin,
Boyd,	Porter,
Broder,	Puttee,
Clancy,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Culbert,	Robinson (Elgin),
Earle,	Schell,
Ganong,	Scott,
Gilmour,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Thomson (Grey),
Halliday,	Tolton,
Henderson,	Wilson—33.
Ingram,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Lavergne
Barker,	(Drummond & Artha.),
Bazinet,	LeBlanc,
Beith,	Lennox,
Blanchet,	Loy,
Borden (Halifax),	Macdonald,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	MacLaren
Bourbonnais,	(Huntingdon),
Brodeur,	McCarthy,
Brown,	McCool,
Bruce,	McGugan,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Bureau,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Marcil (Bagot),
Christie,	Matheson,
Copp,	Mignault,
Costigan,	Morrison,
Cowan,	Murray,
Delisle,	Oliver,
Demers (Lévis)	Paterson,
Erb,	Préfontaine,
Fielding,	Pringle,
Fitzpatrick,	Riley,
Fortier,	Rosamond,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Ontario),
Gervais,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gibson,	Ross (Yukon),
Grant,	Russell,
Harty,	Stephens,
Heyd,	Stewart,
Holmes,	Talbot,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Thompson
Hyman,	(Haldimand & Monck),
Johnston	Tobin,
(Cape Breton),	Tolmie,
Kendall,	Turgeon,
Lang,	Wade,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright—72.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MACLEAN. The division that has just taken place is rather portentous. It may mean a new era in this country and it shows that at the present time the people are beginning to see where they are in regard to this new and progressive question. I now beg to move the following amendment :

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to committee of the whole with instructions to amend the same by the insertion of the following clause :—

4. Section 264 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsections :—'The tolls charged in any standard passenger tariff shall not exceed the following namely :—for all companies the gross earnings of whose passenger trains, as reported to the Minister of Railways, under the provisions of section 304 of this Act, equalled or exceeded the sum of $3,000 for each mile of road operated by the said company, two (2) cents per mile ; and for all companies, the earnings of whose passenger trains, reported as aforesaid, were over $2,000 and less than $3,000 per mile of the road operated by the said company, two and one-half (2½) cents per mile ; and for all companies whose earnings, reported as aforesaid, were less than $2,000 per mile of road operated by the said company, three (3) cents per mile.'

I have spoken several times already in the House on this question. The substance of this amendment is to make the law that prevails in Michigan apply to the railroads of Canada; it is a graded regulation of the passenger rate. Our Railway Act says that the railroad companies must have a standard passenger rate. I have tried to fix it here, and to explain the standard passenger rate. Our Railway Act says the companies shall file yearly their passenger tariffs. They have not done so, they never will do so until they are compelled by parliament, and until parliament assumes and discharges the duty of saying what the passenger rate is. I have had hundreds of communications from all portions of the country in favour of this proposition ; I am not going to take up the time of the House further than to read one of them, and to say where some of the others are from. This is from the riding of South Brant :

Brantford, May 6, 1904.

W. F. Maclean, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—At a meeting of the South Brant Farmers' Association held at Burford on May 4th, it was moved by myself and seconded by W. H. Preston, M.P.P.,—

That in view of the recent application by the Michigan Central for a renewal of its lease of the Canada Southern, and of your proposal to incorporate in the new lease a clause providing that the Michigan Central Railway shall not charge a higher passenger rate on its Canadian section than on its Michigan, we, the South Brant Farmers' Association, do heartily endorse your proposition ; and that we send official letters to yourself, to the Premier, and to our representative, stating our position.

This motion was carried unanimously, and I have much pleasure in communicating it to you.

Yours very truly,
W. C. GOOD,
Sec.-Treas.

I have a similar letter from the Farmers' Association of the county of Haldimand, from Algoma, from South Huron, from West Simcoe—all these name their members and trust they will support the motion ; from East Kent, from North Wentworth, from East Lambton, from South Wellington, from Lennox, another from Kent, from the Ratepayers' Association of Toronto and a number of others. They are all to this effect, that parliament is the only body that can regulate a standard passenger rate, that it ought to be defined, that it is in the interest of the public that it should be defined, and that wherever a passenger rate has been defined by parliament or by a legislature lower passenger rates have resulted. Notwithstanding all that has been said in this House about the smallness of the law in Michigan and about the smallness of the law in the state of New York, the great fact is that the majority of the travel—again I assert it in this House without fear of contradiction—the majority of the travel in the state of New York and the majority of the travel in the state of Michigan by reason of the legislation there, is for 2 cents, and less than 2 cents. I say this, that in a number of states where they have advertised a thousand mile ticket for $20, which is 2 cents a mile, good results have come from it, and that the time has arrived when we must have a standard passenger rate fixed in this country. I assume to fix it by this amendment, and fix it as fairly as can be under the circumstances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion is put I desire to offer a few observations in regard to it. I thought that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) was going to speak. I yield to no one in appreciating the importance of reasonable passenger rates in this country but I think it is undesirable that we should pass any legislation which might result in the postponement for an indefinite period of what we would regard as reasonable passenger rates. The motion of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) provides that :

The tolls charged in any standard passenger tariff shall not exceed the following, namely :—for all companies the gross earnings of whose passenger trains, as reported to the Minister of Railways, under the provisions of section 304 of this Act, equalled or exceeded the sum of $3,000 for each mile of road operated by the said company, two (2) cents per mile ; and for all companies, the earnings of whose passenger trains, reported as aforesaid, were over $2,000 and less than $3,000 per mile of the road operated by the said company, two and one-half (2½) cents per mile ; and for all companies whose earnings, reported as aforesaid, were less than $2,000 per mile of road operated by the said company, three (3) cents per mile.

The basis of that legislation, as I understand it, is to be found in certain legislation of the state of Michigan which legislation, I am informed, does not apply to the whole state of Michigan. It applies to only

a portion of the state of Michigan. In order that we should go to the state of Michigan for the purpose of establishing the basis of our railway legislation in Canada we must first be absolutely certain that the conditions in the state of Michigan and in Canada are precisely the same. I have not heard up to the present time anything which would convince me of that. The state of Michigan contains a little less than 7,000 miles of railway, while the Dominion of Canada, I suppose thirty times as large, contains something less than 19,000 miles of railway. The state of Michigan is populated very much more densely than the Dominion of Canada as a whole. Unless I am convinced by a better argument than that which I have heard that the conditions in the state of Michigan are exactly the same as they are in Canada, and I do not believe they are, I do not propose to go to the state of Michigan to find out what sort of legislation we should pass in regard to this subject. If we pass this statute the Railway Commission of Canada will properly consider it binding upon them and for that reason they will for all time to come govern themselves by it and thus they will be unable to give us a two-cent rate in many parts of the country where the conditions provided for by this amendment do not prevail and for many years are not likely to exist. It seems to me much more probable that this amendment will retard the establishment of reasonable railway rates in this country, as a whole, than that it will improve our opportunities in that regard.

I do not know whether those who promote this legislation have investigated all the conditions in the state of Michigan. Has any hon. member of this House, for example, investigated the remuneration of railways in Canada as compared with the remuneration of railways in the state of Michigan for the carriage of the mails ? I suppose that is a fairly important subject to consider. In the state of Michigan with less than 7,000 miles of railway more than $1,000,000 are paid every year for the carriage of the mails. In the Dominion of Canada with railways extending over an enormous area and totalling 19,000 miles, we pay only $400,000 more for the carriage of the mails, namely, $1,413,835. These are matters which are proper to be considered before we undertake to apply the Michigan legislation to the Dominion of Canada.

But, the most important objection I have to this amendment is that within six months after we have appointed a tribunal for the purpose of dealing with this very subject and before we have had the slightest experience of the public benefit which would result from the work of that tribunal we propose to take out of the hands of the tribunal the very work that parliament has entrusted to it.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Infanticide.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. I do not think that is good legislation. I should think that parliament, after having committed this whole subject to the Railway Commission by legislation, after having conferred upon that commission as large powers as were ever conferred on any similar body, should, within six months and before any opportunity has been given to ascertain the benefits to be derived from the commission, proceed to take from that commission the very work which was entrusted to it. If we propose to deal with passenger rates why not deal with freight rates in this way ? Freight rates are more important to the people of this country than passenger rates. Any farmer in this country who spends $20 in the course of the year in passenger rates will perhaps pay $200 in freight rates so that the all important question is rather freight rates than passenger rates. Besides, as has been pointed out in this House and I think in the committee, passenger rates are to a large extent ameliorated by the fact that we have excursions from time to time, cheap rates, which are taken advantage of by the people of the country, whereas there are no cheap excursion freight rates in this country. I think that if parliament were to proceed to deal with this question of passenger rates in this way it would be stultifying itself unless it proceeded at the same time to abolish the whole Railway Commission and to deal also with the subject of freight rates. If this motion means anything it means that the legislation which we passed last year was of no avail.

Now, what effect would this legislation have if applied in Canada at the present time ? The Canadian Northern Railway has earnings of $315 per mile. How long will it be before we get a passenger rate of two cents on the Canadian Northern ? The earnings of that railway must increase from $315 per mile to $3,000 per mile before we shall get a two-cent rate on the Canadian Northern.

Mr. MACLEAN. We have a three-cent rate on it now by the legislation of last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The object is to get a two-cent rate upon it and this legislation will produce a two-cent rate on the Canadian Northern when the passenger earnings have increased ten times what they are at the present time.

Mr. MACLEAN. I grant you that ; but it will get you a two-cent passenger rate on the Grand Trunk Railway to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Canada Atlantic Railway earns $670 per mile. We will get a two-cent rate on the Canada Atlantic when its earnings have increased to five times what they are at present. That does not seem to promise any very early relief on that railway. The Canadian Pacific Rail-

way earns $1,460 per mile. We will get a two-cent rate by this legislation when the passenger earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway have something more than doubled. Is that very likely to occur within the next ten years ? It does not seem to me that the legislation suggested by my hon. friend, and I appreciate and sympathize with the motives which have led him to propose it, is likely to result in a very great amelioration of passenger rates in the early future.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about the Grand Trunk ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Grand Trunk earns $2,200 per mile and under that the Grand Trunk would be entitled to charge two and a half cents per mile.

Mr. MACLEAN. To-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To-morrow, and we have legislation at the present time on the statute-book which obliges the Grand Trunk to charge only two cents per mile and I have heard my hon. friend argue that in this House.

Mr. MACLEAN. For third-class passengers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, for third-class passengers, but inasmuch as third-class passenger traffic is abolished in this country, and that practically there is very little distinction between first-class and second-class, it would not seem that the legislation existing on the statute-book has had very much influence upon the Grand Trunk.

I can see what this legislation would result in if applied to a great railway system like the Grand Trunk. It would simply result in the Grand Trunk Railway putting under separate corporations a number of branches which are now included in its general system and it would impose on the people in remote and sparsely settled portions of the country a higher railway tariff than they are subjected to at the present time. That seems to be the propable result. At the present time you have a great system, you have eight or ten or twelve roads which were formerly operated by eight or ten or twelve companies, operated by one company, and under the management of one company—the Grand Trunk Railway system. But if legislation of this kind were put on the statute-books, the Grand Trunk Railway would naturally retain under the management of the parent company only those main lines whose earnings would bring them under the terms of this statute, and it no doubt would seek to place under separate corporate management the subsidiary companies running through sparsely settled portions of the country, because the earnings on these portions of the road would not come within the operation of this statute. It seems to me that this would be the result of legislation of this kind. Thus sparsely settled districts would pay higher railway rates.

But why should we seek in this parliament to deal with this matter in this way when we have in the Railway Commission of Canada the most ample powers that any tribunal ever possessed for dealing with it. Let us look at some of those powers and inquire if there is any reason why we should pass by the Railway Commission. Let me say that the Railway Commission of Canada differs in important respects from many similar tribunals. I supported the idea of a Railway Commission before a measure for its creation was ever submitted to parliament; I supported it for what I thought were good reasons. The Act we have passed confers on the Railway Commission power not only to fix rates, but to enforce them, and in that very important respect it differs from the Interstate Commerce Commission, and from other tribunals in the United States, very few of which have any power of enforcement. For instance, the question of rates is fought out before the Interstate Commerce Commission, but you have to go to the courts to enforce the decision and there the decision of the Interstate Commission is found not to be binding. A railway corporation is able to fight out the whole question again in the courts, and it is only by obtaining the judgment of the courts that eventually you obtain a declaration against the rates disallowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In section 251 of our Railway Act there is this provision :

> The company may from time to time prepare and issue tariffs of the tolls to be charged as hereinafter provided, for all traffic carried by the company upon the railway.

The word 'traffic' includes passengers as well as freight.

Section 251, clause 2 says :

> All such by-laws shall be submitted to and approved by the board.

These tariffs can thus have no effect whatever until approved of by the board. Section 252 says :

> Such tolls may be either for the whole or for any particular portions of the railway ; but all such tolls shall always under substantially similar circumstances and conditions be charged equally to all persons, and at the same rate.

Section 252, subsection 3 says :

> No tolls shall be charged which unjustly discriminate between different localities.

Section 257 says :

> The board may disallow any tariff, or any portion thereof which it considers to be unjust or unreasonable, or contrary to any of the provisions of this Act, and may require the company, within a prescribed time, to substitute a tariff satisfactory to the board in lieu thereof, or may prescribe other tolls in lieu of the tolls so disallowed, and may designate the date at which any tariff shall come into force.

Section 263 says :

The tariff of tolls which the company shall be authorized to issue under this Act for the carriage of passengers between points on the railway shall be divided into two cases, namely :

The maximum mileage tariff, herein referred to as standard passenger tariff ;

And reduced passenger tariffs, herein referred to as special passenger tariffs.

2. The standard passenger tariff shall specify the maximum mileage tolls to be charged for passengers for all distances covered by the company's railway ; such distances may be expressed in like manner as provided herein in respect of standard freight tariffs.

3. Special passenger tariffs shall specify the toll or tolls to be charged by the company for passengers in every case where such tolls are lower than the tolls specified in the company's standard passenger tariff.

Section 264 says :

A standard passenger tariff shall be filed, approved and published in the same manner as required by this Act in the case of a freight standard tariff.

Section 265 says :

All special passenger tariffs shall be filed by the company with the board, and published as required by section 274, three days before any such tariff is intended to take effect.

Section 274 provides that the company shall at each station deposit and keep on file at a convenient place for the inspection of the public its standard and special passenger tariffs and freight tariffs of both classes. It shall also, in some public place in its stations give notice as to where its tariffs can be inspected.

Therefore you have under this statute complete and ample provisions for dealing not only with freight rates, but with passenger rates. You have a commission appointed for that purpose. You have a commission which has powers of investigation which are not possessed by this parliament, and I cannot at the present time see any good reason why that duty which parliament in its wisdom has committed to the Railway Commission only last year, should be taken away from it, and that we should proceed to deal with a subject which certainly we cannot investigate as fully or as carefully as can that tribunal. If we are to accept this amendment, then it seems to me that it was very unwise to undertake an annual expenditure of $100,000 or $150,000 for the purpose of maintaining this commission. We have thought it wise to entrust to the commission these duties, and if now we are able to take them upon ourselves, this expenditure of public money would be useless. I say that if you pass legislation such as is suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) it would in the first place give the railway companies an opportunity of demanding higher rates on freight ; in the second place it would give them an excuse for abolishing all excursion rates, and it might eventually result in a poorer service in districts where there is no competition. Moreover, it adopts the principle that rates shall be graded according to earnings, and therefore it must result in higher rates for sparsely settled districts where the earnings are smaller. Further, it might cause them to carry on their branch lines under separate corporate entities, so as to avoid bringing these branch lines under the terms of the proposed statute.

I believe in giving the railway commission an opportunity to demonstrate its usefulness. If it does not justify its existence by establishing reasonable passenger and freight rates in this country, it is because the personnel of the commission is not suitable, or because the powers which have been conferred upon it are not sufficient. I am prepared to support the administration in dealing with either of these defects should they become apparent. I do not understand that any such difficulty has arisen up to this time. Let us therefore give the Railway Commission an opportunity to know what it can do, and if from either of these causes, of which I have spoken, it does not do the necessary work, then let us reorganize the commission or amend the legislation.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the legislation to which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has directed the attention of the House might eventually result in comparatively low fares in thickly settled portions of the country, and in much higher fares in remote districts. That would be the natural tendency, if the principle of this legislation were insisted upon. In saying what I do, I trust I do not fail to appreciate the efforts which my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is making in the public interest. I sympathize in the objects which he has in view. The only difference between us is, that I think, considering the legislation of last year, his objects can be best accomplished by the Railway Commission which we have appointed for that purpose. He thinks on the contrary, that it is wise, within certain limitations to take that work out of the hands of the Railway Commission and to establish a standard according to earnings, which, in his opinion, would have excellent results, but which does not present itself to me in that view. For these reasons which I have very briefly stated, I cannot support the amendment of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. I supported the principle of this amendment some years ago in this House. I have had discussions with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) regarding it, and I reached an understanding with him as to what principle I would support, and this amendment being in harmony with that principle I believe it my duty to support it. I wish for a few moments to refer to an argument made by the leader of the opposition that it would result in higher freight rates. Of course it

might, there is no question about that. If the railroads did not find it paying, they might charge higher freight rates, but I am told, although I am not prepared to vouch for the correctness of the statement, that in Southern Michigan where the law applies, it has not resulted in higher freight rates and therefore, I would assume that that is not likely to happen here.

Then it was said that if this law is passed we might not have excursions. I again turn to Michigan for an example. I find that excursions there are as numerous as in Canada and yet, this law applies to the Southern part of Michigan, so I do not think that any fear is to be apprehended from that.

It is also said that it might result in portions of the railway system being put under a different management. I think that is not at all likely to happen. Because this only applies to a company whose passenger earnings reach $3,000 a mile, and in the remote portions of the country this amount would not be reached so that the law could not apply to them and there would be no necessity for putting such a section under a new management.

The next argument was that we should not copy Michigan in this unless everything there is on all fours with the conditions in Canada. We who live in Ontario adjoin the state of Michigan, and are back and forth among Michigan people very frequently and know the state well, always regard Michigan as being the same type of country as Ontario. We do not see much difference when we cross the border between the pursuits of the people and the conditions of life. The railroad operations are much the same and therefore I could not see any serious objection to following the example of Michigan.

One objection raised was that this measure applied only to a certain locality. In my judgment this provision was made simply for this reason, that the southern portion of Michigan is thickly settled, while the northern portion is still a comparatively new country and not thickly settled. To make it apply to the northern peninsula, a new section of country, was deemed improper owing to the comparatively light travel on the railways there. But I think it might well be left to apply to the whole country because when the earnings reach $3,000 a mile, it would be regarded as fair that the company should reduce its passenger rate to 2 cents a mile.

A word with regard to the question of whether we should introduce this law in view of the fact that the Railway Act was passed last session. To my mind that is a very strong argument against it, the strongest we have heard advanced, because the clauses of the Act which the leader of the opposition has cited seem to very amply cover the ground, and our Railway Commission has the substantial advantage over the Railway Commissions in the United States that whereas they must depend on public sentiment to compel the legislature or federal authority to enforce the law, in our Act we have embodied the authority to enforce the law. There is one difficulty in connection with the administration of the new Railway Act and that is that it applies only to railways under federal authority. It does not for instance, apply to government or provincial railways, but only to those under federal control. It may be said that if we pass such a law here, we could only enforce it upon the railways under our control. That of course is true, but if we enforce the law on railways under federal control I feel satisfied that under the principle of competition we would at a very early date induce other railways to adopt the same rate, and therefore, the principle would soon be of general application. The fact that by this law the principle would apply to government as well as to other railways might be some justification for the introduction of this measure now, but perhaps the main aim was to have the passenger rate under a fixed and determined law——

Mr. MACLEAN. As they have in England.

Mr. SPROULE——so that it would operate almost by an automatic process. We would know what the principle was and all we would have to do would be to look up the government returns and see if the earnings of a railway justified the reducing of the rate and when the earnings reached that amount the railways would be compelled to reduce the rate and the people would clamour for such a reduction. What we rather fear is that the Railway Commission is another court for the purpose of determining and deciding disputes between railway companies and individuals, corporations, localities, and other railway companies, and that it would be slow in its operation and difficult to move to bring about what the people desire, that is a speedy relief from the grievances under which they are labouring.

Mr. NAT. BOYD. I may say, Sir, that in Manitoba, as is very well known to the members of this House, the provincial government have control of the freight and passenger rates of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. They have that control, subject to an arrangement that until the rates are reduced to a certain figure if there should be any loss in the operation of the railway the province is not to bear that loss but when the freight rates come down to, I think, 10 cents a hundred, then, if the company should lose on the operation of the road the province is to bear any such loss. The provincial government have control of the passenger and freight rates and if this measure which is proposed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) was to pass

it would take away that control which we believe is essential and which now gives to the province the power of regulating the rates and at the same time protecting the people from having to meet any deficiency. On the other hand if this resolution was to come into force and any loss should accrue in the operation of the Canadian Northern the people of the province would suffer. As the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has remarked, the matter of freight rates is of a great deal more importance, so far as the farmers in Manitoba are concerned, than are the passenger rates, because the farmers are not the people who travel a great deal. It is the other people of the country who do the travelling and pay out the greater portion of the passenger receipts of the railways. But the farmers of Manitoba pay possibly an average of $150 to $200 in freight rates, which is of a great deal more importance to them than the question of passenger rates. I think that the same would apply to the whole farming community of Canada. If the farmers would stop to think about it, they would find that the legislation proposed is not in their interests but rather in the interests of the people of the cities and the commercial people.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have fifty letters here from farmers in favour of it.

Mr. BOYD. The farmers at times are misled, and I do not know any one better qualified sometimes to lead them astray than my hon. friend. I represent a farming community and am always ready to discuss anything with them and prepared to show them why I take any line, and I would be quite prepared to discuss this question with them. I say that the passenger traffic is a great deal more important to the commercial interests, and this resolution would be of greater benefit to the commercial people than to the farming communities. If the hon. gentleman would introduce something which would lower the rates of freight on the 2,000 or 3,000 bushels of wheat which the average farmer raises in Manitoba, he would be doing something more beneficial to them than he could possibly do by this proposition, which I would call 'a catch vote' if introduced by some people. The Canadian Pacific Railway, I understand, have an average passenger rate to-day under two cents a mile, so that I do not see of what benefit my hon. friend's resolution, if adopted, could be to anybody. As shown by the leader of the opposition, it would not apply to the Canadian Northern, the Canada Atlantic, the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway. What then is the use of it?

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman say it will not apply to the Grand Trunk Railway? It would give a two and a half cents per mile rate and on the Michigan Central would give a two-cent rate to-morrow.

Mr. BOYD. I am speaking of the roads I am more familiar with. As far as the people of Canada as a whole are concerned, this would not be of any particular benefit to them. I am in favour of low passenger rates. I believe that if the railway companies would consult their own interests, it might be better for them to charge a lower rate and increase their traffic, but they seem to understand that question and they so regulate their rates that on the Canadian Pacific Railway the average is under two cents a mile. The hon. gentleman's resolution, if adopted, would interfere with the arrangements which the Manitoba government have made with the Canadian Northern and impose a burden on the people of that province which we ought not to do, and I am going to vote against the amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Maclean.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Maclean,
Bennett,	McGowan,
Blain,	Monk,
Clancy,	Robinson (Elgin),
Cochrane,	Sproule,
Halliday,	Thomson (Grey),
Ingram,	Ward,
Kidd,	Wilson.—17.
Lennox,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Barker,	Lavergne,
Bazinet,	(Drum. & Artha.),
Beith,	LeBlanc,
Blanchet,	Loy,
Borden (Halifax),	Macdonald,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	MacLaren (Huntingdon)
Bourbonnais,	McCarthy,
Boyd,	McColl,
Broder,	McCool,
Brodeur,	McGugan,
Brown,	McIsaac,
Bruce,	McLennan,
Bruneau,	Marcil (Bagot),
Bureau,	Matheson,
Calvert,	Mignault,
Carbonneau,	Morin,
Champagne,	Morrison,
Christie,	Oliver,
Copp,	Paterson,
Costigan,	Porter,
Cowan,	Préfontaine,
Delisle,	Pringle,
Demers (Levis),	Puttee,
Erb,	Reid (Grenville)
Fielding,	Richardson,
Fitzpatrick,	Riley,
Fortier,	Rivet,
Gallery,	Roche Halifax),
Ganong,	Rosamond,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Ontario),
Gervais,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gibson,	Ross (Yukon),
Gilmour,	Russell,
Girard,	Schell,

Harty,	Scott,
Henderson,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Stephens,
Holmes,	Stewart,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)	Talbot,
Hyman,	Taylor,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Thompson
Johnston (Lambton),	(Haldm'd & Monck),
Kaulbach,	Tobin,
Kendall,	Tolton,
Lancaster,	Tucker,
Lang,	Turgeon,
Lapointe,	Wade,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright.—94.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that

Section 193 of the said Act is amended by adding the following words:—'And such compensation shall be limited to the direct and immediate local damages actually suffered by reason of such construction, operation and maintenance by the railway company at such station or premises, and not from any cause, matter or business extending beyond the same.'

Reference to the Act will show that it is rather vague as it is. It provides that the compensation shall be such as the board deems just and expedient. Now, the words added here to the so-called telephone clause would make this plain and distinct. So much has already been said on the subject that I need not speak at length upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the amendment be adopted?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not yet heard what the amendment is about.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I might explain that this amendment deals with the telephone question. The Bell Telephone Company has made contracts with the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, whereby independent telephones or municipal telephones are prohibited from entering the railway station. The law was amended last session so as to provide, according to the solemn pledge of the Minister of Railways of that time, that these railway companies should be compelled to give access to their stations to independent telephones on payment of actual damage. The Railway Commission has since held that in considering the damages caused by the admission of these independent telephones the destruction of the monopoly must be considered. The sum and substance of this amendment is that an independent telephone company may have access to railway stations at the actual cost of the intrusion regardless of any damages that may be sustained by the breaking of a monopoly or anything of that kind. The amendment is simply to make clear what the government promised last session, and therefore the government are bound to accept the amendment and incorporate it in the Act.

Mr. BOYD.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Though I think I am not in order, the question having been put, perhaps I may be pardoned if I take the same chance that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) did. I cannot do better than repeat the undertaking I gave when the matter was under consideration in Committee of the Whole. I said I thought the amendment was premature, because the question whether the exclusive contract said to exist between the railway companies and the Bell Telephone Company is void as being in restraint of trade has not been formally decided by the Railway Commission; and I think that, so far as they have decided it, perhaps the subject is one that requires further consideration by the Supreme Court. The government has decided that, so far as we are concerned, the matter must go before the Supreme Court in order to have a final decision, so that we may know whether this contract is binding or not. When this is decided we shall be in a better position to know what steps are to be taken in order to give what was undoubtedly the intention of parliament—equal facilities to telephone companies in the use of railway stations.

Mr. SPROULE. What means have the government taken to get that decision? They leave it to private parties.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I said the government would take that means.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the government will take the responsibility of getting a decision on the subject?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost on the same division.

Mr. MONK. No, Mr. Speaker; I object to it being lost on the same division. I was in favour of the previous amendment, but I am not prepared to vote for the present one.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the required number of members demand the yeas and nays, the record will be made; otherwise, I will declare it lost.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Bennett).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Oliver,
Beith,	Porter,
Bennett,	Puttee,
Blain,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Robinson (Elgin),
Halliday,	Ross (Ontario),
Heyd,	Scott,
Ingram,	Smith (Vancouver),
Kidd,	Sproule,
Lang,	Tolton,
Lennox,	Ward,
Maclean,	Wilson.—25.
McGowan,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Barker,	Lavergne (Drum. & Artha.)
Bazinet,	Lavergne (Montmagny),
Blanchet,	LeBlanc,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Loy,
Bourbonnais,	Macdonald,
Brodeur,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Brown,	McCarthy,
Bruce,	McColl,
Bruneau,	McCool,
Bureau,	McGugan,
Calvert,	McIsaac,
Carbonneau,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Marcil (Bagot),
Christie,	Matheson,
Clancy,	Mignault,
Copp,	Monk,
Costigan,	Morin,
Cowan,	Morrison,
Delisle,	Paterson,
Demers (Levis),	Préfontaine,
Erb,	Riley,
Ethier,	Rivet,
Fielding,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Fitzpatrick,	Ross (Yukon),
Fortier,	Russell,
Gallery,	Schell,
Ganong,	Stephens,
Gauvreau,	Stewart,
Gervais,	Talbot,
Gibson,	Thompson (Haldim'd & Monck),
Girard,	Tobin, ,
Harty,	Tucker,
Henderson,	Turgeon,
Holmes,	Wade,
Hyman,	Wright.—74.
Johnston (Cape Breton)	
Johnston (Lambton),	
Kaulbach,	
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SHERRITT. I was paired with the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McEwen) ; otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

At One o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. SAM. BARKER. I wish to say a few words upon one or two of the clauses of Bill No. 132, and to repeat what I said on a former occasion with regard to the first section. The Minister of Justice will recollect that on a previous occasion I objected to the words in the fifth line giving the Privy Council power to rescind old orders made by the Railway Committee, and stating that in my opinion it would be proper, under the circumstances, to give the Privy Council power to validate orders that had been left in suspense, hung up between the two general railway Acts, but that I thought there was an objection to continuing in the Privy Council the power of varying and rescinding those old orders. The hon. gentleman said that the government had considered that question, and for some special reason they desired to continue in the Privy Council the power to deal with the old orders. Well, I could understand that there might be some reason perhaps why, under a particular order such as he referred to—I think that one relating to Yonge street in Toronto—they might want to deal with it. But it does seem to me that they are likely to create a dual jurisdiction which might cause confusion by taking power to vary or rescind old orders, in the Privy Council, because section 33 of the Bill of last year gives to the Railway Commissioners power to deal with such matters. I think this should be reconsidered by the government before the Bill passes the Senate.

Now with regard to what may be called the Sunday observance clauses, I do not want to discuss here the merits of Sunday observance, or whether it is right to prohibit the use of street cars or electric railways in the cities of Canada on the Lord's day. But I think I am justified in calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the very peculiar methods that have been adopted here in dealing with the question. This section 6a professes to validate laws existing in the various provinces, and parliament is asked to endorse those laws. Well, I think the Minister of Justice will have great difficulty indeed in telling the House precisely what those laws are that he has asked us to validate. I think there have been many attempts made to find out what they are, and I am not sure but that the question is now before the Supreme Court. It does seem to me rather peculiar that parliament should be asked to validate laws the provisions of which it is impossible at present for us to know. Now I would like the hon. the minister to consider that question. The whole subject is one of very great difficulty, and I would point out to him the peculiar position this parliament will be placed in after it validates the laws of the provinces. Parliament might hereafter change its mind and wish to alter, or extend, or in some way change those laws after having confirmed them, and I presume we will have no power here even to repeal what we have done, we will have settled the question once for all. As I said before, I do not want to deal with the question of Sunday observance, because I do not think this Bill brings up sufficiently the merits of that question. But it seems to me that we are merely shuffling with the question, and we are putting both parties to the controversy, on the one hand those who are advoctes of the strictest observance of the Lord's Day, and on the other hand those who think there ought to be a little laxity for the convenience and accommodation of the people—we are putting them both, it appears to me, into a sea of litigation. After this Act is passed I doubt whether anybody will be one whit further advanced in his knowledge of what the law really is. I am told, I do not know whether it is true or not, that the question is now before the Supreme

Court, or is about to be submitted there. It occurs to me that it is in the interest of both parties that the law should first be settled, and that legislation should then pass in this parliament, if need be, to supplement or improve the legislation of the provinces. In any case the course proposed to be pursued here is a most extraordinary one, especially as regards subclause 2, whereby apparently we give to the government of the day power by Order in Council to validate laws that may hereafter be passed. I think it is a very grave question whether that is a proper form of legislation. We have a duty to perform as representatives of the people. To say that we now shall give what I called on a previous occasion a power of attorney to the gentlemen who happen to be ministers at a given moment, to approve laws that may hereafter be passed by another legislative body, does seem to me a very extraordinary course. I call attention to this, as I said before, without entering into the merits of the question, but merely to ask whether it is a proper thing for this parliament to do, or whether it can do it with any regard at all to its own obligations and its duties. With regard to the other two clauses concerning the Grand Trunk Pacific matter, the hon. gentleman accepted two amendments I offered the other day; the third amendment that I proposed, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company having control of the Grand Trunk Pacific ought to be made to make good whatever loss the Grand Trunk Pacific might sustain by an improper apportionment of the rates, I think was a proper clause under the circumstances; but I do not think there is any use occupying the time of the House in discussing a section that has already been voted down by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that before legislation such as this contemplated in section 2 is placed before the House, the provincial enactments which are referred to should be scheduled as part of the Act. I am not dealing with the question of Sunday observance. I do not know what the Acts are which we are validating. They may be very wise Acts, They may be Acts to which I would not object if they were presented to the House. They may be Acts that I would thoroughly approve of, but it does seem to me that they should be scheduled and that we ought to know what we are dealing with. The subject that it dealt with is a very important subject. It is one, no doubt, upon which this parliament may be called upon to act, but it seems to me that the proper way to act is by legislation of our own. If we do not see fit to adopt that course, but rather to act in relation to the legislation of the provinces I am unhesitatingly of opinion that that legislation should be scheduled as part of the Act.

Subsection 2 of section 2 raises a question from the constitutional standpoint. It is a question which is not free from difficulty. It seems to be conclusively established by the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada and of the Privy Council that a legislature, or parliament, can delegate only a matter over which it has jurisdiction, but I would think that under the constitution there must be some limit to that. For example, I do not think that the parliament of Canada can alter the constitution which has been conferred upon us by saying that in respect to nineteen or twenty subjects which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of parliament they shall be dealt with by the provincial legislatures in the respective provinces and that any legislation in respect to these subjects enacted by the provincial legislatures shall have the same force and effect as if enacted by this parliament. We cannot go that far; we cannot destroy the constitution. Short of going that far it is a very serious question as to how far we can go. Under this legislation we seem to be going very far because we are authorizing the Governor in Council to ratify, as if passed by this parliament, legislation to be passed in the future by the different provinces of Canada. We are doing that in respect to a matter which has been held to be one of criminal jurisdiction. If we can do this why can we not say that the whole criminal law of Canada shall in future be delegated to the different provinces, shall be administered under laws to be passed by each of the legislatures within the respective provinces over which the legislatures have control? I do not see at present that the principle of the legislation which we have before us would be extended under an Act of that kind. We are taking one branch of what is held to be criminal law and we are saying that any law which is in the future passed by any of the provincial legislatures in regard to this subject shall be a good law upon one condition, namely, that it is ratified by the Governor in Council. It is a matter of some interest as to how far we can go and also a matter of considerable interest as to how far we should go in respect to a matter of that kind.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The point which was made by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) when he addressed the House before, did not strike me as clearly as it does now; that is as to the right to rescind old orders. I did not catch this point at the time he put it before the House as clearly as I do now, but it is a question that deserves immediate attention on the part of the government in order to meet the difficulty which he has stated and which is a real difficulty I admit. The question in respect to Sunday legislation is not free from difficulty. I do not pretend for a moment that it is but I would like to put the question as it ap-

pears to me, as I think it may be fairly put before the House, and in a light in which I think it will meet with the approval of the House. We have taken out of the control of the provinces railways and works of that description which of their nature are merely local works and which, if they had remained, as they were intended to be, local in their character, would have been subject to provincial legislation in respect to the observance of Sunday. By virtue of the power which is conferred upon us by the British North America Act we have declared these works, which are of their essence local works, to be works for the general advantage of Canada and as a result of that declaration they have passed from out the jurisdiction of the provinces to the jurisdiction of the federal authorities, so that while two railways may be in existence in a province operating side by side, both originally authorized under provincial charters, because one of them happens to have been declared a work for the general advantage of Canada it passes from out the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, and the other one that has been created by the same authority continues on under the jurisdiction of the province. It seems to me that there is nothing illegal or unconstitutional in our declaring that while we are taking a work over for the general purposes of its administration and making it subject to our laws we desire that that work, in so far as its local operations are concerned and in so far as Sunday observance is concerned, shall remain under the jurisdiction of the legislature which created it. I do not think that there is anything in that which is improper. I would like to say that this legislation is not at all novel in its character. It is the same legislation that we have adopted in respect to our Franchise Act. We take the Act of the local legislature in respect to the franchise. We allow the legislature to determine the conditions under which the lists shall be made and we declare that those lists shall avail in so far as we are concerned, to that extent adopting the legislation of the provinces. It may be said very properly that this is legislation for which this government are responsible and that therefore we cannot appeal to a precedent created by ourselves. But, that was a precedent created immediately after confederation, because, up to 1885 when the Franchise Bill was passed, we adopted the provincial laws in respect to the making of the provincial lists and which provincial lists we made federal lists for the purposes of our federal parliament; not only the lists as they stood at the time but we practically gave what my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) described as a blanket power of attorney to alter, change, and make the provincial lists and we contented ourselves with adopting anything that the legislatures of the provinces did in that respect. So this legislation proceeds upon the principle that was laid down at the time the Franchise Act was adopted.

Mr. BARKER. Were the conditions not different in the case to which the hon. gentleman refers? There we found ourselves in regard to our own franchises while here the hon. gentleman is binding the citizens of the provinces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The members of a corporation.

Mr. BARKER. The members of the corporation as citizens.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As citizens of the provinces, but it seems to me that in respect of the Franchise Act by allowing each province to prepare the lists in the manner described we bound all those who were to avail themselves of those lists. We bound the voters of this Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. That was only a tentative matter to provide for an emergency until we adopted some other principle, or 'until such time as the parliament of Canada otherwise decides.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, parliament held to that principle a long time or until the change was made in 1885. In respect to subsection 2 of section 2 to which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition refers it is constantly the case that this parliament delegates to the Governor in Council power to make regulations and in connection with these regulations to enact penal legislation for the violation of these regulations. There has not been a session probably since confederation during which it has not been left open to the Governor in Council to make regulations which were more far reaching in their results than the action which would be taken by the Governor in Council on provincial laws with respect to Sunday observance. My hon. friends seem to be somewhat in error when they speak of Sunday observance as being a matter of criminal legislation. It is not a matter of criminal legislation. It is quite true that the Privy Council held that the Ontario Act was invalid because it affected to create a criminal offence, but the Privy Council did not decide that that Act was bad in toto. The Privy Council did not decide that the Act is bad in toto; what they held was that the Act was bad in so far as it pretended to deal with criminal legislation. The questions to be referred to the Supreme Court are settled on, and I think it will be found that the judgment of the Privy Council is susceptible of an entirely different construction from that which has been put upon it up to the present time. That judgment has been construed as taking from the provinces, powers which they are undoubtedly endowed with. I do not think the judgment ever was intended to take these powers from

the provinces and confer them on the Dominion parliament. When the judgment is carefully examined, it will be found, I think, that all the Privy Council decided was, that with respect to these offences which are criminal in their nature, the provinces have no power to alter or amend the law with regard to them, nor have the provinces power to create an offence criminal in its nature. The Privy Council has not said that the provinces have not the right to determine the character of Sunday observance; they have not determined that the provinces have not the right to say that a man shall work or shall not work on Sunday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the provinces have that right; how is their right affected by the fact that certain property within the province is subject to the jurisdiction of this parliament?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The impression exists that in so far as works of a federal character are concerned, these works fall under the operation of Dominion legislation, and that the province has not the power to deal with them except in relation to contracts made within the province. But with respect to the control of these works which are of their nature provincial, it seems to me it is quite proper that while we take them over for federal purposes and declare them to be works for the general advantage of Canada, yet in so far as Sunday observance is concerned, they remain within the control of the provinces. I see no reason why they should not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose this parliament should incorporate a company to carry on a great industry in all the provinces, would the mere fact that we incorporated that company prevent the provincial laws from affecting persons employed by that company?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It has been well settled that the provinces have practically no control over the operation of railways, and the Sunday observance law is almost exclusively applicable to the operation of railways. If a railway becomes a federal railway under the operation of the federal law, it takes it from the control of the provinces. It is in that view that this legislation is introduced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you incorporate a great smelting company or something of that kind, the fact that we incorporated it would not prevent the provincial laws affecting it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Quite so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And it is on the ground that the operation of a railway is under the jurisdiction of this parliament?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Fisheries—salaries and disbursements for fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $85,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an opportune time for the minister to explain in what condition the question is with regard to the division of authority between the Dominion and the provinces with respect to the fisheries.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). No progress has yet been made except with regard to negotiations as to the basis of the submission of a case to the Supreme Court. I have already explained the matter this session. We have discussed the question with the representatives of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. The offer was that the federal government would take possession of the fisheries of the different provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, under certain conditions. These conditions were discussed informally and the result as I stated at the time was that we agreed that if we did not come to any agreement a case would be submitted to the Supreme Court. Mr. Pugsley and the premier of Prince Edward Island had to leave for England to be present at the argument of a case before the Privy Council a few days ago as regards the representation of these two provinces.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the minister give us some information about the contemplated establishment of a naval militia?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the supplementary estimates for 1904-5 there is a special item for that and in addition it will be considered when the Bill now on the order paper is submitted for second reading.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister will make a statement then in respect to the establishment.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Within a few days I presume.

Mr. OSLER. In connection with the large amount of money which is being appropriated for the protection of the fisheries and for fish hatcheries, I think that any one who goes to the rivers in Quebec and New Brunswick will find a general complaint that the regulations as to the taking up of nets for certain periods are not carried out and that the fishing in these rivers is decreasing in volume and extent each year. The money that is expended on fish hatcheries is a mere bagatelle compared to the damage done because the regulations are not properly carried out. I speak as an inland man, but as one having gone for many years down to the fishing sections and I believe that there are

very few people who have any idea of the value of these fisheries and of the importance of preserving the streams. In years to come this is going to be one of the most valuable assets of the province, and I can show the minister from my own experience and the experience of all those who fish on the rivers, both the Restigouche and other rivers, that three out of four of the fish caught in these rivers in many years are net marked, showing that they had had to struggle through the nets. Because the regulations as to taking up the nets are not enforced, the fishing on these streams as I have said, is decreasing in value year by year. I am not saying that the government are not doing as well as has been done in the past, but I think there should be some new regulation and some more stringent enforcement of the present laws or in a few years the salmon fishing will be destroyed. Americans go there and spend a large amount of money and the different districts of these rivers are enormously enriched.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can tell my hon. friend that this question is not at all new to the department and is not new to me, as Minister of Fisheries. Last year I was somewhat of a novice in the question and had to get the necessary information, and I discovered that there was a good deal of friction between those who hold leases in these rivers and those who engage in the pursuit of fishing for a living. I tried to apply the rules and regulations. I knew that there was some complaint by some clubs that we were not severe and strict enough towards the fishermen and license holders. This year we took all the necessary precautions in advance and I think there is no ground whatever for complaint. We have done all that was necessary to be done without going too far in order to protect these provincial rights, because, after all, they are provincial rights and do not interest us in such a degree as the rights of fishermen themselves, or those who have engaged in the industry. Of course we know perfectly well our obligations and know that we are obliged to have rules to protect these people who have leased these privileges from the different provinces for which some of them have paid very heavily, having considered that they were of great value. I know for instance of a special case, the case of Mr. Hill, who has rented a river and who had reasons to believe that at the estuary of the river there was more fishing than was necessary. In order to protect his rights—for he had paid for the property $50,000 and I think is paying about $10,000 a year rental to the provincial government—and in order to give him all the advantages to which he was entitled instead of renewing the licenses at the estuary of the River St. John to the people who had enjoyed them for 50 years we put them up by tender, and I may say to the committee that we had a good deal of difficulty in renewing the licenses at a satisfactory rental. I had a great deal of complaint from those especially interested in the fishing for the last fifty years but we succeeded in selling that license at such a price as was advantageous to the department and would satisfy those interested in the fishing of the St. John river so that there can be no complaint this year. As regards the Restigouche, we have a special launch patrolling the estuary to protect the rights of those who have rented that river. Of course I realize that at the beginning of the season the people interested in the lease were rather nervous and I received complaints that the launch had not arrived. As every one is aware the season was late this year, and the launch had not only to look after the fishermen and those with licenses along the estuary, but also those with licenses in the neighbouring waters. The launch took a few days more than usual to reach the river Restigouche, but as soon as she did reach the Restigouche all doubt, I think, disappeared and there has been no neglect whatever. As soon as she did reach it, all grounds of complaint disappeared. It was not due at all to the neglect of the department.

Mr. GANONG. Did that refer to Mr. Hill's privilege ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He is paying $10,000 a year.

Mr. OSLER. I am not speaking in the interests of Mr. Hill, but in the general interest of preserving the fishery. It is being destroyed every year steadily I speak from my own experience, when I say that five out of six of the fish caught in certain seasons show that they have come through the net and were scarred by it. I was at Matane a day or two this year. The men I employed told me without hesitation that the nets are not taken up according to regulations on Saturday night at six o'clock and kept up until Monday morning, but are left a long time in the water beyond the regulations. That is stated by the river men, and evidently there is too much netting, or there would be more free fish coming to the river than there have been the last two years. There is hardly a fish sometimes in the season not marked, which shows that the nets are not taken up.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to draw attention to a question which I had on the paper three or four days regarding fishing licenses given to fish in the Lake Winnipeg and tributaries of the Nelson river. My information is that the exclusive rights to fish in the water of all the lakes north of Lake Winnipeg and tributary to the Nelson river have been given for a very small sum.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This question was answered the other day when first called,

but by error the answer was not entered in the proceedings. The answer is that no exclusive privilege was given. I can bring down the lease. It is an ordinary lease.

Mr. BOYD. What is the lease ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would rather bring it down, because that would be more satisfactory than speaking from recollection, and I will bring it down to-morrow. Some privilege for fishing in a special way has been granted, but no exclusive privilege.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the lease for the fishing on James' bay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is there yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not that lease give the company exclusive rights ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nothing has been done whatever under the lease given Mr. McNee.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the lease been cancelled, or is it the intention of the government to cancel it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has not been cancelled, and no demand has been made to cancel it. The lease is yet in existence, but no fishing is going on.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister think that giving fishing leases in that way is the proper thing ? In my opinion, it is very improper and unwise. We are giving a lease for many years of what belongs to the public, and are giving it, through political influence, for practically no consideration whatever. Surely the government must have by this time made up their mind whether they intend to cancel the lease or allow it to remain, and let the company take advantage of the privileges.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will look into the lease and see whether it is possible to cancel it. I must state that all leases passed since I have been Minister of Marine and Fisheries contain the provision that if the privileges are not taken advantage of within a certain delay the lease becomes null and void.

Mr. BOYD. I am informed that certain friends of the government have received the rights of exclusive fishing in the rivers I have mentioned for the sum of $10 per year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not remember the figure, but if it be $10, they must have obliged themselves to spend a certain amount of money within a certain delay. Sometimes the lease is given at $400 or $1,000 per year without any special condition attached as to the amount of money to be spent, but in other cases leases are granted on condition that a certain amount shall be spent within a certain delay. A sum as high as $50,000 has been stipulated in some cases as the amount to be spent by the company which undertakes to exploit the fishing. In this case I do not know exactly the amount.

Mr. BOYD. Would it not be better to let the item stand until the lease is brought down ? I understand that the right to fish has been also leased to another friend of the government on Lake Winnipegosis. That lease should be brought down at the same time. The hon. gentleman should explain the policy of the department, so that the public may understand what it really is. The public should know if it is the policy of the government to favour its friends by giving leases of that kind for the paltry sum of $10 a year, and then allowing them to sell their privilege to a fishing company. If the hon. minister will look into the matter, he will find that what I am telling him comes pretty near the mark. In all these leases the men who get them have no intention of doing any fishing, but intend disposing of their rights.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As regards the two leases which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, I shall have them put on the table as soon as possible.

Mr. BOYD. What benefit are those leases to the fishing interests of the district ? Are they in the interests of the fisheries or of the department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course, the leases will explain themselves. For myself I must say that I have never considered any other interest than that of the department and the public interest in granting these licenses and leases. Of course, I have always considered the fostering and development of the industry as important. If parties come to the government and say : We are ready to develop the fishery industry in such and such a section, and will bind ourselves to such and such conditions, then we consider whether the conditions are favourable in the public interest and on that basis the lease is granted or refused. There is a fixed regulation with regard to licenses issued every year, but when it comes to granting licenses for a longer period than one year, the conditions vary ; the questions are settled on their merits, we using our best judgment in the interests of the industry.

Mr. BOYD. I have no desire to press this matter now, so long as it is understood that an opportunity will be afforded for its discussion at a later time. Meantime I would like the leases of Mr. Arch. McNee, of James' Bay, Mr. Merritt, of Lake Winnipegosis, and the other lessee whose name I do not know to the north end of lake Winnipeg, to be brought down.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I promised the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) that he will have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the papers on the table.

Mr. SPROULE. Before this subject is dropped, I wish to say one word on the principle. It seems to me it is a bad principle to give leases to foreigners to take all the fish they like.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have not granted leases to foreigners.

Mr. SPROULE. Whatever the form may be, these are practically leases to foreigners. The law happens to be that an American who catches fish in Canada can take them in to his own country free of duty, a privilege that is denied to a Canadian. But, on the other hand the American cannot get the fish here unless he associates himself with Canadians. The result is that the Canadians catch the fish, but when the fish go across the line they belong to the Buffalo Fish Company or some other concern who say they have the right to take them across the line free of duty, because they were caught by themselves. And so they can get a better market than Canadians can get. That should not be allowed. If they were giving a good consideration for it, it would not matter so much. The minister says: But we develop the industry. But, what use is the development of the industry if there is no royalty ? And the royalty now is a mere nothing. We keep up the Fishery Department and establish fish hatcheries, and these Americans use our fisheries for their own purpose, giving us very little for the privilege. In connection with this fishery question we ought to have a general statement as to the policy of the government, and a statement as to whether they intend to give exclusive rights in any part of Canada which are practically monopolized by foreigners.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) must be under a false impression. There is only one company at all in the position he refers to. The fact is, this privilege granted to some Americans on the Pacific Coast was granted under very peculiar circumstances. It is not a license from the department, but simply an Order in Council authorizing an American Company—I think it is the New England Fish Company—to buy supplies and land their fish on the coast of British Columbia, and to ship fish in bond to their destination. The fish are caught in American waters.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister is not directing attention to the lease I refer to—the lease on James' Bay.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That has not been exploited.

Mr. SPROULE. But what I contend is that the principle of granting such leases is an unsound one. And we want him to bring down the lease so that we may see the provisions of it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I promise to do that. I was going to explain the privileges given to the New England Fish Company on the Pacific Coast. I believe that the granting of these privileges of buying provisions and landing and shipping fish is a good move. The halibut fishery had not been developed at all. There were large quantities of these fish in international waters, but they were not used because they were too far from American waters. Under the present arrangement this fishery can be developed. The advantage to Canadians is obvious. The company employ Canadian labour, buy their provisions from Canadian merchants, and pay large amounts in freight. I understand that the first year the company paid over $100,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway for freights. The second year, they paid $200,000, and last year no less than $300,000. All this trade would have been lost to Canada if we had not consented to the arrangement. If Canadians would be as enterprising as to do the same thing, though they could not have the privilege of the American market as the citizens of that country have, they might be able to develop a market on our own side.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the minister say whether there is any fishery or other patrol belonging to the government now in the waters of Hudson Bay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. None, except the 'Neptune,' which has been cruising there for the last year looking after Canadian interests and visiting the different posts so as to report to the Department of the Interior what means should be adopted to protect Canadian rights.

Mr. OSLER. Has this government control over the fishery in Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. These are entirely controlled by American companies. When you go to Winnipeg, you find considerable apprehension expressed among the public that these lakes will be overfished—in fact that all the fish are being taken away.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is not the information we have in the department. I think the business is not decreasing at all, but is maintaining itself.

Mr. OSLER. The leases are entirely controlled by American companies.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Some of these companies, both Canadian and American are not fishing at all, but are buying from Canadian fishermen in the locality who hold licenses. This fact was brought to my attention by some members from the Northwest Territories.

Mr. OSLER. I think the minister is mistaken. To my own knowledge American companies fish there largely, they have a supply of boats and a supply of men to an enormous extent, and have a large capital engaged.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The licenses are given to British subjects or Canadians,

sometimes organized into joint stock companies. It sometimes happens that American capitalists put their money into these companies and, obtaining control of the stock, they become American companies. But I do not see how we can help that by legislation or by regulations.

Mr. OSLER. It is not so much that I complain of, but in some places the fishing has practically ceased now, the whole industry has gone. When I was in Winnipeg I heard the subject discussed and heard it stated several times that the wholesale catch of fish was practically destroying the fishing in those lakes, just as the sturgeon fisheries have been destroyed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Whether these fish are caught by Canadians or Americans does not make much difference. If they had been caught by Canadians the depletion of which the hon. gentleman complains would have resulted in the same way. But that is not the case. The information of the department is that these lakes are not being depleted. Of course we can understand that in lakes with shallow water where a good deal of fishing is going on, the fish are driven away into more remote places. The same thing has happened in the St. Lawrence. I remember when, twenty or twenty-five years ago, a good deal of fish of all sorts was caught around the island of Montreal, but now you can scarcely catch fish there of any consequence. It is the same everywhere. As settlements are established about the lakes, especially those with shallow water, the fish seek new haunts where they are less disturbed. But the regulations are duly followed, and all precautions are taken in order to preserve the fisheries.

Mr. OSLER. How many inspectors are there on these two lakes to protect the fisheries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think there are four in the west. They are Henry McKay, Cedar Lake ; A. J. McPherson, Dauphin, Man.; James Silverthorne, Lumsden, Assa., and J. F. Healson, Prince Albert.

Mr. OSLER. One at Dawson and one at Cedar Lake have all this enormous stretch of waters to look after north of Lake Winnipegosis.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am asking this year for more money to have a better inspection made. Early this spring I sent one of my officers to report how many are required and what methods are adopted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the object of having a fishery officer at Cedar Lake or within two hundred miles of it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were put there before I came into the department because, I suppose, that was the proper place to put them.

Mr. GANONG. The minister says it is immaterial whether these fish are caught by Americans or by Canadians. Is that a fact ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. So far as the depletion goes.

Mr. GANONG. But does it not make some difference with regard to getting the fish into the American market ? If Americans catch the fish they take them into the American market free of duty.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not see why they should go into the American market free of duty.

Mr. GANONG. Americans of easy conscience are fishing along the eastern seaboard who carry their fish into the United States market free of duty, and I thought perhaps there were some up west afflicted in the same way. I can correct the minister in regard to one thing ; I think Mr. Hill's fishing territory is not on the river St. John, it is on some of the northern waters.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is in the seigniory of Mingan.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What are the duties of the fishery overseer at Lumsden, and what fish does he look after there ? There is but very little fish there.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a fact, whether the minister knows it or not, that fish caught by Americans are going into the United States market free. I know that the Buffalo Fish Company was organized for the purpose of fishing in Georgian bay, and they have been getting their fish into the American market free of duty. If Americans fish in Candian waters the catch can be taken into the American market free of duty, but if Canadians catch the fish and endeavour to get them in United States they have to pay duty on them. Therefore, though Canadians may supply the boats, if the fish are caught under the name of an American firm, they go into the American market free of duty. I think that is a wrong to Canadians because there are many Canadians fishing in the Georgian bay who have to compete with Americans, and they cannot send their product over the line without paying duty. They are denied that right, while Americans fishing alongside of them get the benefit of the United States market. The same principle I am told is being exercised by this American company that is fishing in Hudsons bay and several other places. The same question arose in Newfoundland a short time ago where a firm of Americans are storing ice, or are about to establish an industry there, and it appears that there is a provision in the American customs law which allows them

access to the United States market free of duty. I have no doubt that the Americans who are fishing in Lake Winnipegosis are doing the same thing, and their fish are going free to Minneapolis and St. Paul, while Canadians fishing in the same waters are denied that right.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know that American fishing companies operating on the north shore of Lake Superior get their fish free into the American Sault.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On page 197 of the fisheries report of 1903, you will find the report of Mr. Young, inspector of fisheries for that district.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have you reports from your officers in different districts ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, from different places where there is fishing going on.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the Northwest Territories ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the Northwest Territories. The fisheries in the Northwest are covered by the report of Mr. Miller.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These are officers for the whole country ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have the reports of these officers and we have reports from their sub-officers. The reports from the Northwest Territories commence at page 202 of the Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Beginning at that page will be found a synopsis of reports received from the different districts.

Mr. OSLER. What is the report from the Lumsden man ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Miller the inspector reports as follows :

In Long lake the fishing was about the same as in former years. Overseer Silverthorne reports that large catches of whitefish were made just before the commencement of the close season, the fish seeming to come into the shallow waters rather early. It may become necessary to close this portion of the lake to prevent the destruction of spawning fish. This lake too has gained during the year though still much below its one time level.

In the Qu'Appelle river and the smaller streams the long continued high water afforded small opportunity for the illegal trapping of fish during the spring close season and though some fish weirs were discovered and destroyed by guardians, as a rule they are now only met with in the vicinity of new foreign settlers unacquainted with the law.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understood the hon. minister correctly he stated that fish caught on the Pacific coast could be entered in Victoria and shipped in bond to the United States. Am I correct ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am afriad I have not made myself understood. I did not state anything of the sort. I stated that fish caught in international waters, on the high sea, by this New England Fish Company, to whom the privilege was granted of buying their provisions and landing on Canadian soil could, according to certain arrangements made with the American government, be shipped in bond and delivered in Boston. The fish are not Canadian fish. They are caught in international waters.

Mr. HAGGART. That is still more extraordinary. This American company can come into British waters on the Pacific coast, catch all the fish they like, ship them over a British railway to the United States and sell them there. I knew the law was against them if the fish were caught in American waters or in waters other than British waters, because then they would have no right to come into the port of Victoria or ship the fish over a British railway to the United States. If they had that right what would be the use of our fisheries on the Atlantic coast ? American fishermen could go on the banks off the coast of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, catch fish, ship them by the same means as those employed by our own fishermen and send them free of duty to the United States when our own fishermen would have to pay duty going into the United States ? It would transfer our whole fishing trade from Canadian fishermen to United States fishermen. But, they get around it on the Pacific coast. You can form a company of Americans and they can come and fish in our own waters.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, I did not clearly understand the minister.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know how it is that I have not made myself understood because I have repeated it twice. I said that the fish are not caught in Canadian waters at all. They are caught outside of the three-mile limit in international waters.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand perfectly now. They are caught in waters which are not Canadian waters. Then, the fisherman of Nova Scotia, when he catches fish outside of the three-mile limit, can come into Halifax and ship them into the United States ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He has not applied for that privilege yet.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No fisherman in Nova Scotia has applied for that privilege yet probably because the fishermen in Nova Scotia have not to back them such a large company as the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. I have listened to the debates in this House long enough to know that the Nova Scotia fisherman has no right to do it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Everybody knows that.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it is because of some denseness on my part that I do not understand the hon. minister. He says that these fish are caught outside of Canadian waters, that they are caught in waters in which the fishermen of the whole world can fish and that these fish are then brought into Victoria. Why does not the same principle apply to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island? We have only control over three miles from the coast line. If fish are caught outside of the coast line why cannot they be brought into Halifax or Sydney, shipped over the railway and entered at a United States port free of duty?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not wish to keep the committee back but I would like to say a word or two in connection with the New England Fish Company operating on the Pacific coast. Prior to their coming into our waters there was no halibut caught and there was no halibut industry. The New England Fish Company which control about 300 retail stores throughout the New England states came into the Pacific waters and asked to have the privilege of shipping through a Canadian port, the port of Vancouver, to their market in Boston and the New England states. They received that privilege upon one consideration and that consideration was that they were to employ entirely Canadian workmen, they were to buy entirely Canadian goods, and to operate the industry as far as the catching of the fish was concerned entirely in our interest.

Mr. HAGGART. Who had the authority to make any such arrangement with them?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Why, our government.

Mr. HAGGART. They have no power to do that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Well, they are doing it.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what we want to find out.

Mr. MACPHERSON. They are doing it and it is a proper thing to do.

Mr. HAGGART. That is another question.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Does the hon. gentleman object to the industry which is being conducted upon our coast? I do not think he does.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know anything about it but I do not know where the government get the authority under the law to do it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am not speaking of the authority under the law. It is the fact that I am speaking of.

Mr. HAGGART. I have heard of this arrangement for the first time this evening.

Mr. MACPHERSON. If these Americans had not come in we would not have had the halibut fishery developed as we have. I want to give an illustration to show how government interference can do a great deal of harm. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) spoke of the sturgeon fisheries of the northern lakes. In 1892 an American company came over to the Fraser river and prepared to develop the sturgeon fisheries. They had a large market for these fish in the city of Chicago, they employed two steamers, they had forty or fifty men working for them, and they employed entirely white labour. They were catching sturgeon and shipping them out. The industry had never been started before in our waters. They were taking the sturgeon from the mud banks of the Fraser. In one night a breath came from Ottawa that they must stop fishing sturgeon because they would deplete the fish. The result is that there has been no sturgeon industry in those waters from that time to this so that this important industry was knocked on the head. It does not matter whether it is an American company or Canadian firms who are doing the fishing. We want the fishing industry developed and if Americans choose to take advantage of the opportunities by engaging in the industry and if they take the fish that are caught by our fishermen and which are hauled over our railway, I do not see why we should object. There must be two sides to every question and the Americans must have some advantage. I would like to see our own money invested in this industry but our people do not seem to be alive to the fact that we have such an immense industry in Canada and that there is a possibility of making a lot of money out of the fisheries. Our people do not seem to be so thoroughly alive to the fact as the Americans are. I am strongly of the impression that the government acted wisely and well when they gave to the New England Fish Company these advantages.

Mr. MACLEAN. It follows that the whole Canadian fishing industry could pass from Canadian into American hands.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Not at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, because if you can do it on the Pacific coast you can do the same thing on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Canadians are getting the benefit.

Mr. MACLEAN. The net result is that the whole of our fishing industry will pass

into American hands, and their fish can go into the United States free of duty while ours will have to pay duty.

Mr. GANONG. Has the fish commissioner made any report in regard to licenses along the eastern sea-board ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Their work is not yet finished and they have not made a final report.

Mr. GANONG. It is remarkable that one lawyer, one colonel of militia, one editor, and, I think one fisherman, should be appointed by this government to inquire into the fishing industry worth $15,000,000 a year. It is also remarkable that when an election was expected the commission should be sent out hurriedly, and that when the Grand Trunk Pacific failed to put up the money they were called off again. In the east this fishery commission is looked upon as nothing but a farce.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister bring us down the Order in Council permitting this American company to land and cure their fish in Canada ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is a special arrangement with the New England Fish Company renewable yearly by an Order in Council on the report of the Minister of Customs allowing the fish to pass through Canada in bond. The order has always been issued with the approval of the Department of Fisheries. I never saw the American company or their representative in connection with the matter, but those who asked for a renewal were Canadians, and the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway who were specially interested. I believed it was in the public interest to continue this privilege as long as they were the only ones in the field.

Mr. MACLEAN. Did you consult the Minister of Justice as to your power to pass this Order in Council ; when was it first passed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In 1896 when Sir Louis Davies was minister.

Mr. SPROULE. You are doing by Order in Council what you are only empowered to do by treaty.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not think the Minister of Customs will have any objection to bring down the Order in Council.

Mr. MACLEAN. I ask the Minister of Justice whether this government has power to pass such an Order in Council ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not seen the Order in Council and I cannot answer as to its validity.

Mr. MACLEAN. This thing is illegal, and I believe it is contrary to the national interest.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is nothing contrary to the national interest in allowing fish to be landed on our shore, and carried through to the United States in bond.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is not a Canadian industry in the first place. If Canadians went outside the three-mile limit and caught halibut they would do so in Canadian bottoms ; and the Americans would take good care that fish so caught would have to pay duty. The Americans catch these fish on the high seas in American bottoms, and so they escape the American duty, but they employ Canadian labour and buy their supplies in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. That could be done on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It could, but only under modus vivendi licenses.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not set myself up as a constitutional authority, but I do not think the order would have passed Council if it were illegal. Canadians could not engage in this business under equal conditions. By permitting this Order in Council to be renewed from year to year we give away none of our rights, and this fishing company trades with the merchants of Vancouver and ships their freight over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Order in Council is passed in the interests of Canada and Canada alone. We could repeal the Order in Council any day, but we would lose a great deal of business in consequence.

Mr. SPROULE. We are giving these people a right which otherwise they would not enjoy, and by doing the same thing on the Atlantic coast you could give the Atlantic fisheries over to the Americans.

Mr. PATERSON. That is regulated by treaty.

Mr. SPROULE. We have never attempted to give away such rights unless by treaty, and I believe this Order in Council is passed without authority.

Mr. PATERSON. I have never heard any objection from a Canadian source. If this Order in Council were not renewed, Canadians would not be employed ; the merchants of Vancouver would not be traded with, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would not receive the earnings it does. I am sure that there will be no objection to placing the Order in Council upon the table and that when the subject is fully considered no hon. gentleman opposite would take the responsibility of saying that we should not do what we have done.

Building and maintenance of fish-breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries, including the salary of F. H. Cunningham, $2,000, superintendent of fish culture, whose transfer from inside division without prejudice to his status under the Civil Service Superannuation Act is hereby ratified, $110,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say last year that he had decided to establish a fish hatchery on the Beaver river, close to the Georgian Bay. That is in every way a suitable location, and I would ask the minister if anything has been done or will be done in this matter ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The department intended to establish a hatchery somewhere around the Beaver river, but last year the session was so long and there were such diverse interests as regards the site of this hatchery that the matter was suspended for further consideration. I intended either going myself or having some of my officials go to visit these localities and decide what would be the best place for this and many other hatcheries. I intend to adopt this course in regard to the maritime provinces, and I shall leave next week for British Columbia for a similar purpose. In this case, I think we will be in a position to decide within a few weeks.

Mr. GANONG. Is it intended to establish a lobster hatchery on the Bay of Fundy coast of New Brunswick ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The matter has been represented to the department, and New Brunswick will certainly be considered.

Mr. GANONG. It should certainly receive the attention of the minister. There is no location in Canada that is so well situated, in relation to the live lobster market, as the west coast of the Bay of Fundy. It is contiguous to the American market, and I believe that a hatchery there would add 50 per cent more to the value of the fisheries than in any other locality of the maritime provinces, on account of the convenience of the American market for the shipping of live lobsters. Besides that, these waters in days gone by teemed with lobsters, giving ample evidence of the suitability of the ground for lobsters.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many fish breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries are there in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hatcheries there are :

Hatchery.	Number of Fry distributed.	Species.
Bedford, N.S.	710,000	Atlantic salmon.
Bay View, N.S.....	164,000,000	Lobsters.
Margaree, N.S.....	600,000	Atlantic salmon.
St. John River, N.B.	648,000	" "
Miramichi, N.B.....	1,000,000	" "
Restigouche, N.B....	1,935,000	" "
" "	117,000	Salmon trout.
Shemogue, N.B.....	17,000,000	Lobsters.

Mr. KAULBACH. The fishing industry in the county which I have the honour to represent is very large and important. A great number of persons are employed in it, and I would ask how it is that the Minister of Marine has overlooked that important county and given us no fish hatcheries at all ? I think we are entitled to one at least. We represent the largest amount of capital of any county in the way of exports, and I think we are entitled certainly to some recognition. I would ask the minister to carefully consider that. I am not asking for favours ; I am asking for rights.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As I have explained in relation to the establishment of hatcheries in western Ontario, as well as in other parts of the Dominion, the reason for the delay is the fact that the session last year was so late that the only little trip I could take to the maritime provinces was one to Prince Edward Island in order to settle if possible the difficult question of the ferry to the mainland. I had no time at my disposal to go into the sites for hatcheries. I intend to do so as soon as the time is available for me, and I promise the hon. gentleman that I shall not fail to visit his locality.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think if the minister will carry out his promise and visit my county, my statement will be fully verified, and he will have a very favourable impression of the county. I hope that in the future it will receive the benefits it so richly deserves.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this extra $30,000 in the supplementary estimates to be expended on the hatcheries already established, or is it proposed to open new fish hatcheries during the year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is to provide for new ones.

Mr. CLANCY. Where ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When the item of $30,000 is up I shall be in a position to give the information.

Mr. GANONG. What proportion of this $110,000 goes to the new ones ?

Fisheries—oyster culture, $7,000.

Mr. GANONG. Would the hon minister give us a little explanation ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The annual report for 1903 gives much better explanation than I possibly could.

Mr. GANONG. In what location is this money to be expended ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In Caraquet Bay, N.B., at Malpeque, Prince Edward Island, at the Shediac oyster reserve.

Mr. GANONG. Is any of this money to be devoted towards planting new beds in any other locality ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are waiting for a report from Mr. Kent, who is in charge of this culture, before deciding at what other places we will plant.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is oyster culture encouraged on the Bay of Fundy shore and the Atlantic shore ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have no oyster beds there. There are some in Annapolis, but they are small.

Fisheries—to assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for bait for deep sea fishermen, under conditions to be fixed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, $25,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would move to have this item amended so that it may read as follows :

To assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for deep sea fishermen, including assistance in the conservation and development of deep sea fisheries, under conditions to be fixed by the department.

The idea is not only to contribute a sum of money for the establishment of cold storage for bait for the deep-sea fishermen, but also to assist in preparing the fish by providing driers. The said amount of $25,000 has never been entirely spent in aiding cold storage for bait, and the department has come to the conclusion that by giving driers for fish at certain places, where there is a good market, that would help the deep-sea fishermen very materially. The driers would cost about $1,800. We are installing one at Souris in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. GANONG. What class of drier is the hon. gentleman putting in ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is the drier manufactured by Collas, Whitman & Company. They hold the patent.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any acetylene gas used in this cold storage ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not think so.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there an item on which we could discuss that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, the increased vote for lighthouses.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is the system carried on and receiving aid from the government under a chemical process or the ordinary ice storage ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Real ice is employed.

Mr. KAULBACH. Has the minister recognized and thought favourably of the method of Eaton, which I detailed the other evening at some length ? The party is now in the city, and if the government would interview him, they would be able to receive very much useful information which may lead up to an improvement in the present system.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have no objection at all. If the hon. gentleman will present to me the person in question, he will be well received and I will listen to any explanation he can give.

Mr. CLANCY. How much of the $25,000 voted for cold storage for bait for deep sea fishermen is to be diverted to the new service of building the drier ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About $1,800 per drier.

Mr. CLANCY. How many driers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We will have them at places where we think they will be required. The first place where a drier will be installed is Souris, P.E.I.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that intended to take the place of the $25,000 the hon. minister has voted ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; as I have explained this $25,000 though available on certain conditions has not been spent year after year. Only about half of it has been spent—$12,000 or $13,000. The boards of trade and the representatives of the fishermen have made representations that a certain amount of this vote could be diverted to the building of fish driers. It is somewhat in the same line and is intended to help the deep sea fishermen. After considering the matter we came to the conclusion that it would be a good idea, so we decided that at certain places where they bring their fish to be cured we would establish driers. These driers provide a mechanical means of effecting the curing of the fish which was formerly done by the sun and wind.

Mr. CLANCY. In fact, the hon. minister has been exercising his ingenuity to find means of spending this $25,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Exactly—in the interests of the fishermen.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). The experience has been that fish driers, if used to dry fish as they come out of the pickle or out of the pile ready to be put on the flake, have not been successful, but that driers used to dry fish that are already partially dried by the sun, are most successful. They have been tried in Halifax both ways by drying what we call green fish—which has not proven a success—and by drying fish already partially dried in the sun, which has been very successful.

Mr. GANONG. Some hon. members present may not understand the conditions of the fish market. While I am not a fisherman, I know something about the matter.

It is solely in the interest of the export trade and these fish driers are built to prepare fish properly to go to the West India market, where the atmospheric conditions are very trying. From time to time, fish that are sun-dried and sent to that market turn out badly from sweating and mildewing. But, as I understand, the process suggested by the minister, by the use of what is known as the Whitman drier, has been an immense success, and a large business has been built up with the West Indies in fish cured by this process.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am sure the minister will recognize the fact that my county, Lunenburg, has the largest fishing industry in the export trade, not excepting Halifax, Halifax exports fish, but the greater portion of it is fish from outside counties, particularly from Lunenburg. If there is any aid given to fish driers, evidently the county of Lunenburg is entitled to some of that aid. As the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. William Ross) has just explained, this is simply a process to carry the drying of fish further than it can be carried by means of the wind and sun. To take the fish green, as we call it, and put them through the drier would be rather to injure them for the market, because it would deprive them to a certain extent of their flavour. But when fish already partly dried in the sun are put through the mechanical drier, they can be sent in marketable shape to any part of the world. I think that, under the circumstances, the hon. minister will see that what I say is reasonable, and is in the interest of the fishermen as a whole, and that, as my county exports more largely than any other, he should recognize that fact and act accordingly.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. In conversation with Mr. Whitman, who was here some few weeks ago, I got from him some information which does not accord with the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) who has just taken his seat. Mr. Whitman gave me to understand that it was possible to take the fish green, take them just as they come out of the water, and cure them completely by his method; and that you could very successfully cure them by taking them out of kench and putting them into the drier. Of course, the better way would be to partially cure them in the sun and wind and then complete the work in the drier. But, if the conditions would not allow that to be done, it was possible, as he had proven by practical experience, to cure them completely by putting them in the drier on taking them out of kench—the conditions to which my hon. friend from Victoria refers—or even by taking them green altogether. All along the coast of the maritime provinces, particularly, I know so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, we can get fish in the fall of the year, even in October and November when it it not possible to dry them outside, the weather conditions not being suitable for curing them. It is then that the drier would be very useful. The fish caught at that season of the year can be cured by this means. But the drier would be useful also at other seasons when the fishermen are so busy, particularly if the catches were so good that they would not have time to complete the cure of the fish on the flakes. They could then be placed in the drier and finished. And as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) has said, this method has proven very successful for curing fish for the West Indian market where the climatic conditions are very trying. The curing of fish intended for that market has to be carried further than can be done under natural conditions of sun and wind. The fish have to be made harder, firmer, to stand the West Indian climate. In preparing fish for that market the driers have been very successful and as my hon. friend (Mr. Ganong) has stated a very successful trade has been built up by the Whitmans in curing their fish in this way. So far as I can obtain information on the subject, the driers, wherever they have been used, are very successful, and their operation will be a great assistance in the development of the fisheries.

Mr. KAULBACH. I understand that the information given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) was received from Mr. Whitman. While that statement might have be made to my hon. friend, at the same time Mr. Whitman is wrong. There have been cases in which the fish have been taken right from the catch after being salted and pressed, and put through this drying process and shipped. But it has been shown that they have to be put under such pressure—in order to get the moisture out of them and fit them for the drier—that a large portion of the nutritive properties of the fish is extracted, and it deteriorates the value of the fish, and lessens its price in the foreign market. I make this statement on the authority of shippers, and believe it to be true. Mr. Whitman, the originator and owner of the patent, would naturally be inclined to place all the advantages of his patent before the public. I am advised that the fish lose their virtue to a certain extent in the patent process of drying, if they are put under pressure sufficient to prevent the elimination of the moisture.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). A large drying establishment based on the Whitman process was put up in Halifax, and they had to abandon the drying of green fish altogether. There is no green fish dried in that drier now. The drier is used to harden fish that have already been dried by the sun, in that case the system is successful. This process may be used in drying fish for the

West Indies or for South American trade when they are received by the merchants partially dried. But there is no process in the world equal to the sun drying to make good fish, and my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) will bear out that testimony.

Fisheries—to provide for the maintenance of the Georgian Bay laboratory, $1,500.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is a station for a commission devoted to the study of the fishing industry. It is no invention of mine.

Mr. SPROULE. Has this commission a headquarters or station where they meet to discuss matters, or is it a kind of roving commission ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They meet twice a year to study and discuss these matters in the interests of fishermen, and they publish every two years a report of their work. In the summer they are stationed on the Georgian Bay. This money is to pay their expenses, to provide a boat house in which they live on the Georgian Bay. Their station is on the Richmond Bay, above Midland. There is also a station in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. KAULBACH. I observe an item here for the fishing bounty.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is by statute.

Mr. KAULBACH. I referred to that item the other day, and I would like to ask the minister now if he is prepared to give an increased amount of fishing bounties this year. I think it would be reasonable to do so in view of the fact that the number of fishermen is considerably larger than it was when this amount was first granted. I think they are entitled to a larger amount for general distribution.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This amount is fixed by statute, and when the government considered this matter they came to the conclusion that without more consideration it was not opportune to increase this year the amount for bounties by statute.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. gentleman will see that the amount at first was $150,000, and it was increased to $160,000. The additional amount being also made a statutory allowance. I think in view of the increased number of men engaged in fisheries the minister might well provide an additional amount this year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have not seen our way clear to make an increase.

Ocean and river service—further amount required for Dominion steamers, owing to repairs to the 'Lady Laurier,' $30,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could not the minister succeed in getting the steamer 'Alert' on his list ? It is a good steamer for that service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The suggestion is worth consideration. Instead of leasing a boat as we have been in the habit of doing to supply the lighthousees in the upper St. Lawrence we might use that boat for the purpose.

Mr. J. D. REID. The boat is a large one, and suitable for the purpose. Now that all the other works have been completed and the hon. minister has taken over some of the vessels that are used by the Department of Railways and Canals, there is no reason why he should not take over the 'Alert.'

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have taken over those that were employed in the hydrographic surveys, the 'Scout' and some scows.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, I know ; but it was connected with the same department, the Department of Railways and Canals.

Ocean and river service—to pay amount of damages awarded merchants and shippers for losses sustained on perishable goods, owing to the detention of the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' by ice, $9,562.18,

Mr. J. D. REID. Where was that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That happened during the winter of 1902-3.

Mr. J. D. REID. Between the mainland and Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. The two boats were caught in the ice. Although we did not consider the claimants entitled in law to the amounts which have been allotted to them, we thought that these were fair and reasonable claims for the actual losses suffered by reason of the fact that these boats were caught in the ice. We sent a special officer to examine into these claims and he has reported. We were disposed to pay the amount without coming before parliament, but after due consideration we thought it would be better to lay the whole matter before the House, so that any explanation that might be required could be given.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister, of course, knows that when you ship goods the dangers of navigation are accepted, so that in that case the government are not liable.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In law we are not liable, but this is a moral claim.

Mr. J. D. REID. In this case the government can see their way clear to paying these claims, but the right hon. Prime Minister is not able to see his way clear to paying the claim of the clergyman which I brought to his attention the other evening.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The clergyman did not apply to me ; he applied to the

court. If he had applied to me, it would have been different.

Mr. J. D. REID. He did apply to the Exchequer Court, and he got judgment. In this case had the parties applied to the court the court would not have given judgment in their favour, but in the case to which I refer the Exchequer Court has given judgment, and yet the right hon. Prime Minister cannot see his way clear to asking the House to vote a sum sufficient to cover this amount, $1,200. If it were put in the estimates, there is no question about it that it would pass, and I think the Prime Minister should adopt that course.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am quite willing to consider it favourably, but I must say that the cases are not the same. The reverend gentleman went to the Exchequer Court and got judgment, but the judgment was reversed by the Supreme Court. We are asked to pay a claim which the court has told us we should not pay. The circumstances are different.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister how these damages were arrived at ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When the claims had all been put in we sent a special officer from the department to investigate every case. Although this was done last winter, we have not up to the present moment received any complaints in respect to the settlement of the claims, except that we have received a few claims that were not put in at the time.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of the value was paid ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The claims were reduced in such proportion as the facts investigated by our officer warranted. I may state, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that hon. members on both sides of the House from Prince Edward Island are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not objecting. Did the hon. gentleman pay the invoice price of the goods ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; we paid the actual loss on perishable goods only.

Mr. J. D. REID. This, I suppose, establishes the precedent that in all similar cases claims for damages will be paid. I am not objecting to the amount.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will do justice.

Ocean and river service—further amount required for investigations into wrecks, $2,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE moved that the item be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Ocean and river service—Further amount required for examination of masters and mates, $1,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that in the county I have the honour to represent there is a larger number of young men than in any other part of the province engaged in the merchant marine service, and whilst a number of these young men are employed in the summer time in the prosecution of the industry of fishing, they are employed in the later autumn and winter in foreign service. There is a large amount of material that can be utilized were there a school established in the county, and I would ask the hon. minister if he would kindly look into that matter seriously. I spoke of it before, and I think it is a reasonable request that a school be opened in the town of Lunenburg, where there are experienced ship masters who would be a credit to the service, and who would give valuable aid in advancing these young men to the positions of masters and mates, but who are now kept in the background for the want of a local school. I would ask the hon. minister in all seriousness to give his careful attention to the subject and to have a school opened in the county. There is another matter to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister. For some years the coast service was extended down to the West Indies, while now it has its limit at Cape Hatteras. Although these young men have not the authority to sail foreign as well as coastwise, they go out boldly as well as those who are possessed of the natural qualities of seamen and who are authorized to cross the Atlantic. In a measure they have the experience, because they have been sailing to the West Indies. Their calling is to the West Indies, because a large portion of the fish caught in the summer time are carried in the winter time to the West Indies for a market. I feel satisfied that if the hon. minister would extend the limit of the coast service to the West Indies, as it was in the past, it would be an advantage.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That question is receiving the special attention of the chairman of the Board of Masters and Mates, and we hope to be able to remedy the existing state of affairs. As regards an examiner at Lunenburg, I may state that there is one at Yarmouth and one at Halifax. The distance is not very great, but, all the same, I will have a report made upon the subject.

Mr. KAULBACH. These men desirous of qualifying are of a class who are hardly able to bear the expense of going to Yarmouth, which is a long way off, or even going to Halifax in the adjoining county.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In certain cases, where there are three or four together, we send the examiner to the place so that they many be examined.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am aware of the fact that they are examined at the present time, but still there is no school. Were

there a school they would be able to acquire knowledge of the details to an extent which would advance them much more rapidly than by adopting the rude process that they have at the present time ; that is, going up for examination before the parties who are appointed by the board.

Lighthouse and coast service — further amount required for the construction and completion of the Lurcher and East Point Anticosti lightships, $15,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. Explain.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This will settle the account for the construction of these two light ships. They were contracted for by my predecessor, built by the Polson Iron works and are the most modern lightships in the world.

Lighthouse and coast service—maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $35,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Last year's vote of $345,000 was exhausted on the first of June. A great number of these lighthouses were built before confederation and needed extensive repairs. A large number received new apparatus ; the severe winter entailed extra expense ; at the request of the shipping interests of Montreal the buoys were left in the channel later than usual and some of them were lost, and had to be replaced ; this spring a number of the buoys were carried away.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will acetylene be put in all the lighthouses between Montreal and Kingston and the lighthouse-keepers done away with.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This vote is to supplement the expenditure between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. HAGGART. I will require the reports of your officers as to the use of acetylene gas in these lighthouses. I refer especially to the reports of Mr. Anderson.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will bring all the documents down on the supplementary estimates.

Lighthouse and coast service—further amount required for construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, $50,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. There have been some statements made regarding the purchase of the property for the establishment of a lighthouse depot at Prescott, and I wish to say that I consider that property was bought very reasonably and cheaply, and the purchase of it was all right. There is another lot adjoining that property and if the government do not purchase it the whole look of the property they have will be spoiled. I hope the minister will see his way to purchase that lot and make the property square. I hope he will secure the adjoining lot.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This matter is under consideration. I have never been to Prescott, but I hope to visit it soon, and I will look into this matter. I think $1,000 was asked for the adjoining lot, and I offered $500 and the owner is ready to sell for $750.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think myself the lot is worth $1,000, and the government is not paying any too much for it even at that price. It is a corner lot and it will help to make the government lot more uniform, and the minister should not hesitate to buy it and make their lot complete.

Lighthouse and coast service—to provide for the purchase of a wharf for steamers and lighthouse service at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, $13,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Explain.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When I visited Charlottetown last fall, I found that the ferry boats and government steamers had no proper wharf accommodation. The wharfs which our steamers used were really a disgrace. It was pointed out that we might buy the Poole property, and I was told that the price would be $16,000 or $18,000, I said we were not disposed to pay so high a price, and after a good deal of bargaining $13,000 was settled on, which is considered by everyone as reasonable and fair. It is without exception the best wharf in Charlottetown and besides we save $500 a year.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the government steamers land at that wharf before ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; it was private property.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the government the exclusive right now ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Fisheries—further amount required for salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $20,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The actual expenditure of the department is $105,000, and we have always overlapped to the extent of $20,000. To cover this deficiency we have to vote this $20,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand that system of bookkeeping. Here is $20,000 additional required for salaries and disbursements. How has the minister made the mistake ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not made a mistake. I found when I came into the department that the expenditure for the year previous had exceeded the estimate and the appropriation, so last year I asked for $20,000 to cover the expenditure of 1902-3. This year I am asking for the same amount of $20,000 to cover the amount which I am short for 1903-4.

Mr. HAGGART. Some one must have expended $20,000 more than he had a right to. Who was the minister who did that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can give the hon. gentleman the information as to how far back it was done.

Mr. CLANCY. Does it mean that the hon. gentleman had $85,000 voted and expended $20,000 more ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We expended $20,000 more than was voted last year or the year before.

Mr. CLANCY. Where did the hon. gentleman get the money ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We did not get it, we are trying to get it now.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says he expended it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The obligation is contracted.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you provided for the $20,000 this year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, I have not provided for it.

Mr. HAGGART. That is an extraordinary state of affairs.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not explained why it was necessary to expend $20,000 more than was expended in the former year. I see that the vote for the year prior to that was $85,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In years gone by the expenditure of the department for this service has always exceeded by $20,000 the expenditure of the year previous and it was always voted on the supplementary estimates for the year which had passed. I am doing exactly the same thing as was done last year and as my predecessors did years before.

River St. Lawrence ship channel, $588,000.

Mr. HAGGART. We want an explanation of all this.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In order to explain this matter fully, I shall read the Order in Council which was adopted 11th of March, 1904:

On a report dated 7th February, 1904, from the Right Honourable the President of the Privy Council, submitting that an Act passed at the last session of parliament, respecting the management and control of public and other works (3 Edward VII., c. 53) provides for the transfer by the Governor in Council of the management, charge and direction of any public works or any power, duty or function with respect to any work or class of works, whether public or private which is assigned to or vested by statute in any minister or department to any other minister or department.

The minister recommends as follows :—

1. With a view to systematizing and facilitating the work in connection with hydrographic surveys, the administration of which branch of the public service is assigned to the Department of Marine and Fisheries under the provisions of 55-56 Vic., c. 17, and the work whereof has been continuously performed by that department for many years past, that all hydrographic work of the Department of Public Works and of Railways and Canals be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and that that department alone be charged in future with the management and control of such surveys.

I may state that there appears in the supplementary estimates of 1904-5 an item of $10,500 which was formerly in the estimate of the Department of Railways and Canals. That item the Department of Railways and Canals dropped and it has been transferred to the supplementaries of the Department of Marine for 1905.

That from and after the first of July next (1904) the management and control of the St. Lawrence ship channel, together with the dredging and sweeping plant, steamers and all other appliances now used by the Department of Public Works in connection with that work, be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, so as to place the supervision of the improvements to navigation on the St. Lawrence route under the jurisdiction of the department which is directly responsible for the aids to navigation on that route.

3. That all the duties, powers and functions with respect to any work or class of works conferred upon the Minister of Public Works by any of the Acts relating to harbour commissioners, be transferred to and hereafter exercised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

4. That any records and plans in the possession of the Department of Public Works or of Railways and Canals, which refer to any of the above-mentioned works and which may be required by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for its information and guidance upon assuming control of the said works be transferred to the last named department, upon its making application therefor.

5. That all moneys voted by parliament to either the Department of Public Works or that of Railways and Canals for the purpose of carrying out any of the works under the control of either department and now transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, be placed to the credit of the last named department.

6. That the changes as recommended above take effect from this date except as hereinabove otherwise provided.

Mr. MONK. Has that been laid on the table already ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. This amount of $588,000 is the ordinary amount which has been voted from year to year since 1896 for the work proper of the ship channel and basin, and of course all work of construction and repairs of the fleet necessary to carry on the dredging of the channel. This vote provides :

1. For the working expenses of six elevator dredges and one hydraulic or suction dredge, with their accessory plants, which it

is proposed to keep at work at various points on the St. Lawrence below Montreal, deepening and otherwise improving the ship channel.

2. Maintenance of Sorel ship establishment, inclusive of supplies, charges of management and superintendence of dredging operations, &c.

3. Towards construction of additional dredging plant at Sorel, improvement of shipyard facilities, including wharf and dock accommodation.

4. Carrying on the hydrographic survey of the River St. Lawrence, now in progress, and the operations of sweeping and supervision of the dredge channel.

The following is a detailed estimate of requirements for 1904-5 :

1. Dredging operations—		
Working expenses of six elevators dredges, operating day and night, with their accessory plants of tugs, scows, &c., including fuel, wages, board, stores, repairs and supervision and office expenses ; for a season of about eight months—six elevator dredges at $40,000 each..		$240,000

Last year and the year previous the expenditure was from $30,000 to $37,000 per dredge :

Working expenses of one hydraulic dredge, operating day and night ; including plant and superintendence ; for a season of about six months..		60,000
Working expenses of 2 stone lifters		10,000
2. Shipyard, supplies and new plant—		
Coal for shipyard, 2,000 tons at $4.50..	$ 9,900	
Smith's coal, 500 tons at $6...	3,000	
Drying kiln and other new buildings	5,000	
New blacksmith shop and brass foundry..	10,000	
Removing wreck of old railway wharf..	2,000	
Rebuilding old railway wharf.	12,000	
Rebuilding wharf, upper end of shipyard	5,000	
New electric plant..	25,000	
New plant and machinery.. ..	10,000	
		81,900
3. New dredging plat, yard facilities and improvements—		
New dredging plant and completion of two spare scows, 200 yards each..	$20,000	
Reconstruction of upper part of hull of dredge 'Laurier.'.	12,000	
Winch scow with boiler and winch..	8,000	
Flat scow with derrick	6,000	
New set powerful buckets for dredge 'Lafontaine'..	10,000	
Additional upper works 'Cartier' and other tugs..	8,000	
Purchase of tug 'Carmelia'..	13,000	
		77,000
4. Hydrographic surveys, sweeping and supervision, including commencement of sweeping tug—		
For the continuation of the hydrographic surveys of the River St. Lawrence, now in progress..	$ 40,000	
For the sweeping and supervision of the dredged channel..	19,100	
On account of the construction of a new, powerful ice-breaking and sweeping tug, designed for prolonging navigation, sweeping above and below Quebec, and general towing of dredging plant, especially for Cap à la Roche..	60,000	
		119,100
Total..		$588,000

Now, I am ready to give information in detail about the work.

Mr. HAGGART. What depth does this give you in both places—in lake St. Peter and below ? And what remains to be completed ? and when do you expect to have it completed ?

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. When the committee rose at six o'clock the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) had just read the Order in Council, which, under the statute passed last session, attributes certain of the duties of the Department of Railways and Canals and of the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It reminds me of the campaign of the hon. minister in the division of Maisonneuve, when he presented himself for re-election after his acceptance of his present portfolio. I merely wish to call my hon. friend's attention to this and to ask for a word or two of explanation which, no doubt, he will give. At that time, my hon. friend will remember, it was charged by those opposed to his re-election that the important Department of Public Works had been taken away from the province of Quebec to which it had been allotted at the time of the distribution of portfolios in 1896, and that the department given to the province as represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine) was a department of minor importance. I think that was a legitimate objection to raise in an election when all questions of public interest can be discussed, particularly an election which took place after a ministerial reconstruction. My hon. friend made a very good defence—so good that he was elected by a large majority. Amongst other things, he stated as he will remember, that the department which he was called upon to preside over, if he were elected, will undergo a very large development. That department, he said, would be entrusted with the superintendence of all navigation of every kind—to use his own language—from the Yukon to the Atlantic ocean. What was understood by that was that there was going to be introduced a very important modifica-

tion of the system that had obtained since confederation in the organization of the administrative work of the Dominion. We understood that the Department of Marine and Fisheries was going to take from the Department of Public Works everything which concerned navigation, the construction of wharfs, the deepening of rivers, canal navigation—I believe that was specified at the time by my hon. friend and by his organs,—everything that concerned navigation, including the construction, repairs and labour of every kind. That was a new principle, that is, a new principle here, though not new as applied to other nations. The system which prevails here as hon. members of the committee know, is that the Department of Public Works is entrusted with all work of material construction throughout the Dominion, with whatever department it may be concerned. If the Department of Militia desires to have a drill hall erected, it is the work of the Public Works Department to construct it; if a post office is to be erected, or a customs house built, or a building provided in connection with the Department of Justice or the Department of Trade and Commerce, —any building of whatever kind—it is supposed to be the work of the Public Works Department which is manned by a minister and a sufficient number of officials to carry out all the public works of the Dominion. And that it was which made that department in the eyes of the electors of Maisonneuve such an important department; and that was why they, or at least a certain number of them, could not see why that department should be taken from the province of Quebec.

But the point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is this: After my hon. friend had become a minister, he endeavoured to carry out the pledges he had made to his electors, I will give him credit for that. He made a noble effort to draw into his department everything that he said he would include in it. That he failed to realize his promises there is no doubt, and that is the point upon which I would like an explanation from him. There has evidently been a struggle, there has evidently been a conflict, and the Order in Council which my hon. friend read to us a short time ago is the outcome of that conflict. By the terms of the Order in Council the Department of Marine and Fisheries is charged with the St. Lawrence ship channel, it has charge of the localities that are under the control of harbour boards. Why is the attribution so restricted? That is what I would like my hon. friend to explain. Take for instance, the navigation between Montreal and Quebec. My hon. friend, under the terms of this Order in Council, has charge of the ship channel from Montreal to Quebec where important works are going on; he has charge of the construction of piers and of public works to be executed within the harbour of Montreal, in that particularly restricted locality where the Harbour Commissioners have jurisdiction; he has also charge of works to be executed at Three Rivers, if there is a harbour board there, and I think there is. There is a harbour board at Quebec, and therefore within the jurisdiction of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners his department has charge of the public expenditure. But if wharfs are to be built between Quebec and Montreal outside the very limited jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners, they are not to be attributed to my hon. friend's department, but they fall under the Department of Public Works. Lighthouses to be constructed above Montreal—and there is no subject which it seems to me comes more properly under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries—those lighthouses, so far as their construction is concerned, belong to the Department of Public Works. The canal navigation remains where it was under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals. All wharfs or improvements to be constructed above Montreal, although intimately connected with navigation, unless they are to be constructed within the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners, are completely outside the attribution of the department of my hon. friend We are, I believe this year, to execute very important and commendable improvements at Port Colborne which are very important to the inland navigation of this country. Unless there are harbour commissioners at Port Colborne, and I am not aware that there are any, all those improvements will be constructed outside the control of the department of my hon. friend. That is the way I understand it. I do not think there are as yet harbour commissioners appointed for the ports of Port Arthur and Fort William. Any improvements we make there in the way of construction work would therefore be under the Department of Public Works and not under the department of my hon. friend. In other words, there has been a creation to the department of my hon. friend, but it is limited as indicated in the Order in Council read by him.

What I would like to ask my hon. friend is this: Upon what principle did the government proceed in that division, in that attribution to his department of works which previously were under the control of the Department of Public Works? What was the guiding principle? Was it, as everything leads us to believe, a mere compromise between my hon. friend and the head of the Department of Public Works by which the latter relinquished some of his patronage, if I may use such an expression, a certain part of the subject previously attributed to it, in order to satisfy my hon. friend? Was it that, or

was there some principle which guided the government in making that attribution? Of course once we depart from the principle that all works of construction performed by the government, in whatever department they may belong, belong of right to the Department of Public Works, the moment, I say, we depart from the principle as we have upon the present occasion I do not see why that department, which used to be the most important, should not gradually be shorn of all its attributes. In England undoubtedly, in France, I believe, and in the United States there is no Department of Public Works. In those countries I understand, the departments have to construct themselves the works that they need; there is no special department of state to which the work of public construction is confided as has been the case in this country since confederation. That is also, I think, the system adopted in several provinces of the Dominion. I say once we depart from that principle I see no reason in reality why each department should not have charge of its own construction, and why the Department of Public Works should not be replaced by some new department which might supply all the many wants of a rapidly growing country like our own. I would like to know from my hon. friend what is the principle which guided the government in the division of the public works, and the attribution to his own department of those specially indicated in the Order in Council?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Order in Council explains itself very well, and is easy to understand. The government of this country thought proper to delegate to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries certain functions which before had been performed by the Minister of Public Works. These are duly set forth in the Order in Council. Take for instance, the business of hydrographic surveys, which constituted an extraordinary anomaly in the administration of that branch of the public service. Part of those surveys were made by the Department of Railways and Canals, a part by the Department of Public Works, and still another part by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, although by statute constituting the Department of Marine and Fisheries, all the hydrographic surveys should have been conducted by it and were attributed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Order in Council has settled that point and this work is now entirely confided to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Certain works which belonged entirely, according to the opinion of the government, to the control and supervision of the Department of Public Works were attributed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These include the most important national works of this country, the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec, and the equipment of the St. Lawrence. The ship channel between Montreal and Quebec is an essential part of our national highway. It is a work of the greatest importance and there would be really no national highway if the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec were not equipped and put in such a condition as to offer all the security and facilities that the trade and commerce of this country require. If I understand well my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier he would have liked if the whole of the work connected with minor improvements upon the route of the St. Lawrence, the construction of wharfs on the River Richelieu or on Lake St. Louis in his own county or in remote places in Canada, had been confided to me. There are thousands of small wharfs, some of them important, which are not really connected with what is known as the national route of the St. Lawrence and which are not therefore confided to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. In our judgment we thought that everything that was constructed in the general sense of the word should remain properly under the control of the Department of Public Works. What is the difference after all? I would have liked probably, if I had consulted my own ambition, that everything should have been placed under my control, but after considering my capacity and realizing my position I came to the conclusion that my department could not embrace the construction of all these different works. I ask what is the difference after all whether these wharfs are constructed by the Department of Public Works or by the Department of Marine and Fisheries because after being constructed they are handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to look after and administer. It makes no difference after all. It does not make very much difference whether the Department of Marine and Fisheries or the Department of Public Works controls the expenditure of the money. There is a higher and more important question than that. My hon. friend seems to be under a misapprehension when he says that the wharfs and piers remain under the control of the Department of Public Works. That is not the case according to the law. The law provides that after these wharfs and piers are constructed they shall be handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to administer. My hon. friend is also under a misapprehension about the construction of lighthouses. The construction of lighthouses, the establishment of aids to navigation, and the furnishing of whatever is necessary for the safe navigation of the St. Lawrence route have been since 1872 under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and they continue to be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend say that the construction of lighthouses belongs to his department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. By all means. It has been so since 1872 and I would not come before parliament and ask the large vote that I am asking for during the present session if all these works were not entirely under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and its officers. Everybody who is familiar with the history of our national route, everybody who is familiar with what has taken place in the city of Montreal, and with what the business men of Montreal have done since 1850 is perfectly aware that the ship channel as a national question forty or fifty years ago did not exist at all and that it did not become a question of importance until two men of brains, two business men of Montreal, took the matter in hand. I refer to the late Hon. John Young and to Sir Hugh Allan. At that time there was on the flats of Lake St. Peter only nine feet of water. These gentlemen contributed to organize the harbour commission of Montreal and with the aid of those interested in the question they started this immense work of making the route of the St. Lawrence what it is intended to be. Starting with the channel between Quebec and Montreal having a depth of nine feet we have the gratification of knowing that at the present time there is a depth of thirty feet during nearly the whole season between Montreal and Quebec, that there will be a depth absolutely of thirty feet within the next two years and that the width of the channel will be from 350 to 450 and at certain points 500 feet. This result has not been attained without a great deal of work and a great deal of expenditure. The trade of Montreal for years and years was taxed to pay the expense incurred in carrying on this work which was considered a national work. It was only in 1892 or 1893 that the government of Canada were convinced that it was really a national work and being convinced of that the government assumed part of the debt of the harbour commissioners of Montreal. Since that time part of that work was confided to the Department of Public Works. What do we find as regards the carrying on of that work ? It was established beyond doubt that there were misunderstandings between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Department of Marine and Fisheries had the powers and functions of establishing lighthouses and providing aids to navigation. In order to place the buoys and establish these lighthouses they had to confer with the Department of Public Works as the work was progressing and I may here say that it has progressed very rapidly during the last five or six years. But, it came to the point where it was not in the interest of navigation or conductive to the safety of transportation between Montreal and Quebec that the control should be divided. That is the reason why it was put under the sole control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and there are no other reasons. This work, of course, is of the greatest importance When we have a ship channel 450 feet wide and 30 feet deep we will be face to face with improvements of navigation, with the enlargements of ships and there is no doubt that in five years or sooner we will be face to face with the problem of having a channel not only 30 feet deep but 600 feet wide.

These improvements are needed and they must be undertaken unless this country wants to remain in statu quo or to go backwards. We must keep pace not only with the development of our own country, but we must keep pace as well with the progress of other countries, and especially the United States. If we desire that the St. Lawrence route should be enabled to compete advantageously with the American waterways ; if we want to have the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John, and Halifax in a position to compete to advantage with Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Newport News and other ports on the Atlantic coast, we must do our duty towards our national water route. I believe Sir, that everyone who understands the position approves of the departmental changes which have taken place. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would consult the business men and the shipping interests of Montreal, I think he would find that they unanimously endorse the action of the government in making these departmental changes. I intend to carry out in its integrity the plan adopted by the government for the improvement of the St. Lawrence route, and of course I shall be glad to receive and to rely upon the suggestions of the business community interested and especially of those connected with shipping and transportation interests. I may say that last November we were able to see what never had been seen before, namely : steamers drawing 26 and 27 feet of water steaming into the port of Montreal during the nighttime. That has been a common occurrence this spring, and it is highly important to our shipping trade, inasmuch as it means a saving of from 6 hours to 10 hours on the voyage. This shows that the government has been trying to carry on the work in such a way as to make it most beneficial to the shipping interests, and to the business men of Canada in general, because when we improve our national route it means not only facility for shipping, but it means advantage to the producers, to the consumers and to the commercial world generally. I may say, and I know what I am speaking of, that such is the improvement in the St. Lawrence route, that we have in sight an important reduction in the rates of insurance. That being so, I believe the people of Canada without distinction of party will cordially approve

of what we have done and what we are doing. After all it is not a question of politics. During the elections of 1902, it was claimed by the friends of the Conservative party, that I should be whipped out of my division, and that I was a renegade to the province of Quebec, because I had accepted a less important portfolio in the cabinet. It was charged against me that instead of going into the cabinet by the front door, I was satisfied with climbing in through the window or through the chimney. I did not doubt for a moment that the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries was an important one, and I knew that it had been held in the past by men who were the mainstay of the Conservative party, such as Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, the Hon. George Foster, Sir Albert Smith and many others. When the Conservatives were accusing me of having disgraced myself by accepting the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries, I thought they were paying a very poor compliment indeed to these leaders of theirs.

Mr. CLANCY. And all were satisfied to administer the department as they found it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Well, of course every one has his own tastes. I do not reproach them for not having thought well to improve the national route of the St. Lawrence, but I will point out that this government has taken the matter in hand, and it is going to show the people of Canada and the people of the United States, as well, that the St. Lawrence route is the great national highway for this part of the North American continent, and that it can compete with any other route in the United States. As I said, I do not reproach the Conservative Ministers of Marine and Fisheries for not having dealt with the St. Lawrence route, but I point out to the people of Canada that the improvements are now going on, and I do not think they will be disposed to blame the government for having made certain departmental changes. The question for us to consider is: is this work well carried on; are the plans well matured; is the execution of the work in the best interests of the country? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, then the people of Canada will take very little stock in minor considerations as to what minister is in charge of the execution of the policy of the government in this regard. My hon. friend seems much concerned that I have not the administration of the canals. Well, I am a new minister and have quite a good deal to look after now, and I am not ashamed to confess, a good deal to learn. I do not pretend to be perfect, but at the same time I am doing my best to administer the affairs which I have under my control at the present time. I may say that I am perhaps not as well posted as I would like to be in the fishery branch of my department, because I have not had the advantage of visiting the different parts of the Dominion to ascertain for myself the requirements of the people. I can say, however, without fear of contradiction, that as regards the port of Montreal and the channel between Montreal and Quebec, I have some knowledge of the needs of the situation, and I trust I may be able to apply that knowledge to the best advantage of the people of Canada. As to the lighting of the St. Lawrence route, we are trying to do the best we can. We are adopting the most modern apparatus so that we may give satisfaction, not only to the shipping trade entering Montreal from the east, but also to the transportation business coming to that port from the west. I think our efforts are directed in the proper way. If my hon. friend is not satisfied with what has been done, I must tell him I am perfectly satisfied. My friends are perfectly satisfied also and he is welcome as he was in 1902 in my division of Maisonneuve, to come and preach the same doctrine as he has preached to-night. I am perfectly willing to have my friends judge me by my acts and what I am doing.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has displayed a great deal of irritation unnecessarily. I do not know that there is any electricity in the atmosphere that would contribute to irritate my hon. friend, but he has given us a political harangue unnecessarily and has refrained from answering a very plain question. What I asked my hon. friend was this: There has been a redistribution of the work of the departments. I mildly, gently, mellifluously asked what principle had guided the government in that work of division, and the minister gets up and says he has made great improvements in the St. Lawrence, that this government is responsible for those improvements, and that people threw insults at him in his election. I never did anything of that kind myself, and I do not know that anybody else did. I never met my hon. friend during that election. I thought we had a right in that election to say that the Department of Public Works had been, in our opinion, unnecessarily taken from our province. We may have been wrong, but I think that was a legitimate question to discuss, and my hon. friend thought it so important that he said that the department of which he was taking charge was to be a new department altogether, and that everything that concerned navigation throughout the country, to use his own words, from the extreme west to the east, from the coast of the Pacific down to Nova Scotia, on the coast of the Atlantic, any construction work with reference to piers, lighthouses, or any work of construction in connection with navigation, which belong to the Department of Public Works, would be transferred to him. He was elected upon that new programme which he defined in that election. I stated a moment ago that the system which has prevailed in Canada has been that all construction of this and every kind whatever, for post offices, for military use, for any

department, was performed in this country by the Department of Public Works. In England, where there are forty-five ministers, every minister controls the construction work of his own department. We have a different principle. My hon. friend preached through his election that that principle was going to be changed. He has changed it in part. He has taken a part out of the Public Works Department. A man cannot get up in this House and ask my hon. friend the principle and the line of conduct laid down in that division without getting from him a refusal to answer and an appeal to popular passion. I find that strange, and I repeat that I am sorry the minister refused to explain to me and to this committee why it is that if a wharf is to be built at St. Lambert, opposite Montreal, he has nothing to do with that construction, and if it is to be built at Hochelaga, within the limits of the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners, it belongs to him entirely. My hon. friend will not answer that question, and I will let it rest there. This is a very important item, and I wish to ask my hon. friend to give the committee a general idea as to how he proposes to spend this large sum. What are specifically the improvements that are going to be carried out this year in that ship channel, which interests the business and trading community of this country in such a large degree? There is a very good report by Mr. Lafleur, acting Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, in the report of the Minister of Public Works last year, which gives a great deal of information. I find, amongst other things, not quite a justification of the proud boast which is made by the minister that he had inaugurated, and his government had carried out, under him, very important improvements. I find that what has been done for the past ten years in the ship channel is but the carrying out of a plan laid down in 1844, I think before my hon. friend was born, certainly before I was born. We are carrying out that programme of deepening and improving the channel between Quebec and Montreal, and no doubt my hon. friend will contribute his part, as other ministers have done, to the carrying out of that plan first enunciated by the Hon. John Young, and which we have been carrying out ever since. The channel between Montreal and Quebec is 160 miles long. Sixty-five per cent of that channel requires no improvements, it is deep enough and wide enough to admit of the passage of vessels. The only improvement to be made there is the proper lighting of the channel. I find in Mr. Lafleur's report that the plan is to give the channel a depth of 30 feet from Montreal to Quebec, a width of at least 450 feet, which is the least that is safe, and where there are curves a width of at least 650 or 700 feet, or even more. No doubt it would be desirable that that channel should be wider, a depth of 30 feet and a width of 450 feet is barely enough, and the object we have in view is to give it a width which would avoid some of the accidents that have occurred and which have damaged the reputation of the channel. We have excavated over 36,000,000 cubic yards. We have expended for plant, shops, surveys, &c., $2,331,527.23, and we have expended for dredging $4,910,155.62. We have seven dredges. My hon. friend told the committee before six o'clock that we are going to have an eighth dredge. I would like to know whether it is contemplated continuing the work of improvement during the present season. what parts of the channel he is going to dredge, and what other improvements he is going to make, besides dredging, in the way of lighting, and generally in the way of carrying out the suggestions so ably made to the government two years ago by the shipping interests of Montreal, who carried on an investigation at their own expense and laid the result of that investigation before the government, from whom they obtained the promise that their suggestions would be carried out. Where are we going to increase the depth and the width of the channel, and what improvements are we going to carry out in the way of lighting the channel? Are any new buoys going to be added in order to secure safe navigation? Can my hon. friend give us any valid reason for the unfortunate number of accidents which have occurred in that channel since the beginning of the season? I find in Mr. Lafleur's report that last year we had eight accidents in the River St. Lawrence. The accidents which have occurred this year appear to be due in a large proportion to negligence on the part of somebody; but whatever may be the cause, they have inflicted serious injury on our channel and make people skeptical as regards the accomplishment of the very excellent object which my hon. friend has in view, namely, of having the navigation of the St. Lawrence just as safe and free from risk as is the ocean navigation to the great American ports. My hon. friend has stated that under his administration, and that of the past few years, the insurance rates have greatly diminished. Is that the case, and what is the diminution?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. My hon. friend is mistaken. What I said was that we had in sight the diminution of the rates of insurance.

Mr. MONK. Then I misunderstood my hon. friend. But as I understand it—and I see my hon. friend from St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) is in his seat, who is conversant with this subject—we are handicapped in the way of rates. The St. Lawrence route is mulcted in heavier rates than the American ports. That is a very serious disability for which I am told is no cause. There is no reason for it except the ipse dixit of the English underwriters, and it is most desirable that that

inequality should disappear. My hon. friend has a large sum at his disposal. He contemplates important improvements, and he states to the committee that he is certain that after those improvements have been carried out, the disability I refer to will either disappear or be seriously diminished. What guarantee can my hon. friend offer as to that? I would be prepared to vote an additional sum if my hon. friend can state to this committee that he has conferred with the underwriters and that the improvements he contemplates will result in a removal of that grave disability from which we suffer of being burdened with heavier rates of insurance than the American ports. Since my hon. friend, in a moment of irritation, which I cannot very well explain, has judged fit not to answer my first question, this one I beg him to believe is in no way connected with politics. The ship channel is to me a question apart from politics. It is a business matter which interests the whole Dominion and the city of Montreal in particular, and if my hon. friend will give me a little enlightenment on the points I have mentioned, I shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. Because I thought proper to explain as clearly as my control of the English language would permit, a few of the points which he thought proper to charge against the government, he feels that there was electricity in the air. My hon. friend may have felt it, but I did not and there was no cause for it. Now he says that the plan we are executing is one which was begun in 1844. Sir, the plan now being carried out was never begun in 1844. What was begun in 1844 was an attempt to dredge the channel through the Lake St. Peter flats, and whatever information the hon. gentleman has taken upon himself to give to the committee, he has taken from the reports of the Public Works Department for 1903 under the heading 'History of the ship channel.'

The actual improvements were commenced in 1844, and continued by the government as a public work until 1846, and abandoned the following year owing to opposition to the location of the channel.

Legislation was passed in 1850 transferring the plant and authorizing the Montreal Harbour Commissioners to borrow money and proceed with the works as they should deem best.

From 1851 to 1888 all operations for the improvement of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec were carried on by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, the interest on the cost of the work being defrayed by a tonnage tax on all vessels drawing 10 feet and upwards.

In 1888 the channel from Montreal to Cap à la Roche was completed to 27½ feet at ordinary low water, and from there to Quebec 27½ feet at half tide.

The government decided in 1888 to re-adopt the River St. Lawrence ship channel as a public work.

Under the Public Works Department, from 1888 to 1898, the work begun by the Harbour Commissioners was continued.

The difficult rock work at Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles was completed, as designed.

Almost all of the dredged portions of the river, except the channel in Lake St. Peter, were cleaned up or deepened, and many curves and narrow places were widened.

Surveys were made, and between Cap Charles and Quebec, to avoid the necessity of waiting for the tide, channels were dredged through several shoals.

The extraordinary low water of 1895 and 1897, and the increase in the size of vessels, urgently called for a wider and deeper channel.

In 1897 it was decided to construct new plant consisting of large and powerful dredges, tugs, barges, &c., suitable for channel improvement on a large scale.

It was only in 1899 that the present plans were fairly started and the new plant acquired. My hon. friend asked me what was going to be done, and before six o'clock I gave him the details of what we expected to accomplish with this sum of $588,000. We propose to complete the channel as planned in 1899 and to make it a thirty feet channel the whole length between Montreal and Quebec and from 450 feet to 750 feet wide as required. From the report I have from the engineer in charge of the channel, I take the following:

In view of the improvements already completed, and those expected to be completed in the near future, I have to-day forwarded to you a report recommending for the consideration of the lighthouse board, a number of improvements and additions to the lighting and buoy service on the River St. Lawrence ship channel, between Longue Pointe and Batiscan.

The list calls for some 20 new piers, most of them ice-breaking concrete structures, 27 new lighthouses, and some 12 to 15 gas buoys.

These piers and permanent lights will be necessary in view of the proposal to prolong navigation in the autumn and spring, and to operate ice-breaking steamers.

During these operations buoys will not be available, and shore marks must be relied upon exclusively. The number and character of the lights therein suggested, would give a system of lighting equal in type and protection to the general design of the improved thirty foot channel which is being dredged. With the exception of the widening in Lake St. Peter the dredging throughout the three divisions will be completed some time in 1905. The depth will also be completed in Lake St. Peter with the bends all enlarged, so that between Batiscan anchorage and Longue Pointe, the eastern limit of Montreal harbour, thirty foot navigation will be available at extreme low water. From Batiscan anchorage to Quebec, by taking advantage of the tide, vessels of the same draught may pass. The lighting from Quebec up to Batiscan is for the present channel about sufficient, as it is

not advised that deep draught vessels should pass Cap à la Roche at night. The completion of the improvement by dredging and the placing of the lights as suggested will mark a further important step in the perfecting of navigation by the St. Lawrence route.

With the details that I gave before six o'clock I think there is sufficient information to enable the committee to form the opinion that the work which is proposed to be carried out under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is purely and simply the execution of the plan which was adopted in 1899 and the carrying out of a system of lighting in such a perfect manner that the navigation between Montreal and Quebec will be made just as safe as it is in the best waters in the world. But, the department does not intend to stop there There are other improvements as regards aids to navigation in the Lower St. Lawrence which are being considered by the department, and as this work is in the same hands I think it will help in having it executed more rapidly and in a better condition than it was carried on before.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was affecting indignation or not when he made a rather heated reply to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The hon. gentleman sat down without giving a single reason why a portion of the Department of Public Works and a small portion of the Department of Railways and Canals should have been taken away from these departments or why he should have attempted, merely upon an election pledge, to dismantle other departments. I would like to ask him if it means a vote of want of confidence in the gentleman who presided over the Department of Public Works. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say by his action that the present hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) was unable to perform the duties which were assigned to him? Was that the reason or was it because the hon. gentleman wanted more patronage? The hon. gentleman did not take the pains to tell the committee. He tells the committee very frankly that he has much to learn in respect to his own department. I am pretty well persuaded that this committee will conclude that the first thing that the hon. gentleman ought to do is to master every detail in his own department before he undertakes work belonging to other departments. He is a new minister, he has only been a short time in his department and yet after entering it, in fact before he had been fairly seated in his department, the first thing he did when he went to his constituents was to make the promise that he would make a raid upon other departments. I was expecting the hon member for London (Mr. Hyman) to pronounce a eulogium upon the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his having pirated largely other departments and taken over other work. Was it essential to his election that he should have made a pledge in the city of Montreal that he would take over portions of other departments? That was a part of the hon. gentleman's election pledge and he has been strong enough to redeem it. He has been strong enough to take other men by the throat, men who have retired from this House in consequence of it, men who are to-day absent from the House largely on the ground that the hon. gentleman took a portion of other departments in fulfilment of an election pledge and he is now pluming himself upon what he has done. I will leave it to the country to judge whether the hon. gentleman is discharging these duties better than they were discharged before. I have very grave doubts as to that part of it. I do not believe he is doing so. I believe they were as well discharged before as the hon. gentleman discharges them, and the country will expect some explanation from the hon. gentleman as well as from the right hon. Prime Minister as to the reasons why the hon. gentleman took from the Department of Public Works portions that could have been as well administered under the old order of things. There was no pretence that they could not have been and this change was only made to satisfy the greed of the hon. gentleman and to give him greater power.

Mr. TAYLOR. On this side of the House I do not think there sits an hon. gentleman who is not quite willing to vote $588,000 or any other sum which may be required for the purpose of improving the national highway, but I would like to inquire from the hon. gentleman why the money is frittered away as it is. I find in the Auditor General's Report of last year that large sums of money were expended upon articles that have nothing to do with aids to navigation. I find at page V—30 that $719.50 was paid to Wm. Robertson & Son, Halifax and charged to the ship channel and I want the hon. minister to explain what these expenditures have to do with the improvement of the ship channel. The following articles were purchased: Dominion ensigns, Blue, 4 yards, 14 at $8.70; red, 3 yards, 12 at $6.10; 6 yards, 2 at $18; stars and stripes, 3 yards, at $6.50; 6 yards, 2 at $18; blank ammunition, 200 shells, $70; brass cannon, 1 inch bore, 4 wheel carriage, rubber tires, 2 at $100; French flags, 3 yards, 12 at $3.50; 6 yards, 2 at $9.50; Union Jacks, 2 yards, 12 at $3.50; 6 yards, 1 at $10; blue pennants, 3 yards at $7; 4 yards, $10; and 6 yards, $13.50, making a total of $719.50. It appears to me that these articles would be required more for the naval militia that the hon. gentleman is talking about starting than for the ship channel. Why should these items be charged to the Montreal ship channel? I find further down, 'A. Rosenthal, vegetable dish, $19.75.' Surely that was for a wedding present for somebody. They would not require a $19.75

vegetable dish in connection with the St. Lawrence ship channel. We want the hon. minister to explain why he spent this large sum of money and charged it to the Montreal ship channel for a lot of bunting, brass cannon, Yankee and French flags. There was a Yankee flag and a French flag; I think one kind of flag is enough for Canada, the Union Jack. The hon. gentleman gets this vote of money, but he does not explain what he is going to do with it. Any person reading the Auditor General's Report for last year would be tempted to vote against this item. I ask the minister to give a detailed account of what he purposes doing with the money.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The information I get from the officials of the department is that this expenditure was incurred for the reception of the Duke of York. It must be remembered that the ship channel fleet at that time made the best display that was made on the river. I am astonished at the criticism of the hon. member for Leeds who appears to think that the Duke of York was not entitled to a fitting reception by the ship channel authorities and by those who have charge of the fleet.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend need not criticise the member for Leeds as not being willing to spend money to give the Duke of York or any other notable person from England, or elsewhere, a fitting reception. The hon. gentleman has not put in the Auditor General's Report that this money was spent to receive the Duke of York; it is simply charged as an item of expenditure to the ship channel, so many French flags, so many Yankee flags. What do we want of a French flag or of a Yankee flag for the reception of the Duke of York? The $19.75 for a vegetable dish, was that to give the Duke of York a fitting reception by the fleet?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think the Duke of York ever went aboard one of the dredges.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Everything that was proper was done for his reception. The 'Frontenac' was equipped especially to take him up from Quebec to Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then why did not the government ask for a special vote to pay for these things, and we would vote all the money that was needed for the reception of the Duke of York, or of Lord Dundonald. To present the accounts in this underhand way is misleading the public and misleading the House. When the hon. gentleman wants a sum of money for a specific purpose he should mention that purpose.

Northwest Mounted Police—required to complete the service of the year, $40,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Last year we asked for an appropriation of $400,000, but we find it was not possible to complete the year for that sum, and we ask for a further sum of $40,000 to complete the service of the year which has just lapsed. The reason for this increased expenditure is largely to be found in the enormous immigration, and the increased demand for police supervision from new settlements, and the extension of the police force north of the Mackenzie river.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that mean the additional one hundred men?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the one hundred men are provided for in the estimates for next year. This is for current expenditure.

Northwest Mounted Police—to provide for gratuity and pension to the widow and children of the late Arthur Frederick Montford Brooke, staff-sergeant in the Northwest Mounted Police, who was drowned while on duty, $1,204.25.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sergeant Brooke was drowned in crossing a river while on duty. I think he was out arresting a prisoner. There had been a freshet, which washed away the ford, and as a consequence the horses lost their footing and Sergeant Brooke was drowned. We give his family the same gratuity that we would have given if he had been killed in action. In 1885, we gave a pension to the families of those mounted policemen who had been killed in action, and this is calculated in exactly the same way, according to rules which have been in force for many years.

Northwest Mounted Police—to provide for a gratuity for the widow of the late J. A. Beaupré, interpreter in the Northwest Mounted Police, who was drowned while on duty, $420.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Beaupré was an interpreter who accompanied Sergeant Brooke on that occasion. He did not belong to the regular staff of the mounted police, but was employed from time to time, as occasion required; and we give his widow the sum that we have been giving others under similar circumstances.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no objection to this item. But it seems to me some similar provision should be made for men employed by the government on harbour works, for instance, who lose their lives by accident and through no fault of their own. As a rule these are poor men, and I think that something should be done for the families of those who lose their lives in the employment of the government. I am sorry the government draws the line so close.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At this moment I will answer only for the department for which I am responsible, the Mounted

Police. I am glad the hon. gentleman takes no exception to this vote. I think if he will examine these estimates he will see that wherever there is a case of hardship, if a man who has been working for the government has met with a casualty and lost his life, a gratuity is paid to his widow. I think he will find several items of that kind in the estimates of the present year.

Mr. INGRAM. I am very glad to hear that. I know instances, deserving cases where something should be done.

Northwest Mounted Police—required to complete the service of the year, $10,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We asked for an appropriation of $500,000 and we require $10,000 more to complete the service for the year expiring 30th June.

To pay Inspector W. M. Walke for portion of loss caused by destruction by fire of Mounted Police barracks, Dalton Trail, Yukon Territory, $200.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Inspector Walke was in a post that we have on the Dalton trail. I may say that we have different stations in different parts of the territory at which we have one, two or three men according to the importance of the post. If I remember well, Inspector Walke was alone or had one man with him. The cabin which he had erected and in which he lived was burned by accident. Inspector Walke lost his uniform, accoutrements, &c., for which he put in a claim of $346. We thought we should allow him $200.

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings generally, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of this ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). This is the usual amount, and is used for public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. EARLE. Was the $8,000 voted last year all spent ?

Mr. HYMAN. The expenditure for the year 1902-3 was $5,000; last fiscal year, from 1st July 1903 to 1st March 1904, the expenditure was $6,054.

Public buildings—construction of armouries, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is an item that has been in the estimates for two years. The intention of this item is to provide for the smaller armouries outside of the cities and towns. Last fiscal year up to March, 1904, the expenditure has been $15,000 on different armouries constructed in such places as Baddeck, Sussex, Dundas, Kaslo, Revelstoke and so on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these constructed by contract after tenders publicly called for ?

Mr. HYMAN. They are all constructed by contract in the regular way after tenders being received.

Mr. SPROULE. How are tenders invited ?

Mr. HYMAN. Publicly. That is the case with every item in this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the lowest tender accepted in every case ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, so long as the tender is regular.

Experimental farms—new buildings and renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., in connection with existing buildings, fences, &c., $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the usual item.

Mr. SPROULE. What new buildings are to be constructed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Any new buildings constructed will be only small. This is principally for renewals, improvements and repairs. The amount spent under this head in 1902-3 was about $9,900.

Public works—chargeable to income—Ottawa public buildings, including repairs, ventilation, lighting and furniture, &c., $125,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for buildings in Ottawa only ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Is there anything in this vote to improve the ventilation of this chamber ?

Mr. HYMAN. We have endeavoured to improve the ventilation. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will look at the windows, he will see that a large amount of money has been spent on them.

Mr. WILSON. How much was spent on this account last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. In 1902-3 the whole appropriation was expended.

Mr. SPROULE. In this same vote there is an item—'Ottawa public buildings, gas and electric light,' and so on. And this item is for repairs, ventilation, lighting, &c. The item of light seems to be covered in two or three places.

Mr. HYMAN. The difference between the items is this : The word 'lighting' in the item now under discussion is intended to cover material, as gas piping, new fixtures, and so on. The other item is for the actual gas or electric light.

Mr. INGRAM. I have a suggestion to make which I have never heard made in this House before, though I have been many years a member. Hon. members on both side at times bring their wives and families

to Ottawa. But when the wives or daughters of members visit this building accommodation for their reception is not at all adequate. It is really a shame when you think of it, that our wives and daughters are asked to come to Ottawa and if a member is doing his duty in this chamber, his wife or his daughter must remain in the room they may have down town. It seems to me that some action should be taken towards providing proper accommodation for the wives and daughters of members of this House. Those members who are ministers of the Crown have their comfortable homes in Ottawa, but the rest of us are here at a distance from our homes. I think it high time that some action should be taken towards providing better accommodation. I hope that in making this plea for the wives and daughters of hon. members on both sides I shall not be alone.

Mr. HYMAN. I believe that accommodation of the character referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) should be provided in this building. I am only acting minister, but I will give the matter every consideration possible.

Mr. SPROULE. It is my experience of the library that with the present system of electric lighting it is very difficult to read a book printed in even moderately small type. You first have an electric light of 16 candle power, and then you lower it to 8 or 9 candle power by putting an opaque globe over it. I could understand it if these globes extracted certain rays that are irritating to the eye, but their only effect appears to be to reduce all the rays of light. So far as I am concerned, I cannot with any comfort read a book in the library at night time. Years ago when we had gas it was much better. There was the same trouble in the reading room, but that has been improved until the light is fairly good now. I cannot understand why you put those opaque globes over the light. It is on the same principle that some people cut great large windows in order to let the light in, and then they cover them with some kind of black cloth to keep the light out. I have heard many complaints about the light in the library, and I hope the defect will be remedied.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed that this is the first complaint made with regard to the library lighting, but I will look into the matter and see that an improvement is made.

Public Works, rentals—Dominion public buildings, $64,000.

Mr. EARLE. Might I inquire what rents of public buildings you pay out of this vote?

Mr. HYMAN. This is to cover the rents paid by the Department of Public Works, but in a great many instances the Post Office and other departments pay their own rents.

Mr. EARLE. Under that system you cannot tell what departments these rents belong to.

Mr. HYMAN. I presume the only way to get at that would be to move for a return so that the several departments could send statements.

Mr. EARLE. I wish to call to the attention of the government a matter in regard to a public building which is not rented to a public building which is not rented to government to other parties. This building was formerly used as the Post Office in Victoria, but since the new post office has been built the old building is rented out by the government. As I understand it, this building is not subject to municipal taxation. The municipality looks upon it as rather unfair that the government should be in the real estate business in competition with private real estate owners, and not be subject to municipal taxation. The government does not use this old building any longer for government purposes and they have not offered it for sale but have rented it.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that at the present time this building is rented.

Mr. EARLE. Yes, and the complaint of the municipality is that it is not subject to municipal taxation although it is not used for government purposes. If it were used for the purposes of the government of course it should not be taxed.

Mr. HYMAN. What is it used for ?

Mr. EARLE. It is used for storage and offices.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the first I have heard of the matter. I believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) is perfectly right in his contention. If the Dominion government own a building and rent it in competition with the buildings of private owners, it is only fair and right that some one should pay the taxation. In the present instance, I presume that the leases are made, but I think it is only fair that when the opportunity arises it should be assessed for municipal taxation in the regular way.

Mr. WILSON. I think it would be well for the minister to read out a list of the rents paid for all the departments.

Mr. HYMAN. I would be glad to give the committee a list of the buildings rented that come under this item. The following is an estimate of what is required for 1904-5 :

NOVA SCOTIA.

Halifax—		
Examining warehouse.. ..	$1,000 00	
Savings bank building.	1,200 00	
Engineer's office..	350 00	
Penitentiary..	0 24	
		$ 2,550 24

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Charlottetown engineer's office..		

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Portland post office.. .. ..$	131 00	
St. John custom-house (water lots)..	88 00	
		219 00

QUEBEC.

Chicoutimi—		
Engineer's office .. .. ..$	50 00	
Montreal—		
Civil service examination office..	150 00	
Immigration office.	500 00	
Windsor station (C. P. Ry.) part of ground floor of new addition on Osborne street for post office purposes..	1,300 00	
Merchants Bank of Canada (corner of St. Peter and St. James streets) for Public Works Department..	350 00	
Letter-carriers depot, from Mrs. M. Horton, No. 55, Metcalf..	300 00	
Branch post office, station 'C,' No. 2465, St. Catherine street, from A. L. Pacaud for 5 years, from 1st July, 1903—L.C. No. 4765 (after 5 years rent increased to $2,300).. ..	2,200 00	
Montmagny—		
Post office..	240 00	
Quebec—		
Engineer's office..	180 00	
Valleyfield—		
Inland Revenue offices	300 00	
St. Lin—		
Post office (see Laurentides)..	300 00	
St. Eustache—		
Post office..	144 00	
		6,014 00

ONTARIO (outside of Ottawa).

Dundas post office.. .. .. ..$	500 00	
Picton—		
Customs offices	175 00	
Toronto—		
Civil service examiners' offices..	75 00	
Grand Trunk Ry.—Union station accommodation for storing, sorting and forwarding His Majesty's mails, $2,400 to be paid per annum after the government is reimbursed $6,000 with 4 per cent interest for improvements made, which will become the property of the railway company, say in about 6 years from 1900-01..		
A. L. Bender and A1 store, 117 King street west, for a branch post office.. ..	750 00	
Engineer's office..	555 00	
Steamboat inspectors' office.	450 00	
		45,601 00

MANITOBA.

Winnipeg—		
Engineer's office.. .. .. ..$	500 00	
Weights and measures offices (3 rooms)..	480 00	
		980 00

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Alameda—		
Dominion lands agency.....$	200 00	
Calgary—		
Engineer's office..	240 00	
Edmonton—		
Court-house	600 00	
Immigrant building...	600 00	
Leduc—		
Immigrant shed..	120 00	
Lacombe—		
Immigrant shed	300 00	
Macleod—		
Immigrant shed..	120 00	
Court-house....	300 00	
Red Deer—		
Dominion lands agency.. ..	96 00	
Immigrant shed..	360 00	
Yorkton—		
Dominion lands agency ..	360 00	
		3,296 00

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

New Westminster—		
Engineer's office.. .. .. ..$	700 00	
Vancouver—		
Examining warehouse— Lewis Block, on Granville street..	2,400 00	
Post office..	300 00	
		3,400 00
Rented phones for Dominion buildings outside of Ottawa (see statement next page)..		1,012 00
To provide for unforeseen requirements in 1904-05....		927 00
Total estimated expenditure for rents, &c., for the fiscal year 1904-05.. ..$		64,000 00

Mr. WILSON. Did you say you rented a building in Picton for some purpose ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes ; for a custom-house, $175.

Mr. WILSON. I do not understand that ; it is not long since a new building was erected there.

Mr. HYMAN. That item, of course, will disappear as soon as the new building is occupied.

Mr. WILSON. Has it not been occupied for about two years ? The postmaster was a member of this House in the last parliament, and I am under the impression that he has had the appointment for three years, and that the building must have been finished two or three years ago.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, the hon. gentleman will see that this is an estimate. It may be that the officers of the department made a mistake in including that $175. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will have it investigated.

Mr. MACLEAN. The minister might pay some attention to the fact that, as I am

told, there are quite a number of properties owned by the Dominion in various portions of the country, and even in Ottawa, that have been rented on long leases to parties at very small rentals. I believe that here in Ottawa, while we are paying exorbitant rentals for buildings for the use of the public services, there is property owned by the Dominion, but rented to different persons at very small rentals. There should be an investigation and a change in policy in that respect.

Mr. HYMAN. Will the hon. gentleman give me any instance ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I believe there are some instances in Ottawa.

Mr. HYMAN. I could hardly look into the matter on that information.

Mr. MACLEAN. There are instances down on the Rideau canal ; I cannot give the exact buildings.

Mr. WILSON. There seems to be a very large amount for the office of the Railway Commission.

Mr. HYMAN. The item for the Railway Commission offices is $5,300.

Mr. WILSON. Is that the rent alone ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Where is it ?

Mr. HYMAN. On Queen street.

Mr. EARLE. Will they occupy the whole building ?

Mr. HYMAN. Except some portions of the building occupied by the custom-house since the fire.

Mr. EARLE. What rent is paid for that ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is the rent for the whole building, which is occupied by the Railway Commission, and part of which is temporarily occupied by the custom-house.

Mr. EARLE. I understood a rent was paid by the Customs Department ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it is all the same rent ; it covers the whole building.

Mr. SPROULE. We had this question up last year, and some were of the opinion it would be the part of wisdom on the part of the government to endeavour to acquire land and put up public buildings, because the rent we are paying, in some instances, as far as I have any information on it, is very exorbitant. The minister told us last year that he would look into it and see if ground could not be secured somewhere in convenient places and buildings erected for the use of the government. Does the minister know whether anything was done in that direction, or has he any information to give to the House ?

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that so far as I am personally concerned, I entirely agree with the hon. member for East Grey, that the time has come when the question of all these rented buildings should be taken up, and accommodation provided by building for all the departmental offices. Of course, it is a very large question, and there is considerable difference of opinion as to where the site ought to be chosen. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works, has given the matter a considerable amount of thought, but has not been able to reach any definite conclusion up to the present. Only a short time before he left the department he discussed the matter with me, and I hope that before very long some action will be taken.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had that hope expressed every year for the last three or four years. We are living in hope and likely to die in despair if no greater effort be made than has been made hitherto. The minister says it is a large question. No doubt it is, but large men are supposed to be capable of dealing with large questions. The hon. gentleman has at his command engineers and others, and there ought to be sufficient of them to make some kind of calculation as to what the aggregate amount is that we now pay in rents and how much capital that would represent, and then ascertain if it is not possible to secure land and erect buildings sufficient for the needs of the government which will cost a smaller sum than the capital of the rents we are now paying.

Mr. HYMAN. The aggregate is $64,000 a year rents which we are paying now.

Mr. SPROULE. In the city of Ottawa ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. We are speaking of the city of Ottawa, which is the place we know more about. There may be places where it is cheaper to pay rent than to build, but in Ottawa rents are very high and rapidly increasing, and the government should ascertain whether we could not do better by buying land and erecting buildings.

Mr. HYMAN. The amount of rent paid in Ottawa is $43,096.

Mr. WILSON. I think the rent paid for the Railway Commission office was altogether too high. How many clerks are on the staff ? We are paying $5,000 a year rent, which is out of all proportion to the size of the commission and the staff it employs.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman ought to take into consideration the size of the building and staff.

Mr. WILSON. Why do they want so much room ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is not only space to house the commission that is required, but there is also the public to be considered. The rent of the building is 51 cents per square foot for the space it occupies, which

I do not think extravagant. The floor space is 10,000 square feet.

Mr. WILSON. That is a very large amount to pay. The hon. gentleman says it is a very large building, but why should you rent more room than you require? If the building is occupied by other departments, he should say so. If you go to the Auditor General's office, you will find Mr. Hayter there in a room about as big as four of these desks, and he is doing an immense amount of work. You are providing very elaborate accommodation for this commission.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister consider 51 cents per foot cheap?

Mr. HYMAN. I consider it a fair rent.

Mr. SPROULE. Would he be surprised to learn that a building could be put up for about 30 cents a cubic foot? The Langevin block only cost 29 cents per cubic foot, and we are paying 51 cents a square foot in rent for this building.

Mr. WILSON. What is the number of the building on Queen street, so that we may go and see it?

Mr. HYMAN. It is near the Grand Union hotel, between Elgin and Metcalfe streets.

Mr. INGRAM. It is the building the customs are in.

Mr. EARLE. The building, a portion of which is occupied by the Militia Department and the other portion by the Woods Limited, is a still worse case. We are paying $11,000 a year rental for that building. Half of it is occupied by the Militia Department and half by the Woods Company. The amount paid by the government for rental would, at the rate they borrow money, represent a capital of $400,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The rental for that building is 48½ cents a square foot, which is somewhat less than the other.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are these buildings rented from?

Mr. HYMAN. There are two buildings rented from Mr. Woods. One is used for the Railway Commission and the other for Militia and Defence.

Mr. SPROULE. What other parties rent us buildings?

Mr. HYMAN. We rent a building from Bate & Company, on 12 Albert street, for the Railway Mail Service, at $600. There are the translators' offices rented from D. N. Ranger at $180. We rent the exhibition branch of the Agricultural Department from the Ottawa Investment Company at $1,000, on the corner of Metcalfe and Queen streets.

Mr. SPROULE. Are those all the buildings rented in Ottawa?

Mr. HYMAN. These are all the new buildings rented inside the year.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to get the names of the parties from whom the buildings are rented and the amounts that are paid them.

Mr. HYMAN. The list is as follows:—

Geological Museum (Sussex Street, P. Baskerville)	$ 600 00
French translator's office (Sussex St.), D. V. Ranger	600 00
Government workshop, No. 1, Mrs. H. Wright)	600 00
Government workshop, No. 2, Slater estate	1,160 00
Agricultural Dept., Queen St. (Chas. E. Pearson estate)	2,250 00
Central basin coal shed (Slater estate)	360 00
Thistle Estate (Wellington St.) Gas inspection and weights and measures	550 00
Inland Revenue—Seybold building, Sparks and O'Connor streets	6,500 00
Methylated spirit warehouse and laboratory—Interior Dept., corner of Queen and Lyon streets, J. B. and W. A. Lamb	1,200 00
McDougall (Sussex St.) Marine storehouse—Light	360 00
The Ottawa Bdg. Coy. Ltd. Nos. 98 and 100 Wellington St., for Customs Dept	1,500 00
Molson's Bank, Metcalfe St., 2 flats for Labour Dept.	1,200 00
New building for Surveyor General's staff, corner of Metcalfe and Slater streets, Ottawa Building Co.	3,000 00
International Boundary Commission and Astronomical Branch of the Interior Department, ground and upper floors of No. 26 Wellington St. (W. R. Thistle estate)	800 00
Interior Department, including vault (Slater & Sherwood)	1,140 00
Interior Dept., Imperial Bdg., Queen St., for Immigration Branch (Mrs. E. A. Pearson)	1,950 00
Mounted Police, 172 Wellington St., Slater & Sherwood)	1,140 00
P. O. Dept., Sparks St. Chambers (Slater & Sherwood)	540 00
P. O. Dept.—Railway Mail service, 12 Albert (Bate & Co., up to 1906)	600 00
Rooms occupied by Dept. Pub. Works (Slater Block, Sparks St.)	480 00
Militia and Defence Dept., J. W. Woods Bdg., Slater St.	11,040 00
Ry. Comm., J. W. Woods Bdg., Queen St.	5,300 00
Agricultural Dept., Com. of Exhibition Branch, The Ottawa Investment Co., Ltd., corner of Metcalfe and Queen streets, Nos, 94 and 96	1,000 00

Rideau Hall, allowance for fuel and light, $8,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the usual allowance.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this cover the whole expenditure?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the total vote.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $87,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the same vote as last year.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that this includes coal. How is the coal bought ?

Mr. HYMAN. By public tender.

Mr. SPROULE. What price is paid ?

Mr. HYMAN. The prices paid last year were : Furnace coal, $6.90 ; egg coal, $6.94 ; stove coal, $6.90.

Ottawa public buildings—grounds, $10,000.

Mr. WILSON. There is an increase here of $2,000.

Mr. HYMAN. There are certain small increases in salaries, and besides, the department is paying more attention to the grounds. No more will be spent on this account than is necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. How are the grounds kept ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a superintendent of the grounds and the men are hired under him.

Mr. WILSON. But what is the explanation of the $2,000 increase ?

Mr. HYMAN. Besides the reasons I have given, there is the fact that the expenditure has been overrunning the appropriation for some years past, and each vote has been required to pay something on account of the previous year. This is a small item but it has been $1,000 or $1,200 short at the end of the year.

Mr. WILSON. I suppose, then, the minister does not expect any overrunning in the coming year.

Mr. HYMAN. I hope not.

Ottawa public buildings—Major's Hill Park, $7,000.

Mr. WILSON. There is the same trouble here ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the same thing happened in this case. For the last two or three years the vote has hardly been sufficient for the purpose, and out of each year's vote we have had to pay for a month or two of the previous year.

Mr. SPROULE. Do these votes cover the whole expense of these grounds, or are we to be called on to vote another item in the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. HYMAN. For maintenance these are the total votes.

Mr. INGRAM. The summer house in Major's Hill park has been boarded up. What is the reason for that ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the first that the officers of the department have heard of it. Mr. Ogilvie is the engineer in charge of the buildings and I will bring the fact mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) to his attention.

Ottawa public buildings—removal of snow, including Rideau Hall, $3,000.

Mr. WILSON. Why should Rideau Hall be included ? The vote for Rideau Hall has been increased by $5,000, and the snow cleaning is included in this item. Why is not that given separately ?

Mr HYMAN. It is one of these things that have gone from year to year in the Public Works Department ; the vote taken for the removal of snow includes both these buildings and Rideau Hall.

Mr. EARLE. I suppose there was an over-expenditure last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, a large one.

Mr. WILSON. But this is an increase of $500 for the coming year.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, we are expecting a hard winter.

Public Works—salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., Dominion public buildings, $110,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The vote of $99,000 for last year is now increased to $110,000, the reason being that there are a number of new buildings that have come under the care of the department.

Public Works—heating Dominion public buildings, fuel, &c., $75,000.

Mr. WILSON. There is an increase of $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will remember that the price of coal went up very largely on account of the strike two years ago. The appropriation taken that year was not sufficient, and the consequence was that several items on this account had to be paid out of the appropriation for the year following. That is the reason this vote is larger.

Mr. SPROULE. This is for the ensuing year, and has nothing to do with that vote whatever.

Mr. HYMAN. The shortage of last year was paid out of last year's vote, and then this year we have a shortage that we have to pay out of this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Why have you a shortage on account of the strike of two years ago ? You are contracting for the coming year. In what way can the strike of two years ago increase the price of fuel for the current year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Certain accounts which were unpaid for 1903-4 have to be paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have supplementary estimates for that already, this is for the coming year 1904-5.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman must remember that coal is not always delivered

within the year it is contracted for. A certain amount may be delivered in June and July that goes into the next year. The accounts get mixed in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. That explanation could not apply to this vote, because this vote commences to run from the 30th of June of the current year. Whenever there is a shortage we always have a vote in the supplementaries to meet that shortage, but here we are providing for the future. I venture to say there is not a pound of coal bought out of this money, we have not voted the money yet.

Mr. HYMAN. Nevertheless the coal is being delivered as I have explained. I may say in addition, that in the supplementaries of this year we have to ask for an extra amount. The officials of the department tell me that we have to ask for a supplementary estimate for another year.

Mr. WILSON. This cannot possibly be intended for any shortage of last year because this is for the coming year.

Mr. HYMAN. There is an item in the supplementary estimates of the coming year to pay for the shortage of this year. This vote of $75,000 will cover the total expenditure of the present year. In the supplementaries there is an item of something like $28,000. Last year was an extremely cold year, we are not taking a vote in anticipation that next year will be as cold.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total amount last year for coal in public buildings ?

Mr. HYMAN. $60,000 in the main estimates and $28,000 in the supplementaries.

Public Works—water, Dominion public buildings, $20,000.

Mr. HYMAN. There is quite a number of new buildings which are included in this item which largely accounts for the increase. The accounts coming in from the different places where these buildings are situated, come at different times in the year. Last year there was a small shortage of some $2,000 in this account.

Mr. GANONG. We have found accounts in two different departments for furnishing wine. Is this minister also furnishing wine?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not see anything in the estimates for it.

Public Works—electric and other power for running elevators, stamp cancelling machines, &c., Dominion public buildings, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you pay per horse-power for electric power for running these machines ?

Mr. HYMAN. This item is spread all over Canada. I have the total amounts here, but I have not the separate item the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to know what you pay in different places for your horse-power for this purpose.

Mr. HYMAN. I will have that information to-morrow.

Public Works—Yukon public buildings—repairs, fuel, lighting, water service and caretakers' salaries, $37,500.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the same amount as last year, though we have had the assurance over and over again that times will get better and this item will come down. We never seem to be able to make a reduction. We have been paying extravagant figures, as we understand values down here.

Mr. HYMAN. The department have an officer there supposed to be a very careful man, who closely scrutinizes these accounts, and the department has to depend on that officer. That is the explanation given to me.

Mr. SPROULE. I have looked over several accounts, and some parties out there have informed me that there was the greatest extravagance that I ever heard of.

In fact, it seemed to me that it could not be accounted for in any other way in the world except by the fact that an election was being run and that money had to be poured out like water so as to secure the government candidate's election. I have not heard a word about it from the hon. gentleman who represents the Yukon in this House since he came in. It goes to show that there was the greatest saturnalia of corruption or at least the most profligate expenditure that one could imagine, and that this has been the order of things out there with everything that the government has done. I am not saying that it goes to the same extent in connection with the use of this money, but when we get the particulars it always seems to me that we are paying a very high figure for everything we do out there, much more than private individuals pay and I cannot understand why that should be the case.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to know if the hon. minister has at hand the different amounts to be appropriated for fuel, lighting, and the services of caretakers.

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate for 1904-5 prepared for this vote is as follows : Government House, one caretaker, one charwoman, one furnace man and one gardener $5,640, lighting $3,000, fuel $2,000, repairs $3,000, water and ice $600, improvement of the grounds $3,000. Dawson post office, one janitor, one night watchman and one charwoman, $5,640 ; lighting $3,000, fuel $2,500, repairs $3,000, scavenging $120, water and ice $200. Whitehorse post office, caretaker $1,400, fuel $1,000, repairs $2,000, water $150, scavenging $120, lighting $1,330, salary and living allowance of superintendent, contingencies, &c., $6,000. The total esti-

mated amount required for 1904-5 is $43,700, of which we are asking for a vote for $37,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you ask $6,000 for the superintendent and his contingencies ?

Mr. EARLE. What is the gardener occupied at ?

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose he is occupied with the usual gardening occupation there. There is a certain amount of gardening to be done.

Mr. EARLE. I see that there is a large amount for improvement of the grounds.

Mr. HYMAN. There is an amount for the improvement of the grounds.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if all public buildings in the Yukon are the property of the Dominion or if any of them are rented ?

Mr. HYMAN. As far as I know I think that all the buildings we occupy are the property of the Dominion. There are no rents.

Mr. WILSON. It seems to me that $6,000 for the salary and contingencies of the superintendent is a very large amount. I do not see why it should be so much.

Mr. HYMAN. The salary paid to the caretaker is $3,000.

Mr. WILSON. What are his living expenses and contingencies ?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course the balance of the amount is made up of the contingencies in connection with his office. There are telegrams and things of that kind in connection with his office. This gentleman who represents the Department of Public Works in the Yukon has a considerable number of duties to perform.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give the name of the gentleman, how much he is allowed for living expenses, how much for travelling expenses, and how much for contingencies ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Bertrand is his name. There is no living allowance ; $3,000 is his salary without any living allowance.

Mr. WILSON. Tell us what he spent for travelling expenses and for contingencies ?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to bring down the details of this item if the hon. gentleman will allow it to pass.

Mr. WILSON. Well, bring them down to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. If he is the caretaker of a public building, how could he have any travelling expenses ?

Mr. HYMAN. He has charge of the public buildings at Dawson and at Whitehorse as well. He is the representative of the department in the Yukon having charge of all government property there.

Mr. WILSON. What do you call his office ?

Mr. HYMAN. He is superintendent of Public Works in the Yukon.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the word 'caretaker' as set out in this item correct ?

Mr. HYMAN. He is not the caretaker. He is the superintendent, this item is for the salary and contingencies of the representative of the Department of Public Works in the Yukon, having charge of all government property in the Yukon.

Mr. EARLE. And of public works as well ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, generally speaking, he is the representative of the department.

Mr. EARLE. Similar to the agent of the Department of Public Works in the provinces ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. EARLE. Is there a caretaker as well ?

Mr. HYMAN. There will be a caretaker of each of the buildings, of course, but he will only be the caretaker of the building.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Abram's river—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. EARLE. There was $1,000 voted last year and apparently not spent.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a revote.

Mr. EARLE. What is the object of putting it in year after year and not spending it ? Is it in consequence of an anticipated election this year ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, I do not think that is the intention at all.

Mr. EARLE. It looks so.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot help how it looks.

Mr. EARLE. Explain why it is.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will possibly remember that last year the session was kept on until some time in October when it was almost impossible to get on with public works.

Mr. EARLE. You could have expended $1,000 by the first of June.

Mr. HYMAN. There was a very large number of public works.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county is this in ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yarmouth.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Bailey's Brook—breakwater wharf, $1,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county is that in ?

Mr. HYMAN. Pictou.

Mr. EARLE. Does this complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a revote of last year's amount.

Mr. EARLE. It was $3,000 last year.

Mr. HYMAN. $1,000 is a revote.

Mr. EARLE. Does that complete it ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the estimated amount required to complete.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is a kind of evasive answer.

Mr. HYMAN. It is not completed yet.

Mr. EARLE. Your officers ought to be able to give you the information.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes ; the officials of the department inform me that it will.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Bayfield, harbour works, $4,300.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended on this up to date ?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate was $6,850, and there was expended to the 30th of June last $3,350.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the work done by contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. By day labour.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not by contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. In many cases it is impossible to do it by contract ; the officers of the department report to the minister that the work would be done more expeditiously and cheaply by day labour.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was the material obtained by contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. It would hardly pay to advertise for these small supplies. The material was purchased at the very lowest price.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Baxter's harbour, $2,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Where is this ?

Mr. HYMAN. King's county.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How does it happen that no money was expended last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Owing to the lateness of the session, it was impossible to get some of these works under way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not a satisfactory reason, because an interim Supply Bill was taken as early as August for one-fifth of these amounts, and it was done for the express purpose of preventing excuses of this kind.

Mr. EARLE. In the previous work you had no difficulty in expending $3,000.

Mr. KAULBACH.

Mr. HYMAN. That work had been started, and the officers of the department tell me that it was impossible to commence this work.

Mr. LENNOX. If the session happens to be late, do the officials remain idle until prorogation, and then remain idle for the balance of the year ?

Mr. HYMAN. That does not follow ; the staff was very fully employed, but they were unable to start some of these works.

Mr. LENNOX. The same thing applies with reference to all these works, and if we had the same staff as the year before, they must have remained idle.

Harbours and rivers—Big harbour (Port Bevis), wharf, $3,700.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The same observation would apply to all these votes, that very little money was expended on the vote of last year. In the case of Big Pond, Big Harbour, Breton Cove, Bridgewater and most of the others, substantially no money has been expended. Either these works were premature last year, or else there has not been a great deal of energy displayed in prosecuting them.

Mr. EARLE. I presume the demand for these improvements was very slight.

Mr. SPROULE. They were awaiting the elections.

Mr. HYMAN. The acting chief engineer informs me that everything possible was done to get the work under contract ; but, of course, plans and specifications have to be prepared, in some instances titles acquired and, where necessary, tenders called for. There was no desire on the part of the department not to expedite these works.

Harbours and rivers—Big Pond—wharf, $8,200.

Mr. KAULBACH. In what county is this?

Mr. HYMAN. Cape Breton.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Breton Cove—boat landing, $4,600.

Mr. KAULBACH. In what county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Victoria.

Mr. COCHRANE. What do you mean by 'boat landing' ?

Mr. WM. ROSS. The shore is exposed there, and this wharf has to be built so as to afford shelter for boats.

Mr. HYMAN. It might be called a 'wharfette.'

Mr. COCHRANE. You might call it anything.

Mr. EARLE. Is it used by the public ?

Mr. WM. ROSS. Yes. Steamers go there three times a week, and the passengers have to be landed in boats now.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of this large increase in the vote for Big Pond ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is simply to complete the works contracted for.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why did not the contract provide for its completion ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract is $7,720.

Bridgewater—dredging, $5,000.

Mr. EARLE. Is the dredging under your department now ?

Mr. HYMAN. The general dredging, except the dredging of the St. Lawrence channel, is under the department, all the dredging that has ever been under the Department of Public Works except the ship channel.

Cow Bay run—breakwater to protect outlet of harbour, $2,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why has no work been done on that ?

Mr. HYMAN. The vote last session was $4,000, of which $2,000 was spent and $2,000 will be spent this year.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is that under a contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it is being done under day labour.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why ?

Mr. HYMAN. In all these small votes the matter is entirely under the control of the engineers. The department is guided entirely by their advice. The resident engineers decide whether it is better to be done by contract or by day labour. In this case the report to the department was that there would be less delay in the execution of the work by day labour.

Mr. COCHRANE. I can understand where there are improvements or repairs to a wharf that it might be better to do it by day labour, but where there is a new work, as I think this was, I cannot see why it should be better or more economically performed by day labour. We all know that in connection with such works that system is not cheaper.

Digby pier, renewals and repairs, $1,500.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended on that.

Mr. HYMAN. The expenditure to July 30, was $513.15.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have that item stand. The hon. member for East Simcoe is not here and he wants to speak on that.

Mr. FIELDING. This is only for repairs. There will be some other items.

Mr. BLAIN. When will these repairs be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. These piers are timber piers. This amount is departmental. The officers of the department have asked the department to put this amount in the estimates for the maintenance of this particular work. This year they have asked for this amount, with timber piers which are exposed to storms there is always apt to be a certain amount spent each year in the way of departmental expenditure.

Mr. BLAIN. That is all very well so far as it goes but it does not go very far. It seems to me that where a wharf requires repairs the department should make an estimate of what the repairs would cost and that amount having been expended it seems to me that no further amount would be required for some years. Is there any revenue from this pier ?

Mr. COPP. I think the gross revenue is about $4,000 and the net revenue $2,300 or $2,400. It is one of the best paying of them all.

Mr. INGRAM. I suggest that this item should stand.

Mr. FIELDING. As these items are grouped together, allowing one of them to stand, holds back all the rest. If it is desired to have an opportunity of discussing it on some future day we can do so on some other item, but the holding of any one holds them all. However, if the hon. gentleman wishes we shall allow it to stand.

Fort Lawrence landing pier, $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. We should have some information on this.

Mr. HYMAN. The work is under contract, the amount of the contract being $14,895, to which is added superintendence and contingencies bringing the estimated cost of the work to $16,400.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the contractor, what is the date of the contract and when will it be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract is dated June 2, 1903, and the date at which the contractors agreed to complete is June 2, 1904.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it expected that it will be completed then ?

Mr. HYMAN. That date had passed and the work is not completed but they are at work.

Georgeville, N.S.—wharf, extension, $1,500.

Mr. BLAIN. When will that extension be through ? Are you going to extend a little every year or every four or five years ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the chief engineer that they expect to have the wharf completed during the present season.

Mr. EARLE. Will that make a complete job of it ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Glace Bay, N.S.—harbour improvement, $25,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was considerable question about the title last year.

Mr. HYMAN. It is exactly in the same position now. The matter is before the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think it was behind the department. That question of title was to have been looked into.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not entirely familiar with the matter and have not had time to follow it up. It has not been finally dealt with.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will this be done by contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. I would not like to make a distinct promise. Regarding work of this kind the department must be governed by the advice of the engineer.

Mr. EARLE. On what do you base the estimate $25,000, if you have no report from your engineer ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a case in which the government and the company who own the harbour propose to co-operate in making the repairs. The plan proposed is that the company should undertake to perform the work and make this a public harbour, with a schedule of wharfage rates to be approved by the government. Many years ago this was quite a shipping point, but when the small mines became amalgamated with the large mines in Cape Breton, the company ceased shipping coal in Glace Bay. Since that time a large settlement, running into 20,000 people, has grown up within a radius of two or three miles, and the people are very anxious that the harbour should be opened and utilized for the shipping of coal and also for the bringing in of produce by vessel from different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I visited the locality since last session and saw the harbour. It is an artificial harbour and the ownership of the land is vested in a company. No doubt the work is very desirable, as there is a large community there and a great deal of business is done. We see rows of houses where only a few years ago there was a forest. The community is not only large but rapidly increasing and very progressive. The difficulty last year was as to the status of the harbour after the money of the country would be expended on it. The government were not able to state exactly what the arrangement would be in that regard, but it was the view of the Finance Minister that the harbour should be public so that all vessels would have the same right of entry as if it had been a natural harbour in the first instance instead of an artificial one, subject of course to the rights of private property in the wharfs or docks which might be constructed by private enterprise. Not only is the company interested, which proposes to bear part of the expense, but the people of the community are interested in giving to this harbour the status of public navigation.

Mr. FIELDING. The company have not been seeking this change at all. It is the people of the district who are most anxious to have their supplies brought by water direct instead of having them landed at Sydney or Louisburg and then transhipped by railway. The harbour will always be useful for the shipment of coal by vessels of small class. The difficulty has been in obtaining a title and nothing is finally decided. My idea was that if we could secure an arrangement with the company to have this harbour open to all, with a scale of wharfage rates fixed, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, that would meet all the requirements of the public. It was an agreement of that character which commended itself to my judgment, and that is the form in which it is to be hoped the arrangement will be made.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the same explanation as was given last year. When does the hon. gentleman expect the arrangement to be completed ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am consistent.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, but not very speedy in the discharge of a public duty. The government should be a little more active in the interests of the public. Do I understand that this harbour is owned by a coal company ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, at present.

Mr. BLAIN. Do the government purpose purchasing the property ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not exactly a purchase but the company are to enter into an arrangement under which, in consideration of the expenditure of this public money, the harbour should be to all intents and purposes a public harbour, to which all vessels would have the right of entry, just as if the harbour had been a natural one instead of an artificial in the first instance. That was the policy suggested last year, and the policy that I myself advocated. I do not think that any money should be expended unless an arrangement of that kind is brought about.

Mr. HYMAN. It is anticipated that the company will agree to spend a sum of money besides this. There have been negotiations between the company and the government, in fact they have been almost continuous.

I am almost sure we shall come to an arrangement.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total cost be to both the government and the other side ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will depend on whether the estimates of the department are satisfactory to the company. This is really one of the matters under negotiation between the company and the department at the present time—the amount of money the company shall be called upon to spend before the department enter upon an agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the estimated cost of the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Something over $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. These items are nearly all in the same category—in nearly every instance the money is a revote. Now, either the needs of the country demanded that these expenditures should be made, or they did not. If the expenditure was necessary, and the money was voted, it ought to have been spent ; if the expenditure is not necessary, the vote should never have been asked for, because money voted and held in this way can be used for only one purpose, and that is electioneering. I have no doubt that many of the items we voted last year were voted in view of a probable election. But it happened that the election was not held. So, we have none of the money spent. I would like to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this case do what he has done many a time in this Houes—direct the thunderbolts of his eloquence against this voting of money which was not intended to be spent, but only to be held out as a temptation to corrupt the people. The minister, in explaining these items, gives just about the same explanation as he gave last year—or, in some cases the year before, for some of these votes are re-voted for the second or third time. It reminds one of the story of the lady of uncertain years, who was asked by the census officer her age. And when he came back some years after, this same lady gave her age at exactly the same figure. When he remonstrated, she answered, 'I want you to understand, sir, that I am not the kind of girl that would tell one story one year and a different story another year.' That seems to be the principle upon which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works go. If we turn up 'Hansard' we find that, concerning these works, they told almost the same story in almost the same words last year and the year before.

Green Cove—boat harbour, $600.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county is this in ?

Mr. FIELDING. Victoria.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). This work is completed.

Hall's harbour—improvements, $2,500.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. FIELDING. King's county.

Iona—extension of wharf, $12,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract for $10,230. Adding the usual amount for superintendence and contingencies, we get a total of about $12,000 the amount of the vote.

Mr. EARLE. If you had the estimate of the engineer, how was it you asked only $5,000 last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. When a department asks for a vote of $5,000, that does not necesarily mean that that amount will complete the work for which it was voted. The sum of $5,000 was asked for because it was thought that that was all that could be spent in that season.

Indian Harbour—wharf, $12,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. FIELDING. Halifax.

Island Point—repairs to wharf, $800.

Mr. FIELDING. This is in Victoria county.

Janvrin's Island—wharf, $800.

Mr. FIELDING. In Richmond county.

L'Ardoise—extension of breakwater up to shore, $14,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is that under contract?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. KAULBACH. What is the amount ?

Mr. HYMAN. $24,820.

Mr. KAULBACH. When will it be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract calls for the completion by the end of the present calendar year.

Larry's river—breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is in Guysborough.

Mr. LENNOX. I noticed that last year $14,250 was voted—almost the whole amount. Is this vote necessary because the estimate is exceeded.

Mr. HYMAN. The contract for this work is $15,840. Allowing for contingencies and so on, and you have about the total amount voted for this work.

Mr. LENNOX. One would suppose that, if there was an estimate made of the cost of the work, instead of voting $14,250, and leaving $2,000 to be voted this year, the hon. minister would have asked the whole amount.

Mr. HYMAN. As I explained in the other case, that was the amount that could be spent during that year.

Mr. LENNOX. But, when the amount is so near the total, one would expect the whole sum to be voted. As a matter of fact what was the estimate ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was under contract last year.

Mr. LENNOX. Was the contract let before the vote of last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, it was let on 22nd of November, 1902.

Lingan—beach protection, $1,000.

Mr. HYMAN. In Cape Breton county.

Livingston's Cove—repairs to breakwater, $2,200.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county is that in ?

Mr. HYMAN. Antigonish.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does that complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

McNair's Cove breakwater—extension, $5,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Antigonish county.

Main à Dieu breakwater—extension, $5,000 ; harbour, $6,500.

Mr. FIELDING. In Cape Breton county.

Malignant Cove—close piling ends and sides of channel piers with creosoted piles, $2,800.

Mr. KAULBACH. Where is that ?

Mr. HYMAN. In Antigonish county.

Margaretsville—general repairs to harbour works and extension of eastern breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Annapolis county.

Meteghan Cove—restoration of breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Digby county.

Melbourne wharf, $900.

Mr. FIELDING. In Yarmouth county.

Middle River—shear dam, $1,000.

Mr. HYMAN. In Victoria county.

Neil's Harbour—breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Victoria county.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose at the close the minister will give us a summary of these counties, showing where each work is situated.

Mr. HYMAN. I think the hon. member for Lunenburg will be able to give that.

Mr. EARLE. At the same time he might supply us with a map of Nova Scotia, so that we might see if there are any of these coves that have not been supplied with a breakwater.

New Campbellton—ballast wharf in Kelly's Cove, $12,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Victoria county.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that work under contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. No ; there is some question about the site, and until that is settled the work will not be put under contract.

North Gut, St. Ann's—wharf at Morrison's Point, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Victoria county.

Ogden's Pond—to complete channel protection works, $500.

Mr. FIELDING. In Guysborough county.

Pembroke—breakwater, $8,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Hants county.

Mr. HYMAN. That is under contract, dated 28th March, 1904. We expect it will be completed in one year.

Mr. BLAIN. A few minutes ago the minister read a contract which called for completion more than a year ago.

Mr. HYMAN. That was the exception rather than the rule.

Pickett's Pier—reconstruction of, $3,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In King's county.

Pleasant Bay—wharf, $6,700.

Mr. FIELDING. In Inverness county.

Port Au Pique—wharf, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Colchester county.

Port Hastings—wharf, $4,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In Inverness county.

Port Hawkesbury—$10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract, and will be completed at the end of this season. It was to have been completed on the 11th September, 1903.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of the delay ?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). In getting the creosoted pine from Virginia.

Mr. McLENNAN. The work is in my county. The delay has arisen from the fact that the ruins of an old bridge and an old wharf were discovered quite a distance out in the Strait of Canso. These had to be removed by divers, which took a considerable length of time longer than the contractor expected ; in fact, he did not expect to meet such difficulties at all. The consequence was that the work took a great deal more time than was stipulated for.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the contractor has met with these difficulties, will he complete the contract for the amount mentioned in the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was a contract made for the removal of the crib-work and ballast my hon. friend speaks of for $2,900.

Mr. BLAIN. Was that contract made after the original contract was made ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman representing the county says that was to be included in the original contract.

Mr. McLENNAN. Not at all ; the hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the contractor met with these unforeseen difficulties. I suppose he was not looking for these difficulties. The fact of the new contract being made seems rather a peculiar way of doing business. Perhaps the hon. minister will give us an explanation on that point. I understand that after the original contract was let some difficulties were found that were not expected and a further contract was let.

Mr. HYMAN. That practically is the explanation. When the contract was let, there were some changes made in the work. It was found necessary to remove this old crib-work and ballast and a contract was made for the removal at $2,900.

Mr. BLAIN. Who was the contractor under the second contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. A. W. Girouard.

Mr. BLAIN. Were there two separate contractors ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not two separate contractors but two separate contracts.

Mr. BLAIN. Then this second contract was awarded to the same man ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if the engineers who gave an estimate on this work did not see that it would be required ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was not foreseen at the time the original contract was let.

Mr. EARLE. Have you the report of the engineers at hand ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. EARLE. There must be something very much at fault in regard to the engineering staff when we have so many errors of this kind occurring.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think they occur on many occasions.

Mr. EARLE. This is one.

Mr. HYMAN. It was on the report of the chief engineer that this contract was let.

Port Hood harbour—closing of northern entrance with brush and stone work, $20,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. minister the nature of the work that is being done there or which is to be done and whether or not there have been doubts expressed as to its fulfilling the service which it is designed to perform ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work that is being done is brush and stone work which is for the purpose of closing the northern entrance to the harbour. I am informed by the engineer that it is fulfilling the purpose for which it was designed. There are 600 feet already completed.

Mr. KAULBACH. This is between the island and the mainland ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that work being done by contract or by day labour ?

Mr. HYMAN. By day labour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the estimated cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work that it is intended to complete now is supposed to be completed by this $20,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have got some documents with me which give some information on the subject, but I shall take an opportunity on some other item of saying a few words in regard to it.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, upon any other item.

Port Maitland—extension of buttress on seaward side, western breakwater, shorewards, $1,500.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yarmouth.

Prospect wharf, $600.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Halifax.

Sandy Cove—breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Digby.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this to complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is to complete the work ?

Scott's Bay—extension of breakwater, &c., $1,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. King's.

Skinner's Cove—boat channel and protection works, $10,500.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Pictou.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that to complete the work and is it under contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is supposed to complete the work. The contract has not been let.

Spry Bay—wharf, $1,500.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Halifax.

Summerville wharf—addition, $1,600.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Hants.

Sydney quarantine station—extension and repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. HYMAN. Cape Breton county.

Tenecape—breakwater, $7,500.

Mr. HYMAN. Under contract.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hants county. Does this complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, not quite. This amount will be spent during the year and it will require $1,700 to complete.

Victoria Beach—wharf, $25,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A word or two in regard to that would be in order. This is in Annapolis county. Has anything been done there ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract was let for this work on the 15th June of the present year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the work been commenced ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the work has actually been commenced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a further sum in the supplementaries. The work will cost $93,890.

Mr. EARLE. What accommodation will it afford ?

Mr. WADE. This will afford accommodation for a great deal of shipping, but there is a railway being constructed down to this point and there will be more than one line of steamers running from this point to different places. In addition this pier will afford protection to the whole of the Annapolis basin and will be a protection for the shipping that comes into that basin.

Wedge Point—extension of breakwater, $3,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Where is Wedge Point ?

Mr. HYMAN. In Yarmouth county.

West Bay (south side)—wharf, $2,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Richmond.

White's Cove—improvements to breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Digby.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that complete Nova Scotia ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister to be good enough to give us a summary of these counties, the amount expended in each and the total amount voted for the province of Nova Scotia ?

Mr. HYMAN. If I understand the hon. gentleman he is asking for a statement of the votes as they appear in the estimates for each county. I shall be very glad to bring that statement down ; that is a statement of the votes in these estimates for each county.

Mr. BLAIN. For each county.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have avoided asking individual questions in order to save time. I would like also a statement in all cases in which the amount now asked for will not complete the work and a further statement of the amount that will be required to complete the work in such cases.

Mr. HYMAN. Although the return will require some time to prepare I shall be very glad to bring it down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Had I asked the question on each item I would expect the hon. gentleman to be able to answer it. It would save time to do it the way I suggest.

Mr. HYMAN. As I understand, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) desires a statement as to what each of those Nova Scotia items will take to complete, but where the vote completes the work you do not want a statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will understand that the items not mentioned will require no further vote.

Mr. HYMAN. You want it with reference to Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is not putting too much work on the officers of the department it would save a great deal of time if you would give that information with respect to all the other items.

Mr. HYMAN. Shall we now take up the Prince Edward Island estimates ?

Mr. TAYLOR. We have done a good deal of work to-night and there is no member from Prince Edward Island present, but there will be to-morrow morning.

Mr. HYMAN. The appropriations are so evenly divided and so just that I am sure there will be no criticism. I will be glad to leave one item on which any discussion may come up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is suggested that perhaps we might go on with Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR. Dr. Sproule has gone home with the idea that Ontario will not be reached.

Mr. HYMAN. Very well. I will move that the committee rise.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Justice will proceed with the Bills which stand in his name, and then we will go into supply and continue with the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 27th, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 161) respecting the Canadian Assessment Policy-holders in the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Heyd.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 148) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

On section 1,

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK Minister of Justice). This section is intended to amend section 24 of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, in respect that in so far as the electoral district of Algoma is concerned, the returning officer has the power to fix a date beyond the date fixed for the nomination of candidates and the holding of elections in other countries, if he deems it prudent in his discretion. By the Redistribution Act of last session, Algoma was divided into east and west Algoma, and the effect of the present amendment will be that the returning officer will have power to do with respect to the two ridings of east and west Algoma what he had the power to do with respect to Algoma as it originally stood. It makes the law applicable to the constituency as subdivided. The same thing will apply to British Columbia. There the counties of Burrard, Yale, and Cariboo, have been divided into Comox-Atlin, Kootenay and Yale-Cariboo. The electoral divisions mentioned in the Act now practically take in the territory covered by the old divisions in British Columbia. That is the only change except that to the list of counties in Ontario in which the returning officer may extend the time for voting we add the district of Nipissing, which I am informed is geographically in the same position as Algoma. It is a county covering a great area of country, and some portions of it are unorganized, so that the same conditions that prevail in Algoma apply to Nipissing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I regard the provisions of this section, as far as a number of these ridings are concerned, as absolutely unjustified. For example, in British Columbia, I have had time to get information about only one of these ridings, but I find that in the riding of Kootenay the provincial elections were held on the same day as in the rest of the province, without the slightest inconvenience, as I am informed. All portions of that riding are reached by rail or steamboat, and I am surprised that the Minister of Justice should present this measure to the House without giving some better reasons for postponing these elections than he has done. The mere fact that this has been done in the past is not of much consequence ; the question is what the conditions are at present. The country has not been standing still, so far as means of communication are concerned, during the last fifteen or twenty years, and in these districts there are better means of communication than there were before. So far as the two other ridings of British Columbia are concerned, I am not in a position to state their condition, but I shall require some good reasons to convince me that the elections should not be held there on the same day as in the rest of the province. It is not a sufficient reason to state that they are large districts. So far as Algoma and Nipissing in the province of Ontario are concerned, I believe that what I have stated with regard to one of the British Columbia districts is true of one of the Ontario districts —that the provincial election there is held on the same day as the general election.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which of them ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am informed that in the provincial elections the voting in Nipissing is held on the same day as in the other ridings. I am sure the Minister of Justice will regard that as a very cogent reason for carrying out the same policy in this Bill. I am not familiar with the riding of Algoma, but my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) will speak about that. He tells me that there are equally strong reasons why the election there should not be postponed. So far as the ridings in the province of Quebec are concerned, I would not presume to speak of them, not having a knowledge of the facts. The Minister of Justice, I am sure, will be good enough to

make an explanation to the House with regard to these. I am not objecting to this proposal in any case where it is necessary. But I say that there should be very strong, in fact imperative, necessity before any election is postponed. The principle we have followed in this country for more than a quarter of a century is to have all the elections throughout the country held on the same day ; and only for the gravest reasons should that rule be departed from.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. So far as Quebec is concerned, I can speak with some degree of personal knowledge. In the Gaspé district there has been absolutely no change within twenty years so far as facilities of communication are concerned. They have not a single railway within the whole district. The facilities for communication in summer have been somewhat improved, but not to such an extent as to allow the elections to take place under the same condition as in other parts of the province. In Chicoutimi and Saguenay there has been an increase in the facilities of communication. There is a railway which reaches Lake St. John and extends down to the town of Chicoutimi. But it is a very large district and there are many outlying parishes which are in quite an exceptional position. Therefore, I think that the conditions existing in these two districts are such as to justify the action I ask the House to take with regard to them. As to Nipissing, I am personally responsible for having added that district to the number which are treated exceptionally. Looking at the map and taking into consideration the position, I came to the conclusion that the district was not accessible. And, so far as one can judge by looking at the map, it seems to me that this is one of the constituencies which is in an exceptional position. But I am entirely in the hands of the committee so far as Nipissing is concerned. As to the division of Algoma, I merely apply the old law with the verbal changes made necessary by reason of the fact that that territory has been subdivided into east and west Algoma. If there are reasons as to one riding why the old law should not be made applicable, I am quite willing to listen to any objection that may be stated. As to the province of British Columbia, I would ask members from that province to explain the conditions there.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it will be agreed that the two ridings of east and west Algoma were formerly the one riding of Algoma. Now, the minister will find upon inquiry, that the government thought it wise and proper to have the elections in the district of Algoma in 1900 on the same day as the general election.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The provincial election ?

Mr. BENNETT. No, the Dominion election. The local elections are also held on the same day as in other ridings of the province. Surely, if the election for the whole district as one riding could be held on the same day as the general election in 1900, there is no reason why, now that it is divided, a change should be made. That must appeal to the hon. minister's sense of right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) I understand, speaks from his certain knowledge when he says that the election in 1900 in Algoma was held on the same day as the general election ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am very positive about that from something I recollect—I am confident I cannot be mistaken. If a returning officer could do the whole work for these two districts in 1900, and if one candidate could look after his interest for the whole district, surely, now that railway communication is improved and there is more accommodation in every way as well as a considerable addition to the number of settlers, the same course could be pursued in two districts with two returning officers and a double organization.

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to say a word or two respecting the electoral district of Nipissing. That district is described thus in the law :

> The territorial district of Nipissing, with the townships of Clara, Head and Maria, shall constitute the electoral district of Nipissing, and shall return one member.

The same territory constitutes exactly the ridings of east and west Nipissing for the local legislature. The elections for those ridings have always been held on the same day as the general election for the province of Ontario, and there has never been a complaint either in those districts or in any part of Ontario because the elections were so held. The Minister of Justice says that he is responsible for this change. I think it would be only fair for him to make inquiries about the district of Nipissing——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I will drop it.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. minister to say he will drop Nipissing from this section ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. How about Algoma ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I took Algoma because I found it in the statutes we had before. The other statute could not be made applicable to the changed state of things and therefore I included both east and west Algoma in this Bill. If the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says that he is in a position, of his own knowledge, to inform the House that the election of 1900 in Algoma was held on the same day

as the general election, of course I shall have to consider it.

Mr. BENNETT. I am positive that in 1896, the election in Algoma was held subsequent to the general election, and I am equally positive that in 1900 the election in Algoma was held on the same day as the general election.

Mr. BOYD. The Canadian Northern Railway has been constructed since the last election and runs directly through the western portion of the constituency, taking in Rainy River and all that territory, while the Canadian Pacific runs through the other portion. There is really no necessity for making an exception as to the date of holding the elections there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have a communication from a gentleman who is very familiar with that district, in which he says :

> In the old days, when it was the custom to hold the Algoma election later than the general election, there was good cause. It was impossible to give the notices required by law within the specified time. But now, it is different. The railway has opened it up and it is now just as easy to hold the election on the same day as the general election, as it is in any ordinary constituency in the east.

Mr. CLANCY. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that, even if there were any reason why the election in Algoma should be held on any other day than that of the general election, the difficulty would arise with regard to Manitoulin Island, which difficulty could only be at some seasons. If any reasons do exist for this provision, they can only apply to one riding and not to two.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In which of the ridings is Manitoulin Island ?

Mr. CLANCY. In East Algoma.

Mr. GALLIHER. With regard to the division of the district of Yale-Cariboo, the leader of the opposition is in error when he says there is no occasion for having the general election at different dates. I may state to my hon. friend, and I know something about the geography of that country, as well as the facilities for travelling through it, that it is a physical impossibility to have the next general election at the same time in what will be the district of Kootenay. There are nine local ridings in which the returning officer will have to act in the Dominion election ; that is to say, he will have to do the actual work of nine returning officers in a provincial election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman talking about Kootenay or Yale-Cariboo ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am talking about Kootenay for the moment. Now, in the election of 1900 we endeavoured as much as possible to give every voter an opportunity of voting, and we followed out the practice in the Dominion election of establishing polling places at the same points as in the provincial elections, so as if possible to give every person an opportunity of voting. I may state to my hon. friend that there are sections in that district that cannot be reached by rail or by steamer. For instance, you have all the Fire valley to travel through, you have other parts of the Trail district to travel through, and you have parts of the Lardo where you have to travel by teams, and any person who is acquainted with mountain roads must know that you cannot travel over them in the same space of time as you can country roads. Furthermore, a reference has been made to the election being held at the same time as the general election in what was the old riding of Yale-Cariboo. But the conditions then were absolutely different from what they are now. Then all the settlement was in the upper part of the district around Kamloops, and along the railway belt, and there was very little settlement in Kootenay. In fact, I believe that the few people who were residing in Kootenay then did not know there was an election until after it had taken place. That, I believe, is an actual fact. But this was in Mr. Mara's time, before I was elected. That country is settled up now. You must remember that you will have to travel probably 100 miles in one direction in order to deliver the ballot boxes. You cannot cross a range of mountains to reach another valley ; you have to retrace your steps to the central point, and take another direction. Any person who will take the trouble to study the physical features there must come to the conclusion that it is a physical impossibility for any returning officer, within the time between the nomination and election, as fixed by the Act, to do that work.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not have two returning officers for each district ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The Act provides for one for every district. The same remark applies to the Yale-Cariboo district, with equal force. There is no question, as I stated before, that it is a physical impossibility for the returning officer to do the work within the time.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to put the facts of the case before the leader of the opposition, who seems inclined to take the stand that the Dominion elections will have to be held upon the same day. The district of Comox-Atlin is 1,500 miles in length, as the crow flies, from the polling subdivision which will be at Squamish to Surprise Lake. If the election is held in the winter time, you will require a dog train to take up the polling boxes ; if in the summer time, you will require canoes to

take them up. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) has said it is a physical impossibility to hold an election in Kootenay in the time required by law, and it is equally impossible in Comox-Atlin. In fact it is more difficult in Comox-Atlin than in any other district, for the reason that the facilities for travelling are much more difficult. To illustrate by a case in point. On the occasion of the last election the returning officer went into the then district of Burrard—Comox-Atlin is a little larger than the district of Burrard—and he was obliged to travel five days with a dog team. He had first to travel on snowshoes to break a trail for the dog team to bring the ballot boxes in. It takes him almost fourteen days from the time he leaves. If he takes Nanaimo as the central point of Comox-Atlin, it would be a physical impossibility for him to get into Surprise Camp or to Atlin, as my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) can substantiate, in less than fourteen days.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I move that the words 'West riding of Algoma and Nipissing' be dropped from this section.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that with the idea of having Eastern Algoma subsequently ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Eastern Algoma is the most easily approachable, for the reason that a branch line of railway running along the north shore of the Georgian bay runs through a part of the riding, and then it is only a few miles further across to Manitoulin island. In the winter time you can shorten the distance by crossing on the ice. In summer there are numerous boats plying across to Manitoulin. There is a thorough system of telegraph lines all through that district, and a telephone system too, I am informed, on Manitoulin and on the north shore.

Amendment (Mr. Fitzpatrick) agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as the riding of Kootenay is concerned, I am not much impressed by the argument of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher), who I regret to observe has disappeared within the last moment. It is beyond doubt that it comprises nine provincial electoral districts, and an election was held in every one of these nine districts at the recent provincial election. In one of them, Columbia, there was an election by acclamation, in the other eight there were contests. I am informed on the authority of a gentleman whom I know very well, and who is absolutely reliable, that there was no inconvenience whatever experienced in holding all these elections on the same day as the elections in the rest of the provinces. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo dwells on the fact that this district comprises nine provincial electoral districts. The Minister of Justice will remember the riding of Alberta. That comprises eight or ten territorial electoral districts. We never found it necessary to postpone that election. We had the whole of the Northwest Territories divided into four electoral districts. We have never found it necessary to postpone the elections in these. Why should there be any necessity for postponing the elections in these districts in British Columbia ? The means of communication in British Columbia are just as good as they are in the Territories. The physical difficulties of crossing the mountains may be greater, but as far as the roads are concerned I do not think there is any great difference between the conditions in those two ridings of British Columbia and the conditions as they were in the Northwest Territories years ago when we held elections at the same time as in other ridings in the Dominion. It seems to me that there should be an irresistible case made out before the elections in any of these ridings should be postponed. Yale-Cariboo is large, Kootenay is large, but so also are the districts in the Northwest Territories ; so are also many districts in Ontario, where the elections are held on the same day as those in the rest of the Dominion. All through the provinces we have conditions of that kind. If you have an active returning officer, and if you empower him to use the means which may be at his disposal, I think there should be no difficulty of holding these elections on the same day as in the rest of the country. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) did not say very much about his own riding. He devoted his attention more particularly to Comox-Atlin and Kootenay.

Mr. GALLIHER. I spoke of Kootenay and I said that my remarks would apply equally well to Yale-Cariboo.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have spoken of Kootenay, and my remarks will also apply to Yale-Cariboo. I do not see why the elections in these ridings should not be held on the same day as those in the rest of the country and the absence of any special argument in regard to his own riding should be the best reason for believing that the hon. gentleman does not entertain any very strong views upon the subject. I trust the hon. Minister of Justice will not place a blot upon the statute-book by postponing the elections in these ridings unless he is absolutely convinced that it is necessary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The blot is there unfortunately and we are trying to remove it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The blot is not there except under certain conditions, whereas, this is a blot under present conditions. May I ask whether the elections in the Chicoutimi and Saguenay district are postponed under the provincial law ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that if the elections take place in the summer time as

far as Chicoutimi and Saguenay are concerned the voting takes place on the same day. It has taken place on the same day. But if in the winter time I imagine, if there is any justice to be done to the electors, it would be physically impossible to have the election held on the same day as elsewhere, because you have to go all over the riding in sleighs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is it in provincial elections ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is the same as in Dominion elections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are they postponed in these three ridings ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. My hon. friend of course, understands the geographical conditions existing in Gaspé. Gaspé is at the extreme eastern end of the peninsula. It is absolutely inaccessible except in summer time by boat and in winter time by sleigh. As far as Chicoutimi and Saguenay are concerned my hon. friend will remember that the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay takes in the Lake St. John region, the Saguenay river and the whole north shore of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am quite ready to accept the assurance of my hon. friend as to that, but as far as the east riding of Algoma is concerned and as far as these British Columbia constituencies are concerned, particularly Kootenay, I am very strongly of the opinion that they should not be pressed. I would even ask the hon. Minister of Justice to delay for twenty-four hours to make inquiry.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think he would be satisfied that there is no real necessity for postponing the elections in at least two of them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like at the same time to hear all that could be said in favor of the objection that is made to this proposal so that I may be in a position to have all the information obtainable on the subject. I would like to know all that can be said because I must confess that to a large extent I was guided in regard to the east riding of Algoma by what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) said as to the difficulties of getting access to the island of Manitoulin.

Mr. CLARKE. When the distinction was made in respect of the holding of elections in Algoma there was no railway communication at all. This is one of those provisions that was allowed to remain upon the statute-book when it should have been removed. Algoma is just as accessible as many other districts in the province of Ontario. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs along the north shore of Lake Superior and there is no difficulty in getting to Manitoulin now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What about the autumn and spring ?

Mr. CLARKE. There is no trouble reaching the Manitoulin island during the period when navigation is opened. After navigation closes there is access from the north shore at Little Current and there is I believe abundant means of communication with eastern Algoma, just as there are with western Algoma. There is no trouble in reaching western Algoma.

Mr. SPROULE. In eastern Algoma there are only a few weeks in the spring and fall during which there is any danger connected with reaching the island of Manitoulin ; that is in the spring when the ice is breaking up and in the fall when the water is freezing over. That usually takes about two or three weeks. The distance is very short and when the ice is formed there is no difficulty in getting to the island. In the spring of the year up to the time that the ice breaks up it is an easy matter to get to Manitoulin island and when on Manitoulin island the roads will be found to be as good as the ordinary roads of the country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Two or three weeks in the spring and autumn might make a very considerable difference. If the elections were held in the spring or the autumn it would make a material difference. My hon. friends opposite must remember that this power is only discretionary with the returning officer. He is not under any obligation to postpone the election. This is only intended to confer upon him the power to exercise his discretion in view of the conditions existing at the time the election is held. Of course, the returning officer would necessarily be a man upon whom we could rely and who would not postpone the elections if there was not necessity for it.

Mr. CLANCY. I perhaps did not make myself clear to the hon. Minister of Justice. I did not urge that there was any reason why there should be a different period for holding the election in East Algoma but what I said was that if there were reasons, and there were at that time, they would apply to both east and west Algoma since they had been divided. The hon. gentleman knows that the Rainy River district which has been made into one riding and east and west Algoma were all contained in the district of Algoma formerly and that if the same reasons existed as formerly for holding the elections on a different day these two ridings of east and west Algoma would not be subject to them now. But, as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) points out there is no good reason that would apply to even East Algoma now as compared with any other riding in the province. The hon. Minister of Justice has stated that this

power is discretionary with the returning officer but I want to point out to him, that, notwithstanding the fact that the elections in 1900 were held on the 7th November, at a time when Algoma was perfectly accessible, as much so as in June, the election there was held on a different date. Therefore, the returning officer takes the law as mandatory rather than being a merely discretionary power placed in his hands.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In Chicoutimi and Saguenay the elections were held on the same day in 1900 as in other districts, because they were practically held in the summer time.

Mr. BENNETT. I was in error in saying that in 1900 the election in Agloma was held on the 7th of November ; I find it was held a week subsequently. It would appear to me that the reasons for holding the election in East Algoma on the same day, are stronger than with regard to West Algoma.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My only reason for insisting is because of the Manitoulin islands. Would my hon. friend direct his attention to that ?

Mr. BENNETT. The most remote part of the islands is, I think, Little Current, and that is a trifling distance from the main shore ; in fact you can see right across.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In some places it is only 100 yards.

Mr. BENNETT. There are little islands in between and the water freezes over early in the fall and the ice remains late in spring, so that it is usual to have uninterrupted communication to every point. The town of Sault Ste. Marie is in East Algoma and the local elections were held in that district on the same day. The Manitoulin islands are one of the most accessible places in Ontario ; and I remember well that the first returns that came in last election were from these ridings.

Mr. GALLIHER. In view of what the leader of the opposition has further said in regard to Yale-Cariboo and the Kootenay districts, I wish to place the facts before the House. The Kootenay riding is curved out as a subdivision of Yale-Cariboo which I now have the honour to represent, and which after the next election I hope to continue to represent.

Mr. LOGAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I shall direct my remarks particularly to the Kootenay, and they will apply to the new division of Yale-Cariboo. I am informed that the leader of the opposition stated that in the nine ridings the provincial election was held on the same day. That is quite true, but the hon. gentleman must see that the one federal returning officer, in order to establish polling places and to give facilities to the electors to vote, would have to do the same amount of travelling as the nine separate returning officers did in the provincial elections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the practice in British Columbia that the returning officer must travel over the whole riding ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not the practice in my province. The returning officer sits in his office in the city of Halifax and makes arangements over the whole constituency, which has many miles of seacoast without any railway, and he never has had any difficulty.

Mr. GALLIHER. What about the distribution of the ballots between nomination and election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He sends them out by messengers to his deputy returning officers.

Mr. GALLIHER. I can only speak of what took place in the Yale-Cariboo election. There is no question, but that it is a physical impossibility for any one man to get over that district in the time unless you give him wings. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) knew the district as I do, he would realize that. The returning officer has to appoint his deputies, and swear them in and give his instructions to them personally, and he cannot do that as it can be done in other constituencies. Personally I would not object to having the election on the same date as the other elections, but I know it is a physical impossibility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the election held last time ?

Mr. GALLIHER. On the 6th of December, about a month after the general election. I am well acquainted with the district and with the means of egress and ingress, and I will be frank with my hon. friend. There are many mining camps where there are fifty or a hundred men who could not vote unless they had a polling place. It is neither fair nor just to ask them to travel from the camp and lose a whole day going to vote. They have an opportunity of voting in the local election, and they should not be deprived of it in the Dominion election. In the matter of settlement and in the matter of places to be reached to establish polling places, the conditions are entirely different from what they were ten years ago when every one knows that the population in the mining camps was very sparse. My hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) can speak as to the Atlin district, but I know as regards Yale-Cariboo that it is simply a physical impossibility to cover that district in the time provided.

Mr. BROCK. It is most extraordinary that commerce has overcome the difficulties which are spoken of by gentlemen on

the other side of the House. Commercial men have been going through the constituency of Yale-Cariboo regularly, and not carrying a bundle of papers either, but ten or fifteen heavy trunks.

Mr. GALLIHER. On a pullman car.

Mr. BROCK. The whole country is traversed by commerce and it is very hard to make a merchant believe that there is any physical impossibility in getting through that country. The fact of the matter is that we have post offices, telegraph offices, and telephone offices scattered pretty generously through that territory.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we could only vote by telegraph it would be most convenient.

Mr. BROCK. If the people want to vote they will have no difficulty in voting. The hon. gentleman from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) has told us that one election was over before the people knew there was an election at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. I say so again.

Mr. BROCK. Commerce has shown you how to get through that country and how to get through it regularly. Even in Gaspé about which the Minister of Justice speaks so much, the conditions are wonderfully changed as compared with fifty or a hundred years ago.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Brock) has now got me on ground with which I am familiar. In what respect have the conditions changed ?

Mr. BROCK. Ask the Quebec merchant how he deals with that country now as compared with the conditions fifty years ago, and he will tell you that he has his commercial travellers all through the district, and that there are a multiplication of post offices there. Could the returning officer not send the deputy returning officers all the papers by mail, and inform them about the election ? The argument in favour of the principle of having all these elections on the one day, far outweighs any difficulties that might be presented on the other side, and the government should drop this Bill. There may be some injustice done, but that occurs in every act of administration, and the injustice that would be done by holding the elections on the same day is far less than the injustice of making these exceptions which really make it look as if you were providing certain openings for defeated candidates.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That might have been the reason formerly, but we are trying to remedy it now.

Mr. BROCK. The remedy is in the hands of the government because they can fix the elections on any day they like, and they can give notice sufficiently far in advance to afford facilities for voters in these outlying districts. Give the notice a few days earlier, and all the elections can be held on the same day. So far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we are ready for the elections when they may come. But, in view of the failure of the hon. member (Mr. Galliher) to make out a case for his own constituency, I think the government should drop this Bill, and stand on the principle of uniformity. North of Lake Superior and the Georgian bay at one time we had no post offices, telegraph offices or railroads. This is all changed. You would be surprised to know that the people up there now read the daily papers. I hope the people out in Cariboo are becoming educated enough to read a weekly paper, at any rate. The hon. gentleman should supply them, and let them know when an election is coming on. But apart from that, the great question in this country is, when we shall have the elections; and the Prime Minister should name the day far enough ahead so that we can have them in the whole country on the same day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is evidently quite unaware of the difficulty which we have to deal with. My hon. friend must not imagine that by giving a year's notice of the elections we could help the difficulty we are now confronted with. The difficulty is this. There are certain things which have to be done after nomination day : the ballot boxes, the ballot papers, the electoral lists and the instructions have to be distributed. There are only eight days under the law between nomination day and polling day ; and the difficulty arises with respect to those electoral districts in which the physical conditions are such that it is impossible to make the distribution within that time. If my hon. friend's information with respect to Algoma is not more accurate than it is with respect to Gaspé, then I would not place on his information in this respect that reliance which I generally place on what he says in this House. So far as Gaspé is concerned, suppose the nomination takes place at Percé, at the extreme eastern limit of the peninsula, and it is necessary to send the ballot boxes up to Ste. Anne des Monts or Cap Chatte, I would like my hon. friend to tell me how, after the 1st of December, when navigation is closed, it will be possible to do it in eight days ?

Mr. BROCK. By notifying the men whom you appoint as returning officers in the different istricts to be at the nomination and take their ballot boxes home with them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend had them there, and provided them with relays of horses at every ten miles, they could not do it in eight days. That is a fact about which there is no doubt. In the

first place, along two-thirds of the coast there are no roads, and you have to use dogs if you get along at all. On the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in Chicoutimi and Saguenay, you have to go from Tadousac, at the mouth of the Saguenay river, to Blanc Sablon, on the Labrador coast, and how are you going to do it in eight days? It is a physical impossibility.

Mr. BROCK. If you have a will you can do it.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no reason why the nomination should be held at the extreme limit of the constituency. The law says it shall be held as near the centre as possible, and three poll clerks may be appointed as well as one to distribute the ballot boxes and the papers. As a matter of fact, in the province of Ontario, the ballot boxes are usually held by the various municipalities, and are not required to be taken from one centre to another. The provincial ballot boxes are used.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That explains many things. We are getting light now. If the ballot boxes are not under the control of the returning officers, but are distributed around, we had better look after them.

Mr. SPROULE. That has been the case for years. The ballot boxes in most cases are owned by the municipalities and are not in the possession of the returning officers. Where the municipality cannot furnish the ballot boxes, the returning officer is bound to furnish them. But the rule is that the same ballot boxes are used for provincial, Dominion and municipal elections.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say anything about what is done in Ontario, because I am not there; but subsection d of section 41 of the Act requires that 'the returning officer shall deliver to each deputy returning officer, two days at least before the polling day, a blank poll book, forms of oaths to be administered to voters, envelopes, sealing wax and a ballot box.'

Mr. SPROULE. Let me tell the hon. gentleman how he does it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything laughable or absurd about it? The only thing absurd is the ignorance of the laugh. The election clerk gets the ballot boxes from the clerk of the municipality, and after they are used he returns them to the municipality. They are gathered up and distributed by the election clerks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is very improper.

Mr. HOLMES. There is another point that has been overlooked by our hon. friends opposite, that is, that the ballot papers are not printed until after the official nomination; and, as a general rule, it takes two days to print the ballot papers before they can be given to the returning officer.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has had experience—I would not venture to explain why.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the larger districts the returning officer never attempts to distribute all the ballot boxes and papers himself. He delegates that power to others, which I think the law permits him to do. Either the election clerk or some other person is employed by the returning officer to make the distribution. In the outlying counties what is to hinder the returning officer employing half a dozen men, if necessary, to cover the whole ground? Where there is a will there is a way.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no difficulty about his employing others if he chooses. His obligation is to deliver to each returning officer the ballots, the lists and the ballot boxes. When the distances are so great that after the ballots are printed he cannot do that within the eight days, what is going to be the result? If he cannot reach every polling division in the whole district within the eight days, is that not sufficient reason for postponing the election?

Why should any group of men be deprived of their right to vote? Is it not fair to say that if the conditions existing at the time the elections are held are such that any important group in the community may be deprived of the right to vote that the returning officer shall have power to postpone the election in order to give these men the right to vote, especially as this provision is restricted to two or three counties in the province? So far as Ontario is concerned the only district added is East Algoma, and the contention of my hon. friends opposite is that this provision is not necessary for that constituency. I have heard nothing on this side in support of the contention; nobody on this side seems to be interested in the question of whether the election be held on the same day or on a subsequent day. I shall take into consideration what my hon. friends opposite say, but I want to point out that it is not a case of whether all parts of one island are accessible, but whether all parts of the constituency are accessible. Suppose the elections are held in the autumn or spring there might be difficulty.

Mr. BENNETT. Manitoulin island is a very old settled district. Farmers have been living there for years and there is a splendid system of municipal organization. The island is almost connected with the main shore and there will be no difficulty in traversing it at any season of the year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If there is no difficulty, if the thing can all be done within the eight days, then I will have to consider the propriety of dropping the provision as

to East Algoma as I did that with regard to the west riding. So far as Quebec is concerned, I know what I am talking about because I have been about the country and know it. All that is necessary is to take a map for instance of the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay and look at the distance from Tadousac to Blanc Sablon. It must be 150 miles and there is a dog trail for most of the road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall not dispute with my hon. friend about the province of Quebec; he knows more about it than I do, and I am willing to accept his assurance. In regard to Ontario I find, according to the statutes of 1887 the latest I was able to get in the library, that all the provincial elections took place on the same day, and I understand from Ontario members that the same thing is done under the statutes of 1897. If that is so I am sure the Minister of Justice would recognize that it is not necessary to have this extension.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If that is so there is no reason for our making an exception.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as Yale-Cariboo is concerned, let me say that if the mode of procedure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) seems to think should be followed by returning officers were generally adopted about two-thirds of the constituencies in Canada would require to have the elections postponed. He seems to argue that the returning officer himself should go to every deputy returning officer and deliver the boxes and ballots and administer the oath. This is not done. It is not done in my own county, it could not be done in Halifax. If it was done, Halifax would require to be in the excepted list. We have 100 miles to the east with no railways, and 40 miles to the west with no railways, and it would be a physical impossibility for the returning officer to go over that county and visit every district between nomination and polling. The returning officer sends to some of these polling districts a messenger, and for many other districts he has the deputy come to Halifax and personally receive from him the ballot boxes and ballots. I see no reason why the same procedure should not be followed in the constituencies in British Columbia. How shall we say that any one of these is any more difficult to traverse than one of the great constituencies of the west before they were recently divided.

Mr. GALLIHER. I can say it because I speak from knowledge. I know the province and my hon. friend does not, I think, know as much about the Yale-Cariboo as I do. I do not think any man in the House does. I know the district and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. R. L BORDEN. I am not disposed to dispute that for a moment, although the argument the hon. gentleman used a moment ago would seem to indicate that he is not familiar with the mode of procedure in reference to ballot boxes. So far as the physical conditions of the district are concerned, I concede at once that he knows a great deal more than I do. It has been divided since the last election into two districts. How many times has it to be subdivided before the elections there can be held on the same date as the elections in the rest of the Dominion of Canada? How long is this to be kept up? I found very good travelling facilities in that country when I went through it, good steamboats and good railroad trains and I had no difficulty in making progress through the district at a fairly rapid rate. I do not think my hon. friend would be inclined to ask for delay on the ground that the district is in a very backward and uncivilized condition. I did not find it backward or uncivilized; I found it progressive and well equipped for travelling.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think I will dispute that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend will not dispute that? Well, he practically abandons his case.

Mr. GALLIHER. Oh, no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because all we require is that there shall be a deputy returning officer, who by means of messengers or by requiring his deputy returning officer to come to him shall distribute his ballot boxes and ballots within the period between nomination day and election day. Why cannot the returning officer use exactly the same polling districts and polling places as those which were established in the recent provincial election? Ought there to be any difficulty about that? One would not suppose that if there were any real desire on the part of the returning officer to accomplish this within the time mentioned that he would have the slightest difficulty in doing so. My hon. friend is very confident about coming back. So far as he is personally concerned I would like to see him here, but perhaps not, from another standpoint.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think I was egotistical enough to speak in that way. I said I hoped that I would have the honour of being returned. I think a man may modestly say that he hopes he will come back to this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If he is coming back we would like to have him back as early as possible and therefore to have the election as early as possible. Of course we will endeavour to console ourselves if he does not, hoping that we might see him occasionally, but if he is to come back we hope we may see him at the earliest possible moment, and therefore there is every reason from his own standpoint why we should

have the election on the same day as they are held in other parts of Canada.

Mr. OSLER. Is not Yale-Cariboo the mining camp where they play poker for 150 votes ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Order, order.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have no doubt they can play poker in some of the mining camps in Yale-Cariboo.

Mr. BENNETT. The national game.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, the national game. I hope the leader of the opposition does not think that it is not purely from a desire to give to every person and to every part of that district, whether to the miners in the mining camps or to those along the direct line of railway and steamboat which my hon. friend travelled very comfortably, an opportunity to vote that I am taking the position I now take. I certainly want to give every man entitled to vote an opportunity of voting. I therefore want to have every facility granted to these men whether they be working as miners in a mining camp even although it be very remote as some of these camps are. There is no question about the fact that while we are civilized and advanced in British Columbia as far as means of travel are concerned, there are many mining camps in the mountains miles and miles away from these means of transportation, and I want to see these men have an opportunity to cast their vote whether they vote for me or against me. The vote is their own privilege and they have a right to vote for whoever they please. Now, it is all very well to say in general terms : We see no reason why this should not be done. Why the elections should not be held here at the same time as the other elections. Personally I have no interest in postponing it. In fact, if you wish to know my personal preference, I would rather face the fight on the day of the general election than later. But I am instructed, and I know, that it is a physical impossibility to have this election on the same day as the others. I have stated that two or three times already. I do not know how often this district must be subdivided to bring it down to the same position as other constituencies in regard to holding the elections, but I know that though it has been subdivided, it still covers a vast area. It has been said that there are constituencies of great area in the Northwest. That is true, but the conditions are altogether different. From any point in these constituencies in the Northwest you can strike off to any other point. But you cannot do that in a mountain district. You may travel fifty, a hundred or even two hundred miles in one direction to reach a certain point. From there, you cannot cut across the mountain range to a point that may be only twenty miles away, for there is no means of communication. The only thing you can do is to go back to the starting point and strike off at another angle. I do not know why we should have to repeat these things. They are facts, and facts that anyone knows who has travelled through the mining regions. Many points you can reach comfortably in a parlour car or in the cabin of a nice steamer, travel such as the leader of the opposition, like myself, has frequently indulged in up and down that country. But when you get away from the points reached by these means of communication, the travelling is very different indeed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to read to my hon. friend a statement that has been sent to me by a gentleman in that district. It differs from the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher). I do not know whether my information is under a misapprehension or not. Probably my hon. friend would say he is :

The Kootenay district according to Representation Act, 1903, section 2 of the British Columbia division of that Act, provides that the electoral district of Kootenay shall comprise the provincial electoral districts of Cranbrook, Columbia, Fernie, Kaslo, Nelson, Revelstoke, Rossland, Slocan and Ymir. As far as I can see, and all others here agree upon the point, there is no physical reason for postponing the election for this district to any later date than that of the general election. We had a general provincial election in 1903 for the same districts and the election was held in all these districts on the same day. No inconvenience whatever was experienced thereby, and, inasmuch as the Dominion elections will be upon the same lists and with the same polling places, there is absolutely no excuse for making the change. In the Columbia electoral district there was no poll held, inasmuch as the member was elected by acclamation. But an election took place in all the others. Each one of these districts is reached by rail or steamer. The means of communication are good, and in fact the returns were in from every point, with the possible exception of one or two small polls, on the night of the election.

If that is a correct statement of the facts, I do not think there is any adequate reason for postponing the election in this district.

Mr. GALLIHER. Who wrote that letter ?

Mr. BORDEN. It is not a confidential letter, and I do not think the gentleman who wrote it would have the slightest objection to my making known his name. It is from Mr. A. H. MacNeil, K. C., of Rossland, to whom I wrote for information.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is nothing there except what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has repeated. It is stated that every district is reached by rail or steamer. It is true that probably some portion of every district is reached by rail or steamer, but there are points in these districts that cannot be reached in that way. As I said, you have to go by team to the end of the settlement, and from one point you cannot strike across to another even though it is only ten or

fifteen miles away, but must retract your steps and strike off at another angle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend agree that the returns from all these districts except one or two were in on the night of the election ?

Mr. GALLIHER. That is probably true. But my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows that returns can be sent by telephone or telegraph from places which could not be reached by driving except with great expenditure of time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, if you have the means of communication by telephone or telegraph, cannot you bring in your deputy returning officer on the day of nomination and send him out with the ballot box ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Of course, you can reach a man by telephone or telegraph if those means of communication exist, but—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) is not very much in earnest.

Mr. GALLIHER. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not care to have the election postponed. But I am told that it is impossible to hold it on the day of the general election, and I know it is impossible.

Progress reported.

REPRESENTATION ACT 1903—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 149) to amend the Representation Act of 1903—Mr. Fitzpatrick—was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of this ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is to correct a clerical error. When the Bill was prepared last session an Act of the Ontario legislature 1901 was overlooked. It was one of a series of Acts which are passed each year by the legislature of Ontario, entitled 'Acts to amend the Statute Laws.' They are amendments to various statutes and especially this Act in question has reference to the Ontario Territorial Divisions Act, chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes. The amendment consists in shifting the boundary between the provisional judicial districts of Algoma and Thunder Bay, twenty minutes westward from eighty-five degrees west longitude to eighty-five degrees, twenty minutes. The effect of that I cannot realize myself, but it was in order to make our description of that territorial division agree with the territorial division as described in the local statute.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be difficult to tell what the effect really is. The hon. gentleman has no doubt looked into it ; is he prepared to say if it affects the population ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Territorially it will make a very trifling difference, I could not say how much. Twenty minutes is not much.

Mr. CLANCY. It depends upon how fast the hon. gentleman travels.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I know nothing about it except that the gentleman who is responsible for it in my department, Mr. Fraser, drew my attention to the fact that we had overlooked this Ontario Act of 1901, and told me it was important to make the definition in our Representation Act agree with the territorial description given in the Ontario Act. My hon. friend can take my word for it that there is nothing serious in it.

Mr. SPROULE. It is assuming that this description is exactly the same as in the Provincial Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to suggest that as the government are getting out maps of each constituency it would be desirable if they would prepare a map of these constituencies so that we might examine them before the Bill is finally passed.

On section 1,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Sections 7 and 8 of the Representation Act slipped into their present position where they are now, by mistake. Hon. gentlemen who may have a copy of the Act will see that in chapter 60 of the Act of last session, sections 7 and 8 form part of the beginning of the Act and therefore apply to all that comes after it ; that is to say, 7 and 8 will apply to all the schedules for all the provinces because they are at the beginning of the Act. Section 7 says :

> The limits of every electoral district bounded by a river extend to the middle of that river.
>
> 8. The nearness of an island or islet to an electoral district is measured by the relative distance between either side of the island or islet and the shore of the opposite electoral district.

These two sections are taken from the Quebec Act, Revised Statutes, Quebec, chapter 2, sections 67 and 68. The intention was to put these two sections at the head of the Quebec schedule so that they would apply exclusively to Quebec. There is no reason why they should apply to any other province because the electoral divisions of the other provinces are regulated upon different lines. But so far as Quebec is concerned the limits of the electoral district, where it is bounded by a river, extend out to the middle of the river, which is the boundary ; and when there are islands or

islets in a river separating two electoral districts the island or islet is counted with the electoral district to which it is nearest. There is no reason why these sections should apply to all the provinces, and it may create confusion; there is every reason why it should apply to Quebec because it is part of our municipal organization.

On section 3,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I propose to amend that so it shall read as follows:

(f.) For the purpose of defining the constitution and boundaries of the counties mentioned in paragraph (a) and sub-paragraphs 10, 11, 15 and 16 of paragraph (c), of subsection 3 of section 3 of the Representation Act, chapter 6, of the Revised Statutes, the said paragraph and sub-paragraphs respectively shall be read and construed as if the words 'Section 1 of' in each of these paragraphs were struck out.

My hon. friend will understand the meaning of this by examining the statutes of Canada of 1886.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would take a little while to work it out.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Here is the point. Perhaps my hon. friend will be better able to appreciate it after I have made my explanation. I do not intend to ask that the Bill shall go beyond the committee stage at this sitting. The Representation Act, 1886, chapter 6, of the Revised Statutes, section 3, defines the limits of each electoral district in the province of Quebec. In the province of Quebec the counties of Ottawa, &c.

As they were respectively constituted on the thirty-first of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, section one of chapter seventy-five, of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, shall each be an electoral district and shall each return one member.

That is to say that these divisions as constituted under section 1, of the old Revised Statutes of Lower Canada shall each return one member. Then they go on to describe other counties which they say are constituted as they were constituted under section 1 of the old statute. Speaking generally, therefore, all the provisions of the old statute are applicable to all the other counties except these and three or four others, for instance, Quebec county which is my own county as it was constituted on the 31st January, 1861, by section 1 of chapter 75 of the Consolidated statutes for Lower Canada. The same thing applies to Lotbinière, Bellechasse and Beauce.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought they had included all these counties in the first general statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, they included in the first general statement Ottawa, Pontiac, Hochelaga, Jacques Cartier, Laval, Vaudreuil, Soulanges, Laprairie, Chambly, Richelieu, Yamaska, Maskinongé, St. Maurice, Champlain, Montmorency, and others, only a certain number of them. Then they go on and distinguish. I would like to point out the difficulty that results from that. The old statute of Lower Canada, chapter 75, section 1 provides:

The counties, cities and towns hereinafter mentioned, shall be the subdivisions of Lower Canada upon which the representation of the people thereof in the legislature shall be based; and the said counties are those intended for all purposes in these Consolidated Statutes and in the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, except only where it is otherwise expressly provided, either in the said Consolidated Statutes or in some local or special Act remaining in force and applicable to the subject of the enactment, that is to say:

Then they go on to give a description of the different districts. Then section 2 of the statute provides that:

All augmentations or gores of parishes, townships or seigneuries, and all cities, towns, villages or reserves for the same, not specially mentioned in this Act, shall be considered as forming part of the county in which the principal part of such locality or in the immediate vicinity of which, such city, town, village or reserve is situate, unless it be otherwise ordered by some statute in force, for any purpose or purposes.

Then it goes on:

Wherever both banks of any river in Lower Canada are in any district or county, there the river itself is within such district or county:

2. Wherever one bank of any river is in one district or county and the opposite bank is in another, there the centre of the main channel of the river is the boundary between the two districts or counties, each of which extends to the centre of such main channel;

3. And wherever any river or portion of a river is in the county, it is also within the district of which such county forms part.

All these things are provided for in sections 2 and 3 particularly of the consolidated statutes of Quebec, chapter 75 and are applicable to all the counties except those that are constituted under section 1. The effect of the amendment is that in the province of Quebec, where we have only 65 members and where the number does not change, the counties shall be the same counties as were constituted under the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada by section 1, chapter 75.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That results from the provision made in the statute that certain districts settled from time to time shall become part of the counties which they adjoin? That is exactly the idea. I see that you simply strike out section 1.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. Sections 7 and 8 are not mentioned, because we constitute the counties under the old Conso-

lidated Statutes for Lower Canada. In view of the fact that in our province we have only 65 constituencies and that they remain the same we retain the old division as we had it previous to confederation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is really for the purpose of making the law as we understand it already ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As we understand it now.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4,

Paragraph 5 of that part of the said schedule which deals with the province of New Brunswick is repealed, and the following paragraphs are substituted therefor :—

'5. The electoral district of Victoria shall, as heretofore, consist of the counties of Victoria and Madawaska, and shall return one member.

6. Each of the remaining counties of the province shall form an electoral district and shall return one member.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A mistake was made in the New Brunswick schedule, it having been overlooked that the old county of Victoria had been divided by a provincial Act into the two counties of Victoria and Madawaska and that these two counties have since that date formed the electoral district of Victoria, which is entitled to return one member. It will be seen that under the schedule as it now stands there would on account of this mistake appear to be 14 electoral districts in the province each entitled to return one member, whereas the province is only entitled to 13 members.

On section 5,

The said schedule is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following :—

'THE YUKON TERRITORY.

'The Yukon Territory shall form an electoral district, to be called the electoral district of Yukon, and shall return one member.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was omitted.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that before the Bill is read the third time the hon. minister is to furnish a map of Algoma so as to ascertain whether the limits as described are correct or not.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

ARBITRATION WITH THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 152) respecting an arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada (Mr. Fitzpatrick) read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BARKER. What are the questions that will arise on this arbitration, and under what circumstances have the disputes arisen ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In 1879 the government originally purchased that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway extending from Rivière Du Loup, 110 miles below Quebec, to a place called Hadlow on the shores of the St. Lawrence almost opposite the city of Quebec. The road extended at the south side of Lévis up to a point called Chaudière curve, and then came down again towards the city of Quebec on the south side of the St. Lawrence to Hadlow Cove. From Hadlow to a place called South Quebec, there is a piece of line that also belongs to the Grand Trunk Railway, but that piece between Hadlow and Quebec South remained the property of the Grand Trunk Railway. At a subsequent period it was decided to build a branch line extending from St. Charles on the line of the old Grand Trunk purchased in 1879, down to a place called Harlaka Junction, thence from Harlaka Junction on to the town of Lévis, and from the town of Lévis to a place called South Quebec. It will be borne in mind that there are two links there from South Quebec to Hadlow, one the property of the Grand Trunk, and the other from Hadlow to Chaudière Junction, the property of the government. By the original agreement the government granted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for the purpose of using its yard at South Quebec, running powers over that portion of the line extending from Hadlow to Chaudière curve, and on the other hand the Grand Trunk Railway gave to the government the right to use that portion of its line between South Quebec and Hadlow Cove. The government had running powers over the road from South Quebec to Hadlow and the Grand Trunk Railway had running powers from Hadlow up to Chaudière curve. After the St. Charles branch was built down to Point Lévis, then the importance of Harlaka Junction came in. Harlaka Junction is the point where the Quebec Central Railway intersects the Intercolonial Railway, and the Quebec Central, has running powers over the Intercolonial Railway from Harlaka Junction up to Lévis. There is considerable interchange of traffic from the Quebec Central Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. The Quebec Central Railway hand their traffic over at Lévis to the Intercolonial Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway takes the westbound traffic west. Under the original agreement running powers were conferred upon the Intercolonial Railway over this little piece of road belonging to the Grand Trunk Railway between South Quebec and Harlaka Junction, and the Grand Trunk Railway says : We gave you running powers over that, but we did not give it to you for the purpose of taking freight from the Quebec Central Railway ; you must hand that freight over to us at

South Quebec and we will haul it west, but if you do not you will have to pay us for each car you receive from the Quebec Central that you haul over this little piece belonging to the Grand Trunk. They claim from $2 to $2.50 a car which they charge either to the consignee of the freight or to the Quebec Central. Our argument is that when that freight reaches Point Lévis it becomes Intercolonial Railway freight and we have a right to handle it and to get the tolls on it from the time it reaches our line at Lévis until it gets to its destination. We argue that the parties to the agreement of 1879, had in contemplation not only the freight of the Intercolonial Railway proper, but all freight that was gathered from intersecting lines until it reached the point of destination at Lévis. That is the difficulty with respect to the 1879 agreement. There is another trifling matter which arises out of the fact that they are making certain charges for handling our freight at South Quebec which we think are too high. Subsequently, in 1898, when the Drummond County Railway was acquired by the government, another agreement was made between the two companies with respect to the use of the Grand Trunk line from Ste. Rosalie up to St. Lambert Junction, and thence over the bridge into the Bonaventure depot. In return for that, the Grand Trunk were under obligation to hand over to the Intercolonial Railway certain freight that was intended for points eastward. We hold that the Grand Trunk have not carried out the conditions of their agreement in respect of the handing over of this freight at Ste. Rosalie, and as a result difficulties have arisen out of that agreement. All these matters have been referred to arbitration under the conditions of the original contract which provides for arbitration in case of dispute, and it is to carry out the terms of the original agreement that this arbitration was entered into. When the matter got before the arbitrators, we discovered that it would be important to get access to all the documents and all the papers on both sides and the arbitrators found that they were without power to grant the necessary orders for the discovery. It is for the purpose of getting these additional powers and authority to summons witnesses that this Bill is introduced. The arbitrators say that they have not got these powers, and it is at the suggestion of the arbitrators that this legislation is asked for.

At One o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. BARKER. I do not rise to oppose this clause of the Bill, but rather to express my regret that the Bill does not go much further and occupy a very much larger field. We have been entering into other agreements with the company referred to in the Bill, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, with relation to matters of a somewhat similar nature to those that have led to the dispute which is now being arbitrated. It appears that for the last six years, under the contract of 1898, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in the opinion of the government at all events, have been refusing to the Dominion the traffic which they had agreed to give to the Intercolonial Railway. That has been persisted in so that the government have found it necessary to have an arbitration with the company to dispose of the question. Now, we have during this session been spending week after week in discussing an agreement with the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway Company with relation to traffic matters, and especially with relation to the diversion of traffic from Canadian ports to American ports. I say the Grand Trunk Railway Company, because that is the real party to the contract which we call the Grand Trunk Pacific contract. We have again and again endeavoured to get hon. gentlemen opposite to see the need and propriety of inserting in this agreement carefully prepared provisions to protect the people of Canada as against the self-interest of the other contracting party ; but we have been told over and over again that we were dealing with an honourable company, a company of such a character that we might rely upon it ; and the government, instead of inserting proper clauses to protect the people against the selfish interests of the company, knowing all the time that this same company were not carrying out honourably, according to the opinion of the government, a contract which had been entered into six years ago, have refused to accept the amendments proposed by the opposition for the purpose of protecting the people against that company. Under these circumstances I am somewhat surprised that the government should bring in at this session, while the country has still before it the recollection of their attitude with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific contract, a Bill to enable them to get at the books of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in order to see plainly whether that company told the whole truth or not with regard to the course the traffic took under that agreement of 1898. Why, Sir, when we proposed in one of our amendments that the Dominion government should have the right to inspect the books of the Grand Trunk Railway Company with reference to the traffic that is carried from the Northwest to the ocean, the government voted our amendment down, and the hon. gentlemen behind them, in dutiful allegiance to their party, but regardless of the interests of the country, backed up the government in that refusal ; and yet all that time hon. gentlemen opposite knew that the company which they refused to protect the people against, was absolutely, according to their own opinion, refusing to carry out the obli-

gations they had themselves entered into with regard to the traffic. Therefore the introduction of such a Bill as this may be regarded with some surprise. Here we have a Bill enabling the arbitrators to compel the Grand Trunk Company to produce their papers. Why, Sir, when we asked that there should be put into the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill a provision that the Grand Trunk Company should be obliged to disclose its papers to the government, they said, no, we do not require them. They said that, with the knowledge that they were quarrelling with the Grand Trunk Company at that very moment on the same subject, and were getting no redress. Under these circumstances I think we have a right to criticise the attitude of the government on this matter. It is quite true, the hon. gentlemen had settled their agreement with the Grand Trunk Company. That was the only answer we ever received. The Grand Trunk Company could get alterations made in the contract when they needed them, while the government would not ask for the slightest alteration on behalf of the people. When they are introducing this Bill to give the arbitrators greater power, why do they not go a little further ? For the past six years they have had an agreement with the Grand Trunk Company which has not worked satisfactorily. The hon. Minister of Justice tells us that certain traffic which the Grand Trunk had agreed to hand over to the Intercolonial has not gone to the Intercolonial ; and there is a dispute between them as to whether it ought to go to the Intercolonial or to the Grand Trunk. We all know that these questions will arise. On the one hand, the Grand Trunk Company, looking after their own interests and not after the interests of the country, will take every advantage they can to take the traffic over their own rails and on their own trains, and to put the freight charges into their own pockets. Nobody blames the Grand Trunk for that. We only blame the government of the day that allows them to do it, and refuses to put provisions into contracts entered into with the Grand Trunk that would enable the country to get what it ought to get. Now, we propose not only that the government should have the right to inspect the books, papers and vouchers of the Grand Trunk relating to this traffic, but that if there should be found any reason for complaint that the Grand Trunk Company are not carrying out the provisions of that contract with regard to the course or direction of the traffic, that matter should be investigated by the Board of Railway Commissioners, and reported to this parliament for action. The hon. gentlemen not only refuse to give us the power to inspect the papers, or to take upon themselves that power, but they refuse to give the Board of Railway Commissioners the power to investigate and report to this House.

Not one step would they take to enable the country to get protection against what has been going on apparently for the last six years under the contract of 1898. Therefore I say it is a matter of regret in this committee that this Bill, good as it is, does not go further and provide once for all for all contracts between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway. It should have provided for a full investigation of all matters not only under this contract but under any other railway contract, which they may enter into with that company, and it should have provided that in any arbitration or proceeding, either by arbitration or the Board of Railway Commissioners, they should have all the power for which the government is now coming to parliament to ask under this Bill. For that reason and not because I object to the Bill which is all right so far as it goes ; I say that we ought to go further and when the government have entered into a contract of such enormous interest and value to this country as that respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific which is infinitely greater in its relation to the interests of the country than the comparatively small agreement with which we are now dealing, I say they ought to have applied the knowledge and experience that they have derived in the last six years in their traffic negotiations and dealings with the Grand Trunk to the new contracts that we are entering into. They should have availed themselves of that experience to put every necessary provision in the new contracts instead of voting them down as they did when they were proposed by the opposition.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am sure that my hon. friend does not expect me now to discuss over again the clauses of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. So far as I am concerned I think we had better deal with the Bill now before us and refer those interested in the Grand Trunk Pacific to the debates that occurred in the committee when that Bill was under consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Still it would be desirable to have a little further explanation from the Minister of Justice as to the precise nature of the differences that have taken place between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific under the agreement of 1898. As I understand the traffic arrangement made at that time was practically of the same date as the so-called lease by the Grand Trunk Company of a portion of its line to the Intercolonial Railway. The Minister of Justice adverted to differences which had arisen under that traffic arrangement but he did not give us much information as to the magnitude of the differences, of what was really involved in them or of their nature.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. With respect to the differences that have arisen under the agree-

ment of 1898 I would like to say that the Crown claims damages in respect of several breaches :

First, for the diversion by the Grand Trunk Railway of traffic destined for the maritime provinces and Newfoundland, via Lennoxville and the Canadian Pacific Railway which we contended under the agreement of 1898 should have been routed via Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway.

Second, for the diversion by the Grand Trunk of traffic destined for the maritime provinces and Newfoundland which has been sent via United States ports instead of via Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway.

Third, for the diversion of traffic destined for the maritime provinces and Newfoundland by the Grand Trunk Railway via the water route from Montreal instead of via the Intercolonial Railway.

The Crown also claims damages in respect of a certain agreement as to switching and terminal privileges covered by an agreement entered into by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, enjoining the Grand Trunk against switching or permitting to be switched cars or freight to or from sidings on the island of Montreal included in the agreement of the Canadian Pacific Railway from other roads when such freight is destined to or from points on the Intercolonial Railway.

The Crown claims that the Grand Trunk Railway has not afforded to the Intercolonial Railway the accommodation at Bonaventure station required by the contract and claims damages therefor.

The Crown has paid under protest one-half of the cost of a subway and station at St. Hyacinthe. We claim a refund of the amount so paid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the amount of the claim of the Crown been stated in dollars and cents ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. $140,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much of that is for traffic diverted to the United States ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the details.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister will give them on the third reading of the Bill. Could he in the meantime inform the committee on what basis the Crown makes up its claim for damages in respect of the diversion of traffic ? Is it the net profit that would be earned by the Canadian government's railways, or is it the gross amount of the claim or what is the basis ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not draw up the claim myself and I really could not, speaking off-hand, give that information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It occurs to me that it would be useful to know the actual amount of freight in tons which the government claim to have been diverted, and to what United States ports it was diverted.

On section 2,

The said arbitrators may sit for the hearing of evidence wherever in Canada they think it necessary, and they may, from time to time and as often as they think fit, adjourn the sessions to meet either in the same place or elsewhere.

Mr. BARKER. This leaves the arbitrators plenty of time to make their return.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will remember that the third arbitrator is a judge of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Killam. The arbitrators are separated and will not come together until September, and I do not think there is any danger of delay in the rendering of the final award.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—RESIGNATION OF LT.-COL. GREGORY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER. I desire to call the attention of the House and the government to the matter of the resignation and treatment of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, of the 2nd Dragoons of St. Catharines. Probably the shortest way to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia would be to read the letter which Colonel Gregory wrote me last month, in which he asked me to give my attention to the matter, as representing the people of the county in which Colonel Gregory has resided since his infancy. I propose therefore, to give Colonel Gregory's own words to the minister and the House in order that they may have a full understanding of the facts. Colonel Gregory, in writing to me, said that his term of command of the 2nd Dragoons was about to expire when the officers of the regiment signed a requisition requesting him to accept an extension of term. Colonel Gregory goes on to say :

I did not make application for an extension, but as I had been requested by some of the officers of the permanent force to accept an extension I called upon the District Officer Commanding, and told him if my term of command was to be extended I wished to know it, and if it was not I wanted to be relieved of my command at once. I stated that if I accepted an extension at all I wanted it for three years.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is this the same letter which was published in the 'Mail and Empire' on the 23rd of June ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I would not say it is the same. In effect it is, but it is not a verbatim copy. This is a letter addressed by Colonel Gregory to myself, as representing in this House the people of the county in which he resides.

On the 4th of August Colonel Otter wrote me that the period I named would not be entertained by the department. He was quite willing, had that day recommended me for an extension of two years and trusted it would be approved.

I heard nothing more about the matter until on the 2nd of November I saw a copy of the general order of September 3rd, in which my term had been extended to July 12th, 1904.

I immediately sent in my resignation and a few days later received a letter from Colonel Otter saying he had my resignation, but before forwarding it he was writing urging that my term be extended as recommended and not to be surprised at some delay. Shortly after this I was asked to make a report as to the fitness of Major W. R. Ferguson for the position of second in command which he held, and as I was given to understand by Colonel Otter that some one was urging the matter, and believing that Major Ferguson would be gazetted out if he did not resign, I advised him to send me his resignation, which he did, and which I forwarded.

On the 10th of January Colonel Otter wrote me directing me to at once recommend Major Glasgow as regimental major, also for the officer who was to succeed him. I replied that at present and under all circumstances did not feel disposed to accede to his request. Colonel Otter wrote me again January 14th requesting an explanation for writing such a letter, claiming I was in duty bound to do as directed. I replied on the 18th stating that my reasons were that I did not consider it was in the interest of the regiment that he should be promoted at present. On the 21st January I received another letter from Colonel Otter saying, I now tell you it is necessary you should recommend Major Glasgow as second in command, saying further 'You may be sure I have good reasons for asking for this action on your part.' On the 23rd I had an interview with the General Officer Commanding in Ottawa and he gave me to understand that my time of command had been extended for two years or would be extended. On the 25th I called Colonel Otter by telephone and told him if his anxiety for the promotion of Major Glasgow was on my account there was no longer the necessity for it as the General Officer Commanding had informed me on the Saturday previous that my time of command had been extended for two years, and to me Colonel Otter replied that he knew more about the matter than any one else, as he had made the arrangements, and later on in a private interview told me that my extension to two years depended upon me recommending Major Glasgow, saying further, that when in Ottawa some time previous to this the General Officer Commanding had told him to express to me his regrets that he was unable to carry through my extension for a longer period than one year, and that after leaving the General Officer Commanding he went to another.

On the night of the 25th, I had a meeting of the officers of the regiment followed by a dinner to which a number of gentlemen not in the regiment were invited and were present. After the dinner I entered into an arrangement with Major Glasgow that he was to remain in command of his squadron until after this camp in June and in the meantime take a course in the Royal Military College, and I would then recommend him for the position of second in command. The next day I wrote the District Officer Commanding, notifying him of arrangement with Major Glasgow and that I expected to receive a letter from him concurring in the arrangement, but which I did not get.

At an interview I had with Colonel Otter a few days later he informed me that he had reason to believe that nothing but the recommendation from Major Glasgow would secure my extension as recommended and stated that I would only be playing into the hands of those opposed to me and sacrifice the regiment as well if I resigned as I threatened to do before I would recommend Major Glasgow if he did not take steps to improve his qualifications.

On the 22nd February I wrote the district officer commanding again, reiterating what I was prepared to do, and again on the 29th asking if my letter of the 22nd would be acceptable and if my tenure of command was to be extended beyond the 12th of July, 1904, and received a reply dated March 2nd stating that he had written Major Glasgow a few days before, and that he had promised to attend the school before camp for a course, and that he (Colonel Otter) was quite prepared to forward his recommendation at once, and asking me to forward the recommendation as soon as possible. Again on the 3rd of March Colonel Otter wrote me in reply to my communication of the 29th February stating that the recommendation of Major Glasgow as second in command should be sent in at once and he had every reason to believe that the extension of my command would follow.

To this I replied on the 7th that if Major Glasgow did attend the school as he had promised he should remain in command of his squadron until after camp, when his promotion would immediately follow, and that I was firmly convinced my proposition was not only reasonable but in the interest of the regiment, and that I had come to the conclusion that if my extension of time demanded upon me acceding to the demands of Major Glasgow, I had better resign my command at once.

On the 10th of March Colonel Otter wrote me that he regretted that I could not see my way to make the recommendation and that as action had shortly to be taken, he now proposed to do it himself. After getting the 'Canada Gazette' of June 11th, in which appeared the promotion of Major Glasgow to second in command, also that of Captain Sharp to major commanding 'D' squadron, and Lieutenant D. Dell to rank of captain, and none of which I had recommended, I forwarded my resignation to the district officer commanding and asked to be relieved of the command of the regiment at once. My resignation was sent in on the morning of Wednesday, June 15th.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, although I am not technically what would be called a military man, that the department has put itself entirely in the wrong. The people of this country have a deep interest in seeing the Militia Department administered in the interests of the militia of Canada. And digressing here for a moment, I think I can say without any fear of contradiction that it is only as an institution for the benefit of the people of Canada that this militia organization exists; and speaking

as a representative of the people I am just as much entitled to say what I think of it as if I were a military man technically or enrolled in the militia force. I need not of course say that those of us who do not technically belong to the militia force nevertheless have the interest of the militia as much at heart as those who do belong to it; and it is because we have only so many hours in a day and so many days in the month in which we can work at anything, after getting the necessary sleep that nature requires, that we are not all of us able to take that active part in militia affairs that some of us do and others would like to do. Now the case of Colonel Gregory seems to me to be a pitiable one, pitiable from the standpoint of the interests of the people of this country, not to qualify it in any stronger language. I ask the House to accept one statement from me without proof, and that is that Colonel Gregory is, as far as a man can be who is not a regular soldier belonging to the regular army, as well qualified an officer, as careful, as earnest, as painstaking, as self-sacrificing in the expenditure of time and energy in the performance of his duty as any militiaman or any other man in the Dominion of Canada possibly could be, and not belong to the regular army. Colonel Gregory has been known up in the county of Lincoln where he was born and has always lived, to have, as some critics of his would say, spent too much time over the militia; he is known to have sacrificed his money, even his financial interests in his devotion to the welfare of the militia and in the energetic performance of his duties as a militiaman. No man on either side of politics, I am not afraid the most violent Reformer in the county of Lincoln will contradict me in saying, that no man on either side of politics will say that Colonel Gregory as a military man is not absolutely qualified for the performance of his duties, and he has seen that the officers under him and with whom he is associated are also well qualified. It is evidenced by this letter that Colonel Gregory has realized his duty to the country, and to the officers above him as well as to the officers beneath him, and to the whole community in what he was called upon to do. He seemed to think that the duty he was called upon to perform was not a mere bagatelle; he realized that he had a serious duty to perform to those in authority over him in the militia, and to the whole people of Canada, in the exercise of the duties that devolved upon him while an officer in command of that troop. Now he was called upon, as is seen by this correspondence, he was invited, as it were, to ask for an extension of time, he was asked if he would accept an extension of time. It does not matter for what length of time; the point is this, that he was not going to be allowed to have any extension of time unless he did what, Mr. Speaker, unless he certified to a thing that, whether he was right or wrong in his judgment, he would have been a dishonest man if he had certified to holding the opinion he did.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is probably not aware that Colonel Gregory had one year's extension of time without any condition, and he does not pretend there was any condition.

Mr. LANCASTER. Colonel Gregory has had an extension of time of one year before this extension of time without any condition. The question is not whether he should have an extension of time for more than one year. It is idle to say that a different rule or principle should be applied according as the extension of time was long or short, for one year or more. No matter whether it was for one month or three months, for one year, or ten years, or a hundred years, the principle is the same, and it was intimated to him that if he did not do something which he could only do on the assumption that whether it was right or wrong does not matter, and which he could not do as an honest man, he was told that if he did not do it, he could not get that extension. If that principle was to prevail in any department of government it is easy to imagine what the consequences would be. If it was to prevail in the Finance Department, in the Department of Trade and Commerce, in the Department of Inland Revenue, in the Department of the Postmaster General, in the Department of the Minister of Customs—now I have named the departments of all the cabinet ministers who are in the House except the Minister of Militia. I say that if this principle was to prevail, what confidence would any one have in those departments or in any other institution in which it was allowed to prevail? If Colonel Gregory was wrong in his opinion, that might be a reason for telling him that he was no longer fit to command, but it would be no reason for imposing upon the people a commanding officer who was exercising his functions as he was entitled to exercise them, and still telling him that he could not remain in command unless he exercised his functions on a different side of a question to what he in all conscience thought he ought to exercise them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman state what was the condition?

Mr. LANCASTER. The condition, according to this letter, was that if he would recommend Major Glasgow as second in command his extension of time would at once follow. He said he could not do so, because Major Glasgow was not qualified in his opinion, not having the necessary military

training. He was right in that statement, and was asked to certify the contrary.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He was qualified.

Mr. LANCASTER. I differ from the hon. minister. I am not a military man, but I can understand facts and inferences, and the results of facts, in regard to the Militia Department as well as I can understand them in regard to any other department. It is quite clear that Major Glasgow at that time was not qualified, because Major Glasgow partly did afterwards what Colonel Gregory was insisting would have to be done at that time before he could be qualified. The hon. minister may be right technically in saying that he is qualified now, but at the time it was sought to obtain Colonel Gregory's recommendation he was not qualified, and I would like the hon. minister to explain why it was that this gentleman had to get a further qualification before he could get the certificate.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman will look at the papers which were laid on the table of the House he will see by Colonel Gregory's own report that Major Glasgow was qualified in the summer of 1902.

Mr. LANCASTER. I differ from the hon. minister. That may be his way of looking at these papers. I must speak of the facts as I understand them. It is all very well for the hon. minister to put his construction on certain things, but I am sorry to say that I cannot find the facts to be as he represents them. We must differ in respect to the certificate that Colonel Gregory gave. The fact stands out clear and distinct, and I would not be doing my duty to the people if I did not insist upon this fact being presented clearly to them. The fact stands out clear and distinct that Colonel Otter told him that some one was urging him to secure the recommendation on behalf of Major Glasgow. As the hon. minister does not seem to understand it, I will read it again :

On the 23rd I had an interview with the General Officer Commanding in Ottawa, and he gave me to understand that my time of command had been extended for two years or would be extended. On the 25th I called Colonel Otter by telephone and told him if his anxiety for the promotion of Major Glasgow was on my account there was no longer the necessity for it, as the General Officer Commanding had informed me on the Saturday previous that my time of command had been extended for two years, and to me Colonel Otter replied that he knew more about the matter than any one else, as he had made the arrangements.

Colonel Otter had made the arrangement. What arrangement ? Colonel Otter had made the arrangement that Colonel Gregory should have an extension of time. There had to be pressure brought upon him to make the arrangement that Major Glasgow was to be placed in command and that notwithstanding the fact that he was not certified to as being qualified.

Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory says that on the 25th he called up Colonel Otter by 'phone, and Colonel Otter told him that he knew more about the matter than any one else, that he had made the arrangement, and later on he told Colonel Gregory that his extension of two years depended upon his recommending Major Glasgow. If Major Glasgow was qualified without a recommendation by Colonel Gregory, why was Colonel Gregory told by Colonel Otter that his own extension for two years depended upon him granting this certificate ? That is the vice and the mischief of this matter. That is where you are striking right at the heart of our militia. Whether Colonel Gregory's judgment was right or not in saying that he would not recommend Major Glasgow when the government said to him : Although according to your judgment it may be wrong, you must do it, and we will not extend your time of command for two years until you do it, they were introducing a system that means ruin to the militia of this country. It is an unfortunate thing for the people of Canada. Colonel Gregory would not submit to that, because, being a soldier, he was a man. They cast a reflection upon him, and he said in effect. I am a man. I will not certify what I do not believe. He said : I am responsible to Roland W. Gregory and to Roland W. Gregory's own conscience for what I do, and as my superior officers do not say that my judgment was wrong, I consider that it is my duty to resign in order that the people of Canada may clear up the matter and take such means as they see fit to ensure that the government shall not allow this serpent to crawl in and accomplish the disasters that it will accomplish if this course is allowed to prevail, and which undoubtedly would have prevailed if something had not been done to prevent it by putting the facts before the House, as he did and as I am endeavouring in my humble way to do, I being the representative of the county in which this gentleman resides. He goes on to say :

Colonel Otter replied that he knew more about the matter than any one else, as he had made the arrangements, and later on in a private interview told me that my extension to two years depended upon me recommending Major Glasgow, saying further, that when in Ottawa some time previous to this the General Officer Commanding had told him to express to me his regrets that he was unable to carry through my extension for a longer period than one year, and that after leaving the General Officer Commanding he went to another person (but did not give name)——

I think the House will be curious to know who that was.

—and arranged with him that if I recommended Major Glasgow for the position of second in command my time of command would be extended two years.

I do not notice in the correspondence that the hon. minister has referred to a few moments ago any instructions or memoranda by which we can draw any satisfactory inference as to how that result was brought about. There is nothing in the correspondence to indicate how the change took place. There was a changing of mind here on the part of those in authority over Colonel Gregory, but I do not find anything in the correspondence that shows how it came about. There should be some explanation given to the House as to how it arose, because Colonel Gregory says that Colonel Otter, after leaving the General Officer Commanding, went to another person, but did not give the name, and arranged with him that if Colonel Gregory recommended Major Glasgow for the position of second in command Colonel Gregory's time of command would be extended two years, and that information had been conveyed to the General Officer Commanding that his time was to be extended for another year. I want to point out to this House, in endeavouring to do my duty in this matter in the interests of the people of Canada, that, although I am not, as I said, a qualified military man, I do understand the difference between a combatant and a non-combatant. I think we all understand without being in the militia that a man who is trained as a surgeon is not the best man to command in a fight. If it is a question of which wing of the army you shall put forward, if it is a question of drill, if it is a question of whether you shall march or counter-march, a surgeon is not the best man to put in command. I want to tell the hon. minister that we have two officers in our district, Major Stull and Major Birch, who, although residents of my constituency, are not both supporters of mine in politics. The hon. minister need not be afraid of that. He has already heard of Major Birch. He knows that Major Birch had a brother who lost his life in South Africa, he knows that he lives in the county of Lincoln, and he knows that he is a well qualified major of these dragoons.

Major Stull is also a well qualified combatant officer in this regiment; these two gentlemen are the next best qualified after Colonel Gregory to take command of that troop of dragoons. Colonel Otter, who went out of his way to recommend Major Glasgow, for some strange reason, has shown by his course the necessity for having Colonel Gregory's certificate and not that of some outsider who apparently did not know there were two majors who were the next best qualified to command the troop after Colonel Gregory. But what did they do? Major Glasgow was a surgeon-major; he took this very much hurried course—I think it was for less than a month—to qualify him, and he was appointed instead of Major Stull and Major Birch who were overlooked entirely by whoever was interfering—for somebody was interfering—and this Major Glasgow who was promoted——

Mr. LANCASTER.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) does not wish to mislead the House, but he must know, if he has acquainted himself with the case at all, that Major Glasgow was the next in order of seniority.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know what this government, or this Minister of Militia, means by next in order of seniority, but if he means that Major Glasgow was the next best qualified I take issue with him. Major Glasgow was a surgeon-major——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman must know that Major Glasgow was the senior major in command of the senior squadron of that regiment and that he had been in that position for at least two years.

Mr. LANCASTER. If so, he was there without proper qualification as a combatant officer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Which is not true.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am perhaps on dangerous ground not being a militia man—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. member will allow me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have as much right to interrupt as the Minister of Militia, and I object to the impertinence of the Minister of Inland Revenue in calling 'Hear, hear.'

Mr. LANCASTER. If I chose to give the floor temporarily to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) I suppose I could do so?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I hold in my hand the militia list, and I find that these three officers were gazetted on exactly the same day, viz., the 16th of February, 1902.

Mr. LANCASTER. And I think that list describes Major Glasgow as a surgeon-major. Although not a military man myself I have still impudence enough—if you like to use the word—to believe that a surgeon-major is not so well fitted to command a regiment as a major who is a combatant officer. The fact that he is a surgeon-major merely means that he is given the rank and perquisites of a major, but he is not in the force as a combatant officer. If as surgeon-major, he was two years in command of the troop, then there is another grievance against the government, and I can well understand that Colonel Gregory thought it was time to put an end to such a state of things. Although as I have said, I am not in the militia, I represent the militia of the county of Lincoln, and I believe it is my duty to raise this question in parliament. As there are other gentlemen on both sides of the House who are well versed in military matters, and who will no doubt take

part in this debate, I shall not trespass further on the time of the House.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has pinned his faith entirely in this discussion on a letter written to him by Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has shown an utter disregard,—I think I might say contempt—for the papers which have been laid on the table of the House, and whenever he was pressed to give fair play to Major Glasgow he shielded himself behind the fact that he has no particular knowledge of military affairs. I would venture to advise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) to acquaint himself somewhat with the ordinary rules governing military proceedings and promotions before he attempts to discuss a question of this kind in parliament. The letter which the hon. gentleman read is almost word for word the statement which Colonel Gregory published in the 'Mail and Empire' on the 23rd of June last; and before proceeding with the main statement which I have to make on this subject, I will make a passing reference to this statement, which, by the way, I may observe at the outset, was an exceedingly improper statement for Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory to make. It was a direct violation of the regulations of the Militia Department of Canada, and a direct violation of the King's regulations as well; a fact which must have been known at the time to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How is that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman wishes information I will endeavour to give it to him.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the time Colonel Gregory wrote the letter was he under orders?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At the time Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory made the statement he was still commanding officer of the 2nd Hussars though possibly under suspension.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was he in camp?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He was in camp, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) knows perfectly well that it was an impropriety, and even afterwards it would have been almost equally an impropriety, because in that statement is involved an accusation against Colonel Otter, and accusations against Colonel Gregory's superiors in the headquarters staff, and against the minister himself. The King's regulations 2118 says:

> The only legitimate use an officer or soldier can make of documents or information of which he becomes possessed in his official capacity is for the furtherance of the public service in the performance of his duty. Publishing official documents or using them for personal controversy, or for any private purpose without due authority, will be treated as a breach of official trust.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the minister quite sure that Colonel Gregory was in camp when that letter appeared in the 'Mail and Empire?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe so.

Mr. INGRAM. My impression is that he was not.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He was still in command of the regiment.

Mr. LANCASTER. He had sent in his resignation; he had left the camp and had gone home before he gave the interview.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is still on the reserve list of officers and is equally under the regulations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the date?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The 23rd is the day it is published. The article in the 'Mail and Empire' is dated Niagara-on-the-Lake, June 22, from which I assume that the statement was made there and sent from there, and that he was in camp at the time.

With regard to the language of this statement there are just two or three observations which I wish to make. In view of the statement that unjust conditions are attempted to be made, I wish to call attention to the fact that Lt.-Col. Gregory insisted on having three years' extension, which is the maximum permitted under the regulations, and at the outset refused to accept any less, and threatened to resign his commission if less than three years were given. He finally modified that to two years. Further on he says that he 'was given to understand by Col. Otter that some one was urging the matter,' and so on; the insinuation all through being that either the minister himself was taking a personal interest in this matter, or that some one behind the minister was urging the minister to take this personal interest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Although the hon. gentleman did not make that statement, I make it for him, and I say that such an insinuation is absolutely unfounded and without the slightest justification. Moreover, the hon. member bases his argument entirely upon the ipse dixit of Lt.-Col. Gregory, and reiterates Col. Gregory's statement as to conversations which took place between Col. Otter and himself, in which Col. Gregory puts words into the mouth of Col. Otter for which there is no proof whatever, and which I doubt very much Col. Otter ever uttered. He says, for instance:

> On the 23rd I had an interview with the General Officer Commanding in Ottawa, and he gave

me to understand that my tenure of command had been extended for two years.

I do not believe a word of that. I do not see how it is possible that the General Officer Commanding could have given such an assurance as that when the matter had not been discussed with me, and had not been recommended to the minister. Then he goes on to say that Col. Otter visited Ottawa, and saw the General Officer Commanding and then 'went to another person,' meaning, I suppose, the minister. I wish to say here most emphatically that so far as I know and believe and can remember, Col. Otter never discussed the question of Lt.-Col. Gregory with me, here or anywhere else in his life.

I do not know that I need refer to any more of the points mentioned in that letter. But, Sir, I propose, in the discussion of this matter, to refer to the papers which have been laid upon the table of the House. Before doing so, however, let me refer again to a matter which I referred to in a debate which took place in this House on the 23rd of June, namely, the question of the limitation of the extension of Lt.-Col. Gregory's extension to one year instead of three years. There was a recommendation, which will be found in these papers, from Col. Otter that Col. Gregory's term should be extended for two years. That recommendation came before me, and I saw fit—and I believe I acted wisely, as the events prove—to change that to an extension for one year. I did it in conformity with a practice which I had adopted; because great injury and injustice may be done to worthy junior officers by these long extensions of time. If after an extension of one year it turns out that there is still good reason why a further extension should be made, it is always possible to make a further extension. No possible harm can be done by limiting the extension in the first place to one year, because it can always be extended another year and yet another year; but the greatest harm and injustice to worthy, capable and qualified young officers may be done by an immediate extension of time to three years at the outset.

Now, to come to the papers. We are told that Lt.-Col. Gregory is a good officer. I do not quarrel with that statement. I believe he is an excellent cavalry officer; but I cannot say as much for the methods by which he proposed to keep himself in the command of his regiment after the term for which he was appointed had expired. He was appointed for the regular term of five years, and at the end of five years he proposed, by hook or by crook, to continue in the command for three years more, and threatened the district officer commanding that if he did not give him the extra three years he would resign the command of his regiment. Well, Sir, let me point out to the House the peculiar methods which this gentleman adopted in order to attain his end. Let me point out the peculiar little game this gentleman was playing. The second in command of his regiment—will the House believe it?—was a doctor—not Dr. Glasgow, but one of the best friends the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has in his constituency or in the neighbouring constituency—Dr. Ferguson, a prominent Conservative. I suppose it is all right for a medical man to hold a combatant position under such circumstances.

Mr. LANCASTER. With a combatant's rank.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Dr. Ferguson was second in command, with precisely the same qualification that Dr. Glasgow had. Let me stop here for a moment to say, in justice to my profession, that we are sometimes able to fight, and that some of the best combatant officers to-day are medical men. Let me point to Dr. King, whom the hon. gentleman knows. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to sneer at Dr. King because he is a medical man? I think he will not dare to do it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will my hon. friend permit me? I did not object to his being a medical man. I said he had a medical training only, not a combatant's training.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Which is not fair, if it were parliamentary, I would say it is not true; because the hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, if he examined the papers, that Dr. Glasgow possessed exactly as good a qualification as Dr. Ferguson or Dr. King. In saying that I speak of what I know. It does not do for the hon. gentleman to shake his head and make denials against facts. So much for this doctor, the Dr. Ferguson who is all right and to whom the hon. gentleman took no exception. Dr. Ferguson, in accordance with the peculiar methods which I am going to expose on the part of Col. Gregory, was unfit, as I shall show by Col. Otter's report for five long years to fill the position of second in command. He was kept there by Col. Gregory for the very purpose of giving him an excuse for asking that his own tenure of command be extended because the second in command was unfit to fill his place.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no evidence of that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The papers will show that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of this sentence in Colonel Otter's letter of June 10, 1904?

On this I wrote Major Glasgow advising him to take a course as soon as possible to which he replied on the 22nd of February that it was his intention to do so, and had had such in contemplation before he heard from me.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will explain. The reason is that Colonel Gregory had made up his mind that for some reason or other best known to himself, Major Glasgow should not be promoted to the position of second in command although qualified, and he insisted that before he would recommend Major Glasgow, although Major Glasgow was qualified, he must have a promise from Glasgow that he would attend another course. For what purpose ? To improve his qualification, not to get qualified, those are not the words.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend may laugh, but it was to improve his qualification, and those are the words which Lieut.-Colonel Gregory has carefully used.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not making any suggestion to the contrary, but I am asking for information. Why is it in this case that Colonel Otter concurs in that and advises Major Glasgow to do it ? He is not in a conspiracy with Colonel Gregory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because Colonel Otter was anxious to have peace in this regiment and I dare say Colonel Otter recognized even Colonel Gregory himself would not suffer by taking a further course to improve his qualifications, and he was quite willing to co-operate with Colonel Gregory to insist so far as he could although the officer was qualified that he should take or so advise that he should take a further course to improve his qualifications which were already sufficient technically at any rate for the purpose of promotion.

Now, I wish to come to a little closer quarters with Colonel Gregory and I wish to point direct to the attention of the House to a letter which appears in this file of papers, which was laid on the table of the House. The letter is one addressed by Colonel Gregory, in December, 1902, to the District Officer Commanding, Colonel Otter, with reference to officers of his regiment who he said were 'indifferent'. This is a report which refers to those officers only who are 'indifferent'. This is the letter.

Sir, I have the honour to report that the officers mentioned in my report as indifferent are :

1st. Major Glasgow, who intends taking another course at the school.

2nd. Captain M. S. Muir, who is a poor horseman.

3rd. E. D. Taylor, who is not yet qualified.

Evidently the other two were qualified.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
ROLAND W. GREGORY,
Lieutenant-Colonel Commanding 2nd Dragoons.

Now, I have here the report in detail, the confidential report of Colonel Gregory, dated December 3, 1902, in which he reports upon every officer in his regiment in detail under the headings.

General ability, general professional requirement, practical proficiency in drill and in the field, professional zeal, smartness in performance of duties, horsemanship, capacity for command, judgment, tact, temper, self-reliance, and 'is he fit for promotion for higher rank ?'

Now, let us look at these men. First, there is Lieutenant-Colonel Roland W. Gregory himself, who is reported upon by Colonel Otter.

Next comes this Doctor, Major Ferguson, William R. Ferguson, and next comes the other Doctor, the objectionable Doctor, S. H. Glasgow. I follow these two names through under the above headings and I find that whereas Dr. Ferguson, second in command is reported upon as fair, Dr. Glasgow is reported upon in the same column as good. Under the next column where Dr. Ferguson is reported as fair, Dr. Glasgow is reported as good. So it goes on. In nearly every column in this report, Dr. Ferguson is reported upon as fair, and Dr. Glasgow is reported upon as good. In only one case is Dr. Ferguson reported upon as good where Dr. Glasgow is reported upon as fair. This I think is somewhat significant. But it so happens that both are reported upon under the heading of 'Practical proficiency in drill and in the field,' as indifferent. But it does so happen too that under the column

Is he fit for promotion to higher rank ?

Mark you they are majors now.

Is he fit for promotion to higher rank ?

The answer to the question by Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, confirmed by Colonel Otter is 'Yes.'

Mr. HAGGART. Does that mean that he is qualified, that they reported him qualified ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Qualified for major and fit to be promoted to a higher rank, namely, lieutenant-colonel.

Mr. WARD. I believe that confidential report also gives the qualifications of officers, does it not ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I read all that it gives, but I will give the qualifications before I have finished.

Mr. WARD. The hon. gentleman has referred to that qualification which was possessed by Major Glasgow and I would be glad if the minister before leaving the question of qualification would give exactly the qualifications which these two officers possess.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They both possess the qualification of field officers' qualifications. Ferguson's qualification is R.S.C. and Glasgow's qualification is field officer's which is equivalent as I shall show before I get through with my statement.

Now I want to call attention particularly —because I am dealing with Gregory, the

gentleman who has obtruded himself upon the consideration of this House and this country—to the fact that Colonel Gregory has written a letter which singles out Major Glasgow as being indifferent when the record, his own record, shows that Major Glasgow's qualification and his character for fitness and good conduct are better than that of Major Ferguson, and I wish to show you, Mr. Speaker, that this was part of a scheme to discredit Major Glasgow and to keep on Major Ferguson who was not able to attend drill in 1901, indeed was not in camp at all, was only in camp a few days in 1902 and was not able to go to camp in 1903. There again the game was to keep Ferguson on in order to be able to say that he was unfit. He was unable to speak above a whisper and he was kept in that place as a sort of warming pan so that Colonel Gregory could use him and be able to say: There is no second in command able to take my place; therefore I must be kept where I am.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The letter to which the hon. gentleman refers accompanies that same report, does it not? They are of the same date.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This report is not in the letter of Colonel Gregory at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has read a letter in which Major Glasgow is described as one of the officers who are indifferent. It is dated the 13th of December, 1902, and he gave that same date as the date of this confidential report.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the letter accompanied the report.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Exactly. And the letter is a misleading one intended to call attention to Major Glasgow in an unfavourable way, while passing over Major Ferguson who was in a worse position, on Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's own report, than Major Glasgow himself. The hon. gentleman has referred to a round-robin signed by all the officers of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's regiment, asking that his term of command be extended. If the hon. gentleman will look through the papers, he will find that both Colonel Otter and Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory were severely reprimanded, I might almost say—it did not amount to that—but at any rate exception was taken to the fact that a round-robin had been signed in that way, because that is absolutely against all military rules and regulations; and I am informed—I do not state it as a fact—but from all I can hear and see, and reading between the lines, I am disposed to believe that the statement which has been made to me, namely, that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory procured the signing of that round-robin. This is the memorandum that was sent from headquarters:

Will you please inform Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory to communicate to the officers of his regiment that it is highly improper for them to send any communication with reference to his tenure of command.

How could an officer refuse? This paper is put before him. He does not wish to run the risk of getting the ill will of his commanding officer and he signs it, and such a request is against all military regulations and rules, and the reason is obvious.

It was your duty when you received this round-robin, to communicate to the officers of the 2nd Dragoons the great breach of military etiquette and military procedure of which they were guilty, and to have returned the round-robin to those who signed it.

Now we come to the extension of time. On the 4th of September, 1903, under the heading of 'Appointments, promotions, &c., general order 149' we find the following:—

2nd Dragoons—the period of the tenure of command of Lieutenant-Colonel R. W. Gregory is extended to the 12th July, 1904.

It will be remembered that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory in his letter appears to complain of the fact that he found that Major Ferguson's case was being inquired into and it appeared probable that Major Ferguson would have to resign. Major Ferguson was being kept, as I have stated, for a certain purpose, and later on somebody seems to have ascertained the fact. Colonel Gregory, I believe, feared a medical board to examine into the case of Major Ferguson would follow; and Major Ferguson was advised by him that he would lose his position and that he had better make a virtue of necessity and resign rather than have any examination.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who ordered the medical board?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that a medical board was ordered. I said that it was expected that a medical examination would be made and a medical board appointed to look into the matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there any evidence of that in the report? I do not know of any private correspondence or evidence of that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware that there is any.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On what does the minister base his statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I take it from the tone of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's letter.

I find here:

Recommendations for appointments, &c., in the 2nd Dragoons, headquarters at Welland, on

28th March, 1904 : Major Sinclair Holden Glasgow, physician, residence Welland, native country Canada, date of birth and so on. State of health good, recommended for the rank of second in command vice Major W. R. Ferguson, resigned. Qualifications, field officer, recommended by F. L. Lessard, acting district officer comanding military district No. 2.

I hold here a copy of the qualifications of Major Glasgow :

Canada—Certificate of Royal Military Instruction. Cavalry, field officers' class, special course.

This is to certify that Surgeon-Major S. H. Glasgow, Medical Reserve of Officers, has attended the Royal School of Cavalry at Toronto, from 17th October, 1901, until 21st November, 1901, and having passed the required examination in the undermentioned subjects, is entitled to this certificate. R. and O., part viii., paragraph 102.

F. L. LESSARD, Lt.-Col. and B. Col., Commandant Royal School of Cavalry at Toronto, Ontario.

Let me observe at this point that my hon. friend has given the impression, whether intentionally or otherwise, that Major Glasgow had been at the same time acting in the capacity of surgeon or physician in connection with this regiment. But the hon. gentleman gave the impression—I am sure unintentionally—that Dr. Glasgow had somehow or other been connected with this cavalry regiment in the capacity of physician or surgeon. That is absolutely without the slightest foundation. As a matter of fact, Dr. Glasgow was not only qualified yesterday and the day before, but he has been qualified ever since 1901 and has as good a qualification as Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory himself. And it is unfair to Major Glasgow that such an impression should be conveyed to this House or country. In answer to my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward) who asked about the qualifications, these are the qualifications :

1st class grade 'A.' Short course or special course certificate must be obtained by all field officers and adjutants in the cavalry. Regulations and orders, page 269, paragraph 88.

Special course, paragraph 102, page 274, provides for a special course for the permanent staff and field officers and grants of field officer certificate, which is equivalent to the 1st class grade 'A' certificate, and this is the certificate held by Major Glasgow.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Whose statement is that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am quoting the paragraph itself. Now Colonel Otter states distinctly in his letter here that there was no question whatever about Major Glasgow's qualification. But we are told that there was an attempt made to make a bargain with Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, that conditions were imposed. I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the man who wished to impose conditions was Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory himself. First, he wished to impose the condition that his extension must be for three years, and if it was not for three years, he forsooth, would have none of it, and would resign his commission—which he thought better of afterwards. But, Mr. Speaker, let me point out the fact that no conditions were being forced upon Colonel Gregory, so far as I know, but he was attempting to insist upon conditions with Colonel Otter before he would agree to do what it was his bounden duty to do, to recommend, unless there was some strong objection against it, the promotion of Major Glasgow who was next in seniority. And what were the conditions which he wished to impose ? He wished to impose the condition that although Major Glasgow might be promoted to the position of second in command, he should not take that position, but should remain in command, I think it was of D squadron, until after the next camp, that is that he might in name only be second in command ; and that as long as Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, who has followed him with the utmost hostility and endeavoured to block his promotion, remained there, he should not act upon the staff and take his position of second in command alongside of the pretentious Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory. When we talk about conditions, those were the terms which Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory undertook to impose upon the District Officer Commanding, Colonel Otter, and Colonel Otter very properly refused to be dictated to in any such way. It is stated that Colonel Lessard went to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory and asked him to sign the recommendation, and that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory agreed to do so, and then putting the pen to one side, refused ; and after writing letter after letter and doing everything that mortal man could do both Colonel Otter and Colonel Lessard found that it was necessary, in order to do simple justice to Major Glasgow, for them to act without the recommendation of Colonel Gregory, and this they did. I am sure that any impartial man who will read the papers and observe the course which Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory has pursued from the beginning, the means by which he was keeping an unqualified man for five years, knowing him to be unqualified, a man who was not able to attend camp in three years, a man who is described in the manner which I will read in a moment, by the District Officer Commanding, Colonel Otter, keeping that man in a position which was directly against the interests of the militia and of the country, in order to keep Major Glasgow down and to keep himself in——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume the minister means unqualified, not in a military sense ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He does not mean that Major Ferguson had not proper certificates.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, he had no voice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is what I want made clear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know what that would be called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Had he the same qualification as Major Glasgow ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am informed in the department that it is precisely the same, although the letters are not the same. In the case of Major Ferguson it is R. S. I., but in the case of Major Glasgow it is F.O., field officer, which is a more recent qualification, but I am informed is just as good a qualification. Now I want to read what Colonel Otter says with reference to this matter. Here is what Colonel Otter, writing to the adjutant-general, says with reference to Dr. Ferguson, second in command :

Toronto, 8th July, 1904.

Sir,—In reply to your memorandum of yesterday's date I have the honour to report upon the duty performed by Major Ferguson, late 2nd Dragoons, during the latter part of his connection with the regiment.

1901, absent with leave for the whole period of training.

1902, absent with leave for four days of training.

1903, absent with leave for the whole period of training.

As to the ability of this officer to perform his military duties satisfactorily I have no hesitation in affirming that owing to the loss of his voice from an affection of the throat he has not been fit for his military duties during the last five years of his connection with this regiment. In this assertion I am sure that both Colonel Lessard, inspector of cavalry, and his own commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, will bear me out. In the interest of the regiment I should have reported his case long ago, but as he informed me, whenever the inquiry was made, that he hoped soon to be quite well again, I deferred action until it became apparent that his recovery was most doubtful, and that the efficiency of the regiment was becoming affected through the want of a second in command who was able to undertake the duties of that appointment.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. D. OTTER, Colonel.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the date of that letter ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That letter is dated 8th of July, 1904, a few days ago. I do not know that I need go further in the matter. It seems to me it has been abundantly proved that the course which I pursued in limiting the extension of the command of Colonel Gregory, was in the interest of the public service. There is proof that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, although he may be a very good officer, was a man who possessed so little regard for the public interest in connection with his regiment that he kept as second in command, for a period of years during which this man was unable to attend camp, a man whom he knew could never be able to succeed him as commanding officer of the regiment.

I believe that the papers justify me in saying that he did it with malice prepense, that he did it deliberately for the purpose of keeping the place warm for himself so that he could hold it for the extra three years or for a longer period if possible. I say that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, knowing the facts concerning Major Ferguson, has fallen far short of performing his duty in reference to that officer. I say that he has shown a malevolent disposition, at least an unfair disposition towards Major Glasgow who was qualified, who has been qualified for three years past and who holds as good a qualification as Major Gregory does himself, by standing persistently in that officer's way and refusing when he had no good reason for doing so to recommend that that officer be promoted to be second in command and before he would agree to sign the recommendation for promotion endeavouring to impose the condition that Major Glasgow, although he could be promoted to the second in command, should not be promoted and should not enjoy the results of that promotion until after the next camp and until after Major Gregory had passed out of the regiment.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the date of the qualification of Major Glasgow for F.O. —Field Officer ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The date of qualification was the 6th February, 1902. In conclusion let me repeat, if I may, what I have said before, that I believe it is in the interest of the militia and therefore in the interest of the public that these extensions of command should be reduced to a minimum and that no extension of command should be made unless absolutely necessary. I believe it is the duty of the department, and of the head of the deartment to give special attention to matters of this kind and see that abuses such as those which existed in connection with this regiment are not permitted to exist and are not repeated in the service of the militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister rose to his feet he reproved my hon. friend the legal member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) for having shown a disregard and contempt for the papers laid on the table of the House. He demanded fair play for Major Glasgow and he said that my hon. friend had shielded

himself behind his lack of knowledge of the duties of a militia officer, at the same time advising my hon. friend to make himself acquainted with the rules governing the militia. A very strange doctrine, Mr. Speaker, coming from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, who, as is evidenced by the facts that have been brought before us in recent weeks, has shown an utter disregard and contempt for the papers laid on the table of the House. My hon. friend from Lincoln, I venture to say, and I am within the judgment of the House, adhered more closely to the papers laid upon the table of the House than did the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. The hon. minister has paid no attention whatever either directly or indirectly to the papers laid on the table of the House except in so far as it suited his own convenience to draw from them improper inferences in relation to Major Ferguson and in relation to the conduct of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory. A point at the outset and it is an old point of contention between the hon. minister and myself; he asserted that this letter which Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory wrote to the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' on the 23rd June, was written in direct violation of the King's regulations. I asked him at the time how it was a violation of the King's regulations and he gave us to understand, although he qualified it somewhat later, that Colonel Gregory was then in camp. I am going to show that the hon. minister paid no attention to the papers he has in his hand, because if he had done so he would have found that it was by his own order that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory was suspended from his command and that he returned to his home dismissed from his regiment on the 20th June, three days before he wrote that letter.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does my hon. friend think that it makes any difference?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am coming to that in a moment. I am merely pointing out to the hon. minister that he was wrong and that my hon. friend from Lincoln did not utterly disregard the papers laid on the table.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That paper is not on the table of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, the papers are here in my hands.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Furnished by the hon. minister, I presume they are genuine. And here let me ask the hon. minister if all the papers have been brought down. If they have not been we want them. I understood from Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory and other sources that the papers are not all here.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In regard to that, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked the other day for some letters which had passed between us and Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory. I intended to state before and I shall repeat now what I said to the hon. leader of the opposition to-day that these papers will be here to-night or to-morrow morning. I propose to lay them on the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is four weeks since I particularly specified that I desired these papers as well as the others. I would have thought that with a reasonable amount of effort they might have been here a fortnight ago. Let me point out that if the copy with which I have been furnished of the papers laid on the table of the House is correct, the document referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is among the papers brought down.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I thought my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) referred to Colonel Gregory's letter published in the 'Mail and Empire.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No. I was referring to the minister's letter dismissing Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory. As to the papers which have not been brought down the hon. minister will be able to bring them down possibly after six o'clock in case they are not now here. The hon. minister himself in a former debate referred to the fact that he assumed the responsibility of ordering that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory should not get an extension of command. I do not find any such order here. The hon. minister will remember distinctly that he himself assumed the responsibility of issuing the order that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory should not get an extension of command. I find no such order here. Will the hon. minister bring that down?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no such order but what happened was that when the 'Gazette' was made out a recommendation was made for two years and that recommendation was modified to one year. That is what happened and there were no papers in connection with it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister has referred to various other matters in connection with this subject, and I shall take up the point in reference to the King's regulations. I have shown that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory was not in camp at the time he wrote that letter to the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.' Now I want to tell the hon. minister one thing so that he will correctly understand one of the principles of liberty and of responsible government, and so that he will understand what it is to live in a free country and not be under the tyranny of some dark age tyrant; I want to tell him that when Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory is not on duty and is not in uniform he can write as many letters as he can get the

papers to publish and that he is absolutely independent of the Minister of Militia. Is it a repetition of the Ponton case that the hon. minister would have brought before us ? Is he going to dragoon every man in the militia who dares to stand up before him or the Militia Department ; and endeavour to silence him in this way ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would venture to suggest that as a matter of fair play, it would possibly be just as well not to discuss the Ponton case, as my opportunity for speaking is exhausted. I will be quite prepared to discuss the Ponton case when the time comes, but it would be unfair to discuss it at this moment unless I am given an opportunity to reply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We will discuss the case the minister has before him where the members of the musketry school down here are marched up like so many school boys and ordered to give a statement. The minister talks about round-robins, but what was done in the case of the men attending the musketry school ? Let me ask him how any of these poor fellows down at the school of musketry dare refuse the order of the commandant of the school to say that everything was satisfactory ? Why should not a lot of free men speak out and say that they wanted Colonel Gregory to remain as commanding officer ? I am glad that last night the men and the officers at the school of musketry showed themselves free men, and ready to stand up in defiance of the tyranny of their superiors, and to take part in the grand demonstration on the departure of the late General Officer Commanding. What are the facts of the case ? Colonel Gregory was in command of his regiment and there was no question as to his qualification. He comes from a military family ; he has been in the force for a generation you may say, and he has always borne the reputation of being one of the best officers in the service. Colonel Gregory had as senior major, one Major Ferguson who was an excellent officer in many ways, but whose voice had failed him. The doctors reported again and again that it was only going to be a temporary failure of the voice, and Major Gregory was absolutely justified in keeping Major Ferguson second in command until some other officer qualified. Any one who has commanded one of these corps knows the difficulty there was eight or nine years ago when an officer had to go to a permanent school and put on all the fuss and feathers of a parade before Her Majesty ; one can readily understand how lots of these fellows hesitated about the expense of going to these schools. Colonel Gregory was justified in keeping Major Ferguson there until some one was qualified for second in command.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What Glasgow had done on the 6th of February, 1902.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will come to that later on. Colonel Gregory became officer commanding on the 12th July, 1898, and Major Ferguson succeeded to his majority on the 20th of January, 1899, and proved himself to be a very excellent officer. Gregory's five years were up and he was given a year's extension which brought his term to the 12th of July, 1904. I remember distinctly that Colonel Gregory some years ago told me that his business affairs would not permit of his taking hold of the regiment under the proposed reorganization, unless he were given a three years extension. He is a commercial traveller ; is away from home a good deal of the time and he wanted three years in order that he might have a chance under the new arrangement to do justice to himself and his regiment. That is why Colonel Gregory wanted three years extension, and in all fairness he was as entitled to it as any man in Canada was ever entitled to an extension of time. I know for a fact that Colonel Gregory dogged Ferguson to get the best medical treatment possible to have his voice restored so that when he retired from command of the regiment Major Ferguson would be able to take his place. About the beginning of last year we began to see signs of political meddling. Colonel Otter and Colonel Gregory were in Ottawa as is shown by references in the correspondence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is simply a statement of Colonel Gregory that Colonel Otter told him, and it is absolutely unsupported.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister will not deny that on the 4th of April, 1903, Colonel Otter wrote recommending the extension of Colonel Gregory's command for two years in addition to the other.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not in addition to the other.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well for two years. Colonel Otter wrote :

> My reasons for such recommendation are these :
>
> 1st. The officer next in command, Major Ferguson, is not at present prepared to accept the command, as will be seen by the accompanying telegram in answer to a communication from me as to his wishes in the matter. The remaining officers of the regiment have also expressed their desire in the form of the inclosed petition——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Round-robin.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Call it what you like. They had an absolute right to sign this and the minister cannot lay his finger on anything in the King's regulations or the Army Act to the contrary. The minister must remember that the militia of Canada are not a permanent force paid for 365 days in the year ; but must remember that

we are determined to preserve our individuality as citizens in this free country, and we are not going to be held under the beck and nod of every pettifogging officer no matter how high he may be ; even the minister himself. He must remember that we are not going to be dragooned and held to the strict letter of regulations which do not apply in England to the militia volunteers or yeomanry but only to the regular forces. Does the minister imagine that we are going to allow him to dragoon us into line in this country ? We are not.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, well, we know you are a great man, but I might point out that there are special regulations that apply to the militia in England which are quite as strong as the regulation I read. I am not sure that this particular regulation does not apply to the militia in England, but I think it does, and be that as it may the King's regulations apply to the militia in Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this country the King's regulations apply only when a man is on duty or in uniform, and the minister knows that because he and I have discussed it on many an occasion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, well——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister admits it, and the West York market gardener need not interfere. The next statement of Colonel Otter is this :

> The remaining officers of the regiment have also expressed their desire in the form of the inclosed petition, that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory should remain for another term.

The minister says that the other officers were anxious to get Colonel Gregory out, but I know several of them and I know they are independent free men who would scorn to sign this petition at the request of Colonel Gregory or any one else, if they did not believe it. Colonel Otter goes on to say :

> 2. That none of the squadron commanders have had charge of their squadrons for more than eighteen months, and lack the experience to fit them to command the regiment.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And I extended the time for one year so that they would have eighteen months, plus a year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How does the minister get over the statement that Colonel Otter says they were not fit to command ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. After the time was extended a year they would have two and a half years then.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am speaking of the facts at the time the two years were refused. I have given the reason why Colonel Gregory wished the two years extension and I am now giving the recommendation of Colonel Otter. So the minister cannot turn it on Colonel Gregory and Major Ferguson and endeavour to show that it was a conspiracy on their part. I am going by the record laid on the table of this House.

> Third, That in view of the great improvement in the efficiency of the regiment that has taken place during Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's command, I think he is deserving of the recognition of his services which I now recommend.

What further proof do we want, in the face of Colonel Otter's own recommendation, of the political meddling of the hon. member for Welland and the senator representing that district ? The minister endeavoured, until I corrected him, to make it appear that Major Glasgow was considerably the senior of the other gentlemen in the regiment. I want to point out that the officers of the regiment stand as follows : Major Ferguson ; Major Glasgow ; Dr. Ferguson's full majority dates from February, 1892.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend looks further in the list, he will learn that Major Ferguson was put in on the same day as Major Glasgow. How does he happen to be at the top ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will tell the hon. gentlemen how. Dr. Ferguson was a major in that regiment in January, 1899, when Dr. Glasgow was not in a cavalry regiment at all, but was a surgeon, I believe, in the 44th Regiment, an infantry regiment in the city of St. Catharines. Is that satisfactory to the minister ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is Dr. Ferguson a combatant officer ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then Dr. Glasgow is.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Dr. Glasgow was not a combatant officer until 1902 ; the minister does not pretend that he was ; whereas Dr. Ferguson was in the regiment for fifteen or twenty years. Another thing : let me ask the minister why Birch and Stull, men with equal qualifications to Dr. Glasgow, men who had distinguished themselves in a cavalry regiment for many years, the brother of one of whom went to South Africa, and both of them good Liberals—although that makes no difference, for we refuse to recognize the politics of any man in the militia—why these two men were passed over and a medical doctor from the 44th Regiment was selected instead, and put over their heads. Will the minister answer that question ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory so recommended.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let me ask a further question. What machinery was behind Colonel Gregory at that date to get that done ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am pointing out to the minister that if we want to criticise motives, we can show what the motive was from the start to the finish. Now, Sir, what are the facts of the whole case ? Colonel Gregory reports, away back on December 3rd, 1902, that Major Glasgow is indifferent. The minister tried to make some capital out of the confidential report. Let me say that I do not believe in these confidential reports. I never made a confidential report in my life without showing it to every officer of the regiment. I object to these intrigues to cut a man's throat behind his back. The sooner that is stopped the better. There is hardly a regiment in this country in which the sheet which the minister holds in his hand is not taken advantage of. I was complimented once by the statement that I had sent in the most satisfactory report of my second in command in the whole community. I object to any commanding officer sending in a confidential report to the minister that would knife a man from behind his back. The first principle of British justice is to bring the accused and the accuser face to face ; and if the commanding officer has any charge to make against any man in his regiment, the man should have a chance to answer it. The report made by Colonel Gregory in reference to Major Ferguson shows that he was honest, because he says that although Major Ferguson had worked his way up in the regiment, he was not as good a man as he would like, being fair in general ability, fair in general professional requirements, indifferent in practical proficiency, in drill and in the field, good in all other respects excepting fair in judgment. All these things are brought out because Dr. Ferguson, I presume, was indifferent owing to being laid up by ill-health.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What does the hon. gentleman have to say about the letter which he will find in the report of the 3rd of December, in which Colonel Gregory singles out Dr. Glasgow to be reported against, and makes no reference whatever to Dr. Ferguson, who is certainly deserving of a more unfavourable report in that very report than Dr. Glasgow ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These are officers for promotion. Dr. Ferguson could not be promoted to any higher place, and therefore Colonel Gregory had no occasion to report upon him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If Colonel Gregory was going out, he would be promoted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, he would have to pass a special examination, as the minister knows. I had to do it, although I thought I knew as much about drill as the others. I took the courses at Kingston and at London, although I had passed examinations in the same matters years before. Every officer in the service, as the minister knows, must do the same thing.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend will look at the sheet under the heading of 'practical proficiency in drill and in the field,' he will find Major Ferguson marked indifferent and Major Glasgow indifferent ; and if he looks at the special report which Colonel Gregory makes he will find the following :

I have the honour to report that the officers mentioned in my report as indifferent are—

Not Major Ferguson, but first, Major Glasgow, although they are both reported indifferent in this report.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister getting childish, or what is the matter with him ? This is a special report to Colonel Otter himself, and why should Colonel Gregory mention those who are indifferent ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Why should he put one man down as indifferent and not the other ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Because he is reporting men who are fit for promotion. Major Ferguson could not be promoted, because he was already second in command, and therefore did not require to be reported upon to Colonel Otter.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, yes ; I will allow anything, although the minister is not always so courteous to me.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of course, I know I am very remiss in that regard.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, I am sure the minister has been quite brusque.

Sir FREDRICK BORDEN. Under heading 14 the question is put :

Is he fit for promotion to higher rank ?

The reply opposite to Ferguson's name is 'yes.' Thus he was fit for promotion according to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And liable to be promoted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These are for the position of second in command. Major Glasgow, who intended taking another course at school, and Taylor, who was not yet qualified. He reports Glasgow as indifferent in the two essentials for second in command——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Ferguson also.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As indiffrent in practical efficiency, in drill in the field, and

as only fair in horsemanship, the chief requisite of a good cavalry man. He reports Ferguson as good in horsemanship. These two points show that he had Major Glasgow's qualification for promotion in mind when he took the stand he did. Now, what are the facts? He goes to Glasgow and says: Ferguson is unqualified to be promoted on account of the weakness in his throat, I want you to go to the school and be qualified. The minister has told us that this man Glasgow was as well qualified as the other. Now, the minister knows that technically he may be right, but practically he is absolutely wrong, and I shall show him by his own regulations that he is absolutely wrong. I will take the case of an officer who succeeds to the command of a regiment. Under the present regulations he must go and take his qualifying certificate; that is, he must go and brush himself up, so to speak, before he can become commander of a regiment. As far back as 1897, I had to do that, so had my friend Colonel Thompson, my friend Colonel Ward, and every other officer in the country before they could be promoted from one step to the other. A few years before, this did not have to be done. Is the minister fair to this House and the country in trying to make believe that the status in relation to the certificates and the regulations applying to the certificates are the same as they were ten years ago, although a man who came in ten years ago was as well qualified as one appointed now? I will prove by his own regulations that he is wrong. In the regulation dated June, 1904, for appointments and promotions, I find:

No person shall be appointed or promoted to any command rank or appointment in the militia unless such person has the qualification which from time to time may be prescribed for such rank or appointment.

4. No person shall be promoted unless he has served at least two years in the rank which he then holds.

Now, I turn to another militia order, No. 69, Wednesday, March 3, 1904. I find there that the classes for the purposes of professionally qualifying for promotions in the militia, other than the permanent force, will be divided into five classes. The fourth class is:

Of majors who desire to qualify for regimental command and of officers who have passed the third-class examinations and desire to qualify for staff appointments.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. How are they to qualify?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By the rules.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. By being instructed at a central camp. Look at clause 3, on the next page.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (reading):

The third, fourth and fifth classes of officers mentioned in paragraph No. 1 of this order—except those resident in Military Districts Nos. 10 and 11, for whom special provision will be made—and the third-class of non-commissioned officers mentioned in paragraph No. 2 of this order—except those resident in Military Districts Nos. 10 and 11, for whom also special provision will be made—will be instructed at the Central Camp only.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was no central camp, and therefore there could be no qualification.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I point out to the House that under the minister's own rules before Major Glasgow——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—could become second in command, he had to comply with this rule here, or else the rules are made fish for one and flesh for another.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know that officers already had to pass these examinations, that there has been disturbance in the country before, and that under the minister's own regulations these officers have to comply with the necessary requirements before they can proceed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is the celebrated regulation which was made in the effort to improve the education of officers, and this regulation did not rescind the previous regulations and orders of 1898, although, by an extraordinary attempt in a militia order, the General Officer Commanding undertook to make a militia general order rescind an Order in Council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is not out of the country yet; be careful.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think I have shown myself to be very much afraid of the general or of the hon. gentleman opposite.

All previous orders relating to the training of officers and non-commissioned officers at schools of instruction, are cancelled.

That is, a General Officer Commanding, by a mere militia order, attempted to cancel a general order. As a matter of fact, the general order of 1898 is in force, and there has never been any qualification whatever under any other order than the order of 1898, which covers the qualification of Major Glasgow.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Now, Sir, Colonel Otter, not content with the recommendation that Colonel Gregory's time be extended, comes back on November 3, 1903, and again demands the extension necessary for Colonel Gregory, but secret influences are at work, the new influences that have been brought into play, which we have recently discovered in connection with the 13th Light Dragoons, and now with this and other regiments. The political pull has been brought into force, and the hon. member for Welland stated, in

language more forcible than polite, at a dinner at St. Catharines, that Lord Dundonald had nothing to do with granting an extension of command to Colonel Gregory, and that he would not get it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not believe that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will take the word of a gentleman who heard him much in preference to that of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German).

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is hard on a brother member of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In a letter from Lord Aylmer, the 30th June, 1904, Lord Aylmer asks—and I am sorry that the papers between Colonel Otter and Colonel Gregory are not here. I have them, but they are not official, and therefore I do not care to use them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The gentleman may use them ; I have them here, all but one letter, I believe, and I shall be glad to send them over.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think I have them all.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then there is no objection at all. As a matter of fact, I got the letters, and then received word from Colonel Otter that one letter had been found later, and I thought it better to bring them all down together.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On January 10, 1904, Colonel Otter writes to Colonel Gregory :

My dear Colonel,—Will you please send me at once recommendation for the appointment of Major Glasgow as regimental major and also for the officer who is to succeed him in command of 'D' squadron. I think that your extension for another year will be arranged.

(Sgd.) W. D. OTTER.

Colonel Gregory wrote in reply that he did not so intend. Colonel Otter writes on November 3 to Colonel Gregory in reference to the letter which I have previously quoted here, showing that he has again urged the department to give Colonel Gregory the extension. Then Colonel Gregory wrote a reply to Colonel Otter that he did not feel disposed to recommend Major Glasgow at that time. On the 14th of January, Otter comes back on Gregory again. He says :

I have your note of yesterday and cannot understand what you mean by writing such a reply to a request that you are in duty bound to accede to.

Why is he bound to accede to any political meddling of a senator or any minister ? If Colonel Otter is weak enough for this, Colonel Gregory is not weak enough to bow to this command.

Please explain this at once, as I cannot accept from you such a reply. It is, to say the least of it insubordinate, though you may not be aware of it.

I want to point out that, on the day Col. Gregory wrote the letter, to which the letter of 14th January, 1901, was a reply, Col. Otter had not the slightest control over him. And as far as I am concerned, I am going to see that our militia officers and men show the spirit of freedom, and that when the minister or any of his satelites under the political regime that seems to be in force at present, undertakes to dragoon them, they will stand up for their rights as free men, and not allow themselves to be trampled upon. Under the statutory law of Canada, the minister has no control over these men except when on duty or in uniform.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no control, but it seems to me their superior officers ought to have.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not the slightest. Why should they ? Has the minister no better opinion of the militia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You would have a pretty funny militia if you had your way.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all. But we would have a very funny militia if any minister could lay his thumb on these men and say to them : You must dance to the tune I play or I will make you suffer, because you are under the King's regulations. These men are not going to submit to that kind of thing. Then follows other correspondence until the 21st January, when Col. Otter again writes Col. Gregory :

I have yours of the 18th instant and accept your explanation in so far as the abruptness of your note is concerned, for most abrupt it was, being a direct refusal to carry out instructions given you without assigning any reason.

And a little later, when poor Col. Gregory assigned reasons, he was promptly dismissed from the service.

I want once more to tell you that it is necessary you should recommend Major Glasgow as second in command and also the officer who is to take over his squadron, so please let me have inclosed form duly filled in as soon as possible. You may be sure that I have good reasons for asking this action on your part.

I want to know these reasons. What are the good reasons which Col. Otter had for his action in this matter ? Was it a question of political pull ? Here again I want to revive the memory of the minister, and possibly he had better ask his deputy. The hon. minister told me in the House that he assumed the responsibility of cancelling the order giving Col. Gregory an extension of command for two years. I want to see that order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not cancelled it, changed it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister changed it, and I want to see it. We want that correspondence brought down. I am told that Col. Gregory informs his friends that there was an order of that kind issued.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman doubt my word ? I stated a moment ago that the thing happened in this way. A recommendation was made to extend the time for two years. I altered that recommendation to one year. There is not the slightest objection to showing the hon. gentleman or anybody else the original document.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We would like to see it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But it is the first time since I have been in parliament that I have known an hon. gentleman to refuse to accept the statement of a minister as to a question of fact. Of course when the hon. gentleman doubts my word, I shall bring the paper down.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister will pardon me. I want to tell him that I have every reason for thinking he is mistaken ; and I would suggest to him that he should consult his deputy and look up all the correspondence, and he will find out that Col. Gregory's statement is true, that the minister, through his deputy or somebody, issued an order to the General Officer Commanding to cancel the 'Gazette' which gave Col. Gregory two years' extension. The minister will find out, on examining the record, that what Col. Gregory informs his friends is true.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No such thing. I remember exactly what happened. When the recommendation came to me I changed it, and initialled the change, and there it is. I have seen it myself within the month.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There was no letter accompanying it ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I am speaking of the extension of time of Col. Gregory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the very thing I am speaking about. Then Col. Otter goes on to say :

I once more tell you that it is necessary you would recommend Major Glasgow as second in command and also the officer who is to take over his squadron, so please let me have the inclosed form duly filled in as soon as possible. You may be sure I have good reasons for asking this action on your part.

I wish the minister would ask Col. Otter for the good reasons. Now we come to a letter from Col. Otter to the officer commanding the Second Dragoons :

Your letter of 22nd of February was duly received and replied to yesterday. The recommendation of Major Glasgow as second in command will be sent in at once, and the extension of your command I have every reason to believe will follow.

Still Col. Gregory stood to his guns. He still said : Until this man goes and qualifies, until he carries out his promise to me by taking a course at the school, I shall not put him in as second in command.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Improve his qualifications ! He was already qualified.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then Col. Otter says :

I have yours of the 22nd, re the promotion of Major Glasgow. I wrote this officer a few days ago and he has promised me to attend at the school before camp for a course, and am quite prepared to forward his recommendation as second in command at once.

So that Col. Otter is still bearing out Col. Gregory's contention that Major Glasgow has not the necessary qualifications to take the second in command.

And I am quite prepared to forward his recommendation as second in command at once. Will you therefore please send me the necessary recommendation as soon as possible. In the letter above quoted you refer to certain conditions under which you will only make the recommendations to which I refer to. But I would not advise you to adhere to the determination you have expressed as Major Glasgow has promised to attend the course before camp. I think that ought to be enough. I am anxious to get this matter settled as soon as possible.

Then we come to another letter from Col. Gregory to Col. Otter :

Sarnia, March 7th, 1904.

Dear Sir,—I have yours of the 2nd instant re promotion of Major Glasgow, and in reply beg to say that if Major Glasgow does attend the school as he has promised, he should remain in command of the squadron until after camp, when his promotion would immediately follow. I am firmly convinced that the proposition I made was not only reasonable but in the interest of the regiment, and I have come to the conclusion that if any extension of tenure depends upon my acceding to the demands of Major Glasgow I had better resign my command at once.

He was still determined that before he would recommend this officer to be second in command, Major Glasgow should be qualified, and rather than recommend him, under the circumstances, he would leave the regiment. Then Col. Otter writes back to Col. Gregory :

Toronto, 10th March, 1904.

I have yours of the 7th instant re Major Glasgow, and regret that you cannot see your way clear to make the recommendation. An action must shortly be taken. I now propose to do it myself.

So that the minister, in endeavouring to shoulder the blame on Colonel Lessard must see that there was a conspiracy behind all this. Why should Colonel Lessard have become imbued with the notion to get near Colonel Otter, and why should Colonel Otter hold the intention as early as the 10th March to act himself in the matter unless there was a power behind the throne ? Unless political pull was being exercised to the detriment of the force and in order to get Major Glasgow promoted. The fact is before us that without Major Glasgow's knowledge stores were handed over to another man without the officer in command of the regiment being consulted. Here let me tell the minister that he will search the records of the Militia Department from confederation down to the present hour, and he will not find another instance where such a thing was done in connection with a regiment without the commanding officer being consulted and being a party to it. It is scandalous that such a thing should be allowed to take place in a free country. One would think that we were under a despotism of the dark ages. If such things are permitted we shall prove ourselves unworthy, of civil and religious liberty. Here is a letter from Colonel Gregory to Colonel Otter, dated May 4, 1904 :

Sir,—In view of our previous correspondence I have the honour to respectfully request you to give me the following information :

1. When and by whom was the order given for the transfer of the arms and accoutrements of 'D' squadron from Major Glasgow to Captain Sharp, and when did the transfer take place ?

(The order was given by me and transfer made on 25th March, 1904.—W. D. O.)

2. Has Major Glasgow been recommended for the position of second in command ?

(Yes, 4, 4, '04.—W. D. O.)

3. Is my tenure of command to be extended beyond July 12, 1904 ?

(No recent recommendation has been made as I understood from Colonel Lessard that you had told him that you did not desire such as you proposed resigning—W. D. O., 13, 5, '04.)

Then Colonel Gregory, as a free man, answered as a free man would do. This letter I may say reached him during the Niagara camp :

Camp Niagara, June 15th, 1904.

To Colonel Otter—

Sir,—As a protest against the system of political intrigue that compels my superior officers to interfere with the efficiency and discipline of the regiment under my command, by promoting without my approval an inefficient officer in my regiment while knowing and acknowledging such inefficiency, and at the same time being aware of the fact that I was trying to compel the officer referred to (Major S. H. Glasgow) to improve his qualification before I recommended him for the promotion to the position of second in command,

I hereby tender my resignation as commanding officer of Second Dragoons, and would further request that I be relieved of my command at once. I have just seen the official announcement of promotions above referred to in the recent issue of the 'Canada Gazette.'

I have the honour to be, Sir,

ROLAND W. GREGORY,

Lieutenant-Colonel Commanding Second Dragoons.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Now, Sir, see the little petty politician get his hand in. Here is another statement :

Camp Niagara, June 21, 1904.

Colonel Gregory to Colonel Otter.

I have the honour to request that I be allowed to correct the statements made by Sir Frederick Borden regarding myself as reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of yesterday.

I do not know what these statements are, but I presume the letter of Colonel Gregory of June 23rd, corrected them. Now we will see what the sequel to this is. Colonel Otter takes that letter of Colonel Gregory's resignation where he says :

As a protest against the system of political intrigue that compels my superior officers to interfere with the efficiency and disposition of the regiment—

Colonel Gregory does not blame Colonel Otter, but he blames the political intriguers in Ottawa. In reference to that, the colonel forwarded this communication :

In connection with this communication, I resent and deny the charge of 'political intrigue' with relation to the appointment of Major Glasgow as second in command of the Second Dragoons.

As I have already explained in a previous memo, I considered it advisable in the interests of the regiment that the appointment above referred to should be filled with the least possible delay, and as Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory would not make a recommendation in the matter, I felt justified under the circumstances in doing so without his recommendation.

We find Colonel Otter's explanation different from that which I quoted a few minutes ago. I referred to it at that time, and asked the minister to obtain from Colonel Otter an explanation of why he had changed his base, why he had now found out that Major Glasgow was qualified for the command whereas a few weeks ago he found he was not qualified for the command.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He never said so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He says he was unfit for the command. Colonel Otter says on the 4th of August, 1903, giving as one reason for his recommendation :

Second, That none of the squadron commanders have had charge of their squadrons for more than eighteen months, and lack the experience to fit them to command the regiment.

Now there was no camp and no opportunity for Major Glasgow to get any training, or to get any further experience between the 4th of August, 1903, and the date when he was placed in command of

that squadron. I ask the minister, did Major Glasgow spend any time in school, or one day in camp anywhere, where he could obtain the qualification to make him better fitted on the 10th day of June, this year than he was on the 4th day of August, 1903 ? Then he goes on to say :

That in view of the great improvement in the efficiency of the regiment that has taken place during Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's command, I think he is deserving of the recognition of his services which I now recommend.

I want the minister to obtain from Colonel Otter and bring to this House his reasons for changing his position, and for finding out so suddenly that Major Glasgow was entitled to the command.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman would read the memorandum of Colonel Otter addressed to the adjutant general, which is among the papers, he might get some light.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the date of the memorandum ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. June 10, 1904.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will read this paragraph in which he says :

On this I wrote Major Glasgow advising him to take a course as soon as possible, to which he replied on the 27th of February that it was his intention to do so, and had such in contemplation before hearing from me.

I thank the minister for drawing my attention to that clause where Colonel Otter deliberately recognizes the fact that Major Glasgow was not qualified to take the position of second in command, but that he urged him——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman read another paragraph?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister asked me to refer to this recommendation and I am referring to it. The next paragraph reads :

Towards the end of March, in order to get all probable transfers completed, I had the transfer of the squadron made by the District Staff Adjutant and at the same time that officer got all particulars concerning the officers affected by the change, and filled up the militia form C1 on the day the transfer took place, namely the 28th of March.

Now I am delighted that he has referred to me again in this matter. When he opened up he charged my hon. friend from Lincoln with not being familiar with the proper routine of promotions in the service. I charge the hon. minister with having deliberately inspired Colonel Otter to trample under foot the recognized course of responsible government in dealing with promotions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say that is absolutely without the slightest foundation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well many a man has been hung for circumstantial evidence and in this case the hon. minister would stand a poor chance of having a verdict of not guilty rendered in his favour.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If you were the jury I might.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister has declared that my hon. frend from Lincoln did not understand the proper course to be pursued in making recommendations. The captain of a squadron recommends to the officer commanding. If it is a major commanding the squadron then the officer commanding the regiment under responsible government is the man and the only man that can do that. I will recall to the mind of the hon. minister the fact that a gentleman who is now a senator from Lindsay undertook to meddle in the formation of my regiment, undertook to force a man into the position of major who was absolutely disqualified and that I defied him and told him that there was only one person in Canada that could make that recommendation. I would not allow the district officer commanding to recommend an appointment over my head. I venture to say that if the minister and the Department of Militia undertook to pursue an illegal course we would be justified in the regiment in pursuing an illegal course also. That is the only way to bring these gentlemen to time and I am surprised that Colonel Otter should undertake to step into a regiment and make a recommendation that only one in the empire can make under our law, viz., the commanding officer. I am satisfied that Major Glasgow's appointment as second in command without having the necessary qualification is not legal unless sanctioned by Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, the officer in command of the regiment. This is the course laid down under our responsible government and the minister who stands up and charges my hon. friend from Lincoln with not being familiar with the proper course has been trampling under foot every regulation that has been in force in the service for generations. Does the hon. minister expect that this House and this country are simple enough to believe that Colonel Otter would have dared to take the course which he pursued if he had not known that the minister was at his back ? If he does he must think us much more simple than we are.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He did not know from me.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not think there is anything more to be said. There is a great deal of correspondence here but I will not go into it further. It shows the government to have been absolutely guilty

of political meddling. There is just this one point and it is the contemptible manner in which the minister dispenses with the services of a man whose record is as honourable as that of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory. Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's services in the force have been as follows : He joined the St. Catharines troop commanded by his father in 1867. He received his commission as cornet at the suggestion of Colonel Duree, deputy adjutant-general, on the 10th January, 1870, and at the request of the late Colonel Villiers, then brigade-major, he took the adjutancy of the dragoons in 1876, he held that position until he took command of the St. Catharines troop in 1883. He held the command of the St. Catharines troop until appointed major, second in command, of the regiment in 1893 and this position he held until he got command of the regiment on July 12, 1898. There is a record of which any man might be proud and every one in the old Niagara district knows that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory has been one of the most self-sacrificing and disinterested soldiers in the service. Yet, a gentleman with a record of that kind, because he has the spirit of a free man, because he resents the petty political tyranny of the minister and his satellites, because he dares to speak out is treated in this manner. He resigns, but, Sir, in place of accepting his resignation in place of allowing this gentleman to retire the hon. minister who has become so egotistical, carried away by his self-importance does what ? Here we have a letter from the General Officer Commanding the militia. Thank God it is not signed 'Dundonald.'

From the General Officer Commanding Canadian militia to the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Ottawa, 18th June, 1904.

Resignation of Lt.-Col. Gregory, 2nd Dragoons.

While the attached letter, of the 15th inst., from Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, officer commanding 2nd Dragoons, is grossly insubordinate in tone, whether his statements are true or false, I feel that it would be better as Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's regiment is now in camp at Niagara, and under his immediate command, that he should be suspended from his command, furnished with transport requisitions and ordered to return to his home forthwith.

The apparent cause of this officer's insubordination—the promotion of Major Glasgow as second in command of the 2nd Dragoons without the concurrence of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory—is fairly well set forth in the accompanying correspondence, but if the hon. minister should consider it desirable that further information be supplied, a court of inquiry can be assembled at a later date for that purpose, after which the disposal of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's services as an officer of the militia can be decided upon.

(Sgd.) AYLMER,
Colonel, commanding Canadian militia.

Here is the order suspending Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Headquarters, 20th June, 1904.

From the Adjutant General, Ottawa, to District Officer Commanding, Military District No. 2, Toronto.

SUSPENDED FROM COMMAND.

Lieutenant-Colonel R. W. Gregory, commanding 2nd Dragoons.

With reference to the resignation of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, commanding 2nd Dragoons, and your covering letter of the 16th instant thereon, you will be so good as to suspend Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory from the command of his regiment until further orders, provide him with the necessary transport requisitions to cover his immediate return to his home, and hand over the command of the 2nd Dragoons to the next senior officer in the usual manner.

(Sgd.) D. H. VIDAL, Colonel,
For Adjutant General.

Is that a fitting conclusion to the connection of this gentleman with the militia ? I am amazed to think that the hon. minister should lend himself to any interference such as has been clearly proven in the conduct of this whole matter. I am not saying anything against the qualifications of Major Glasgow as a medical doctor. But in the 44th he was only the surgeon of the regiment and he never had any qualifications as a combatant officer until 1902. Then, he is placed over the heads of older military men in the regiment. Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory shows no ill will towards him. He speaks well of him although he says he is not good at drill and not a good rider and he urges that he shall go to the school and qualify himself. Then, it comes down to the question of extension of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's command. He says —at least he said to me ; I am a commercial traveller, I am away from home a great deal, it is not worth my while to take the command of the regiment for another year and go on with the organization of it, but, if I can get the command for three years, I am willing to take it. Then, he compromised by offering to accept an extension of two years, but the hon. minister denies him that right and confers in an unconstitutional manner the appointment on Major Glasgow. I am not saying a word against Major Glasgow, I do not know the gentleman, but as far as Major Glasgow's being placed second in command of that regiment is concerned, although Colonel Otter's report as well as Lieutnant-Colonel Gregory's report says that he is not qualified and that he should go to the school, it simply presents another instance of the militia being dragged through the political mire. I will tell the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that Mr. Mackenzie never allowed it. The old Liberal leader in bygone days never allowed it. The old Minister of Militia (Mr. Ross) has told me, as he has told this House, that he never directly or indirectly permitted it. Sir John Macdonald never permitted it. He alweys said that he

kept the bench and the militia free from party politics, and if the hon. Minister of Militia has fallen into bad hands I call upon the right hon. Prime Minister to step in and see that party politics are kept out of the militia of this country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 159) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada—Mr. Holmes.

WEST CANADIAN COLLIERIES, LIMITED.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 80) respecting the West Canadian Collieries, Limited—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. SPROULE. I have once before suggested that in the case of these Bills coming from the Senate, some one should take the responsibility of announcing to the House whether the amendments made by the Senate are of some consequence, or merely verbal alterations.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendments here are clerical; the only exception being that clause 8, providing that the company may dispose of its undertaking, and clause 9, which provides for the issue of paid-up stock by the company, are stricken out.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY—RESIGNATION OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL GREGORY.

House resumed debate on motion for Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). In view of the somewhat elaborate discussion which has taken place on this matter, I propose to detain the House only a very few moments. It would appear to me that the attacks which the Minister of Militia has made upon Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory are founded more upon inference than upon any evidence we have before us. After a pretty careful examination of this correspondence from beginning to end, I do not find anything that would justify one in coming to the conclusion that there had been any conspiracy on the part of Colonel Gregory. The Minister of Militia founds his inference principally upon the fact of Major Ferguson's illness and the refusal of Colonel Gregory to recommend the appointment of Major Glasgow as second in command. That inference is unreasonable and without any foundation. It is beyond question, so far as I have been able to gather, that Major Ferguson was absolutely qualified in a military sense, and that under the advice of experts he fully expected to recover from the infirmity of the throat which had occasioned his loss of voice. It was therefore entirely fair that Major Ferguson should be allowed a reasonable time to undergo medical treatment, in order that he might recover and proceed to promotion in the regiment.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Major Ferguson's qualification was no better than that of Major Glasgow; in fact, according to the confidential report of Colonel Gregory, it was not as good. They were both reported 'indifferent' in a certain thing, and in other things 'fair' and 'good.' The report upon Glasgow was somewhat better than that upon Ferguson.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that concerns the question very much, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. The question is, whether or not it was a reasonable thing for Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory to insist that Major Ferguson and Major Glasgow should obtain some further training and qualification before either should be recommended as second in command. In that matter Colonel Gregory should have the right to his own judgment; the commanding officer is not supposed to make his recommendation as a mere matter of form; he has to exercise his judgment upon it, and the only sound criticism that could be made upon Colonel Gregory would be that in refusing this recommendation he was not acting bona fide. That would be a fair, and it would be a severe criticism on the part of the Minister of Militia, if he had any foundation for it. But any such idea is absolutely inconsistent with the evidence before us. I am willing to concede, for the purpose of argument, that the minister is correct in saying that Major Ferguson's qualifications were no better than Major Glasgow's, but what does Major Ferguson himself say when there is some question raised as to his undertaking the command of that regiment. In a letter, dated the 13th of July, 1903, he says:

> Letter just received. By all means I wish to see Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's time extended. I am not in a position now to take his place and if it were open to-morrow could not, so wish you would do what is within your power to have his time extended as long as possible. I hope to be able to get to the school this coming winter and qualify.

It has not been denied by the Minister of Militia that Major Ferguson was as well qualified as Major Glasgow, so that out of the mouth of Major Ferguson, as the first witness, we have the distinct statement that if he should take the command of that regiment he regards it as absolutely necessary that he should go to the school and qualify. These gentlemen may be technically qualified, but they may not be regarded either by themselves or by their commanding officer as professionally qualified to fill that high position in such a sense as would justify

the recommendation of the officer commanding. The next witness is Major Glasgow himself, and I will read a letter which has not been placed before the House as yet. This letter is dated the 27th of February, 1904, signed by Major Glasgow and addressed to Colonel Otter :

Dear Colonel Otter,—I received your letter and in reply will state that it is my intention to attend the school to improve myself before the June camp. I thank you for your good advice and in fairness to myself will say that I had the matter under serious contemplation before the receipt of your communication.

Yours truly,
S. H. GLASGOW.

Major Glasgow himself is the second witness in answer to the minister, and he recognizes the fact that he must have a further training before he can hope for a recommendation as second in command, or promotion as commanding officer. He excuses himself ; he says :

In fairness to myself will say that I had the matter in serious contemplation before the receipt of your communication.

That is in reply to a letter from Colonel Otter, in which the District Officer Commanding had pointed out to Major Glasgow the absolute necessity of adopting this course if he desired to be recommended as second in command. Here are two witnesses to prove that it was eminently reasonable for Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory to call upon Major Glasgow to get some further training before he should be recommended to this position. How then can the Minister of Militia for one moment say that Colonel Gregory was acting in bad faith when he suggested that Major Glasgow should take this very course ?

It was a course which Major Ferguson admitted to be necessary in his own case ; it was a course which Major Glasgow admitted to be necessary in his case ; and, according to the statement of the Minister of Militia this afternoon, these two officers, so far as qualification is concerned, were on the same footing. But we have a third witness ; we have the testimony of Colonel Otter in support of Colonel Gregory in this regard. Here is a report from Colonel Otter to the Adjutant General under date of the 10th of June, 1904, and it contains the following passage :

On the 22nd February Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory replied that he would recommend Major Glasgow provided that he, 1st, retained the command of the squadron until after the June camp; 2nd, that he would in the meantime take a course at the Royal School of Cavalry, and improve his qualification.

Now, if the matter had presented itself to Colonel Otter as it evidently presents itself to the Minister of Militia, or rather as he presented it to the House this afternoon, Colonel Otter would have said : I immediately told Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory that that was not at all necessary, that he was going out of his way to make any such suggestion as that with regard to Major Glasgow, because he was fully qualified, and it was his duty either to recommend or not to recommend. Does Colonel Otter leave the situation in that light ? Not by any means. Let him speak for himself. His letter continues as follows :

On this I wrote Major Glasgow advising him to take a course as soon as possible, to which he replied on the 27th February that it was his intention to do so, and had such in contemplation before hearing from me.

You have thus three witnesses not only as to the absolute bona fides of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, but as to the wisdom of the course which he suggested Major Glasgow should follow. Under these circumstances it does not seem to me becoming that any reflection should be made on one side of the House or the other on the bona fides of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory in that regard, or on his conduct in making this suggestion.

I will not deal further with that portion of the correspondence, because it has been gone over pretty thoroughly, and I do not want to repeat what has been said. But I am bound to say a few words on a certain portion of the correspondence which has been read this afternoon, and I must confess that it presents itself to my mind in a very peculiar light. On the 4th day of August, 1903, Colonel Otter wrote to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory as follows :

Dear Colonel,—I have yours of the 23rd ultimo re your extension of command, and while I am sure the period you name, three years, would not be entertained by the department, I am quite willing to recommend you for a term of two years, which I have done to-day, and trust to have approved.

In haste, yours,
W. D. OTTER.

I may say in passing that on no less than two occasions did Colonel Otter recommend Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory for an extension of two years. On two occasions he stated that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's extension of the command for that period was in his opinion necessary to the welfare and efficiency of the regiment ; and I would have thought that after the report of an experienced officer of Colonel Otter's standing, the Minister of Militia should have given some better reason to the House for overriding that report than the reason he gave the House this afternoon. However, the whole record is on 'Hansard.' On the 3rd of November, 1903, Colonel Otter writes again to Colonel Gregory as follows :

My dear Colonel,—I have your official of the 2nd instant, but before forwarding it to headquarters I am to-day writing urging that my recommendation of some months ago, for two years, be granted. You will thus understand any delay that may take place.

On the 10th of January, a little more than two months after he had forwarded that second urgent recommendation, there is a letter from Colonel Otter to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory as follows :

My dear Colonel,—Will you please send me at once recommendation for appointment of Major Glasgow as regimental major, and also for the officer who is to succeed him in command of 'D' squadron.

I think that your extension for another year will be arranged.

It appears that in reply to that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory wrote a letter of which I have no copy ; but on the 14th of January, Colonel Otter wrote in reply to that letter as follows :

Dear Colonel,—I have your note of yesterday and cannot understand what you mean by writing such a reply to a request that you are in duty bound to accede to. Please explain yourself at once as I cannot accept from you such a reply. It is to say the least of it insubordinate, though you may not be aware of it.

I may not thoroughly understand the principles of military etiquette, but I confess that I do not understand how Colonel Otter could say to Colonel Gregory that he is in duty bound to make a particular recommendation. Is this recommendation a mere matter of form ? Has Colonel Otter, as district officer commanding, the right to say to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, You are bound to recommend a particular individual as second in command, though that is against your better judgment ? If there is a form of that kind, I would say that in the interest of the whole country, in the interest of the militia especially, it had better be abolished at once. In reply to that, Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, on January 18, 1904, writes as follows :

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 14th instant received and in explanation beg to say that in the interest of 'D' squadron and the regiment I did not think it advisable to take Major Glasgow from his squadron at the present time. I may not have been sufficiently clear in my note as to my reasons, but I certainly had no intention of being insubordinate.

To that Colonel Otter, on the 21st of January, replied as follows :

Dear Colonel,—I have yours of the 18th instant and accept your explanation so far as the abruptness of your note is concerned, for most abrupt it was, being a direct refusal to carry out instructions given you without assigning any reason.

That seems very curious language to come from Colonel Otter in respect to a matter in which Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory has a right to exercise his judgment—ay, more than that, is bound to exercise his judgment. If Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory gave a recommendation of that kind against his true judgment, he would be guilty of dereliction of his duty in every sense of the term. It would be dishonest for him to do so ; it would be wrong for him to do so. And yet Colonel Otter seems to think he has a right to issue instructions to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory commanding him to recommend a particular officer as the proper person to become second in command.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has no authority.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If he has any such authority, I should think that the sooner it is taken away the better. His letter continues as follows :

I once more tell you that it is necessary you should recommend Major Glasgow as second in command and also the officer who is to take over his squadron, so please let me have the inclosed form duly filled in as soon as possible.

And he uses that language, although he has been definitely and distinctly told by Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory that he does not regard it as in the best interests of the regiment that he should recommend Major Glasgow as the second in command. It seems remarkable language to be used by an officer in a position of that kind. For my part I am not able to understand it. Colonel Otter continues :

You may be sure that I have good reasons for asking this action on your part.

A most mysterious portion of the letter, and a portion of which we have had no explanation up to the present time. I accept at once the statement of the Minister of Militia, that he knows of nothing to which this can refer, if he went that far, but whether there was some action on the part of the minister or not—and in view of his denial we are bound to assume there was not—there certainly was action on the part of some person who thought that he had influence in matters of this kind, and it is evidently on account of the threatened exercise of that influence that Colonel Otter sees fit to say, dares to say, to Colonel Gregory in respect of this matter :

You may be sure that I have good reasons for asking this action on your part.

Let it not be forgotten in dealing with this correspondence that Colonel Otter has twice recommended Colonel Gregory for an extension of two years, has pressed that upon the department, and that that appointment is now being delayed while Colonel Otter is fencing with Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory during all these weeks for the purpose of compelling him to make a recommendation which Colonel Gregory thought he had not the right to make.

The correspondence continues as follows : On January 26, Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory wrote Colonel Otter as follows :

Sir,—I have the honour to report that I have made the following arrangement with Major S. H. Glasgow re promotion.

First, that he retain command of 'D' squadron until after the camp in June, and in the meantime try and take a special course at Royal Military College to improve his qualification.

Second, that I will at, or immediately after camp recommend him for the position of second in command of the regiment.

I expect to have a letter from Major Glasgow concurring in this arrangement which I trust will be satisfactory.

On the 22nd of February he writes a further letter, which I need not read, and which is practically to the same effect. Let it be understood that during all this period there has still been no action taken upon the report of Colonel Otter, that an extension of two years should be granted to Colonel Gregory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like to interrupt my hon. friend there. Action was taken in September, 1903, upon that report, and, so far as I know, there was no report except a letter a month later from Colonel Otter, in which he regrets that the extension had not been made for two years instead of one. I do not know of any other report since that time, and I do not think there was any.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There were two reports of Colonel Otter's.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think they were close together. There was his first report, favouring an extension of command for two years. That extension was cut down by me to one year. Almost immediately after there was a letter from Colonel Otter, regretting that the extension had not been carried out for two years instead of one. That was within a month.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister has not very carefully followed the correspondence I have already read. On November 3, 1903, Colonel Otter writes to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory as follows :

My dear colonel,—I have your official of the second instant, but before forwarding it to headquarters I am to-day——

That is on November 3rd, 1903.

—writing urging that my recommendation of some months ago for a two years' extension be granted. You will thus understand any delay that may take place.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That letter of Colonel Otter's is among the papers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know it is, but my hon. friend thought there was no letter later than September. This will show that there was a letter as late as November 3, and it was to that I was referring.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said that there was but the one occasion upon which the matter was dealt with at headquarters. That was after Colonel Otter's recommendation of September, which was dealt with, and immediately thereafter—I thought it was sooner than two months, but shortly thereafter—a letter from Colonel Otter, reporting that he regretted that the two full years' extension had not been given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Here is the letter I was looking for. It is a letter from Colonel Otter to the Adjutant General :

Toronto, 3rd Nov., 1902.

Sir,—I have the honour to refer to G. O. 149 of 5th September, 1903, respecting the extension of the command of the officer named below for one year.

Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, 2nd Dragoons,

And to respectfully ask the reconsideration of the case by the General Officer Commanding, with a view to enlarging the time of extension to two years as recommended by me in my letter of the 4th August last.

In that letter you will note my reasons for making this recommendation and I am still fully convinced of the desirability of conceding the extension for two years, if the efficiency of the regiment is to be maintained ; besides which I very much doubt if Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory will accept an extension for one year.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. D. OTTER, Colonel.

That is the letter to which I alluded when I said there had been no action taken during all this period, that no action was being taken on this letter.

I have quoted letters from Colonel Otter to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory, demanding that he shall give a recommendation to Major Glasgow as second in command of the regiment, letters not only urging him to do it, but commanding him to do it, as a matter of military duty. Now, I said, and I repeat, that having regard to the terms which Colonel Otter used in these letters addressed to Colonel Gregory, it is evident that some person who either has or imagines he has political influence, is communicating with Colonel Otter respecting this matter, and is insisting that Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory shall recommend Major Glasgow as second in command, or in the alternative that there should be no further extension of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory's command. That is perfectly evident, and no one who reads these letters with any care or consideration can for one moment doubt it.

On February 29, after this had continued during all these weeks—and one can understand why Colonel Gregory should be anxious to know whether or not he was to be continued in command, as he would have his arrangements to make, and would have to consider his own future as well as the future of the regiment—during all this period, while the correspondence was going on, he was in doubt, so finally, on February 29, he addressed this letter to Colonel Otter :

Sir,—I have the honour to respectfully request you to inform me if my letter of the 22nd instant re promotion of Major Glasgow to the position of second in command will be

acceptable and if my tenure of command is to be extended beyond 29th July, 1904.

I have the honour to be, &c.

He frankly recognizes the situation there. He has made a certain recommendation in favour of Major Glasgow as second in command, provided Major Glasgow obtains certain qualifications, and he writes to ask whether or not that recommendation will be acceptable, and if his tenure of command is to be extended beyond the 29th of July.

In reply to that letter Colonel Otter writes under date 3rd March, 1904 :

Officer commanding 2nd Dragoons.

Your letter of February 22nd was duly received and replied to yesterday. The recommendation of Major Glasgow as second in command should be sent in at once.

And the extension of your command I have every reason to believe will follow.

That is as plain as words can make it. If Lt.-Col. Gregory, against his better judgment will, without qualification, recommend Major Glasgow to be second in command of that regiment, then his period of service will be extended one year ; if on the other hand, he follows the dictates of his better judgment and insists on the full qualification to which reference has been made, the period of his service will not be extended one year. There is the whole thing in black and white. You are not left to inference ; there is Col. Otter's direct statement to Col. Gregory as to what the situation is. If my hon. friend the Minister of Militia thinks that is a desirable condition in which to leave this matter without further explanation, I can only say that I should hardly be inclined to concur with him.

There is some further correspondence which, it seems to me, throws no further light upon the subject, until we come to the letter of Lt.-Col. Gregory addressed to Col. Otter, and dated 7th March. It is as follows :

Sarnia, March 7th, 1904.

Dear Sir,—I have yours of the 2nd instant re promotion of Major Glasgow and in reply beg to say that if Major Glasgow does attend the school as he has promised he should remain in command of his squadron until after camp when his promotion would immediately follow. I am firmly convinced that the proposition I made was not only reasonable but in the interest of the regiment, and I have come to the conclusion that if my extension of tenure depends upon me acceding to the demands of Major Glasgow I had better resign my command at once.

Yours sincerely,
ROLAND W. GREGORY,
Lieutenant-Colonel Commanding 2nd Dragoons.

Colonel Otter, D.O.C., Toronto.

I think we would all agree with him that his usefulness was gone if conditions were such that he was not permitted to exercise the judgment which he was bound to exercise in the interest of his regiment and, as I should think, under his oath of office ; if he was not to insist upon certain qualifications which he believed to be necessary but was obliged, as a matter of military command, to make this recommendation, or if he was obliged to make it as a condition of obtaining the extension of command which he thought his due, it is clear that he was right in believing that his usefulness was gone and that he was right in resigning his command. Finally we have his letter of 15th June in which he refers distinctly to political intrigue. This is denied by Col. Otter. I think it would have been well for Col. Otter in making that denial to furnish to this House and to this country some explanation of the letters I have read. And I have to say that, if I had anything to do with him, and if he could not give a clear and frank explanation to show that political intrigue was not affecting his judgment in these matters, I would consider that he was worthy to be dismissed within forty-eight hours. How does this gentleman venture to impose upon Lt.-Col. Gregory, as a matter of military command, that which should be left to the right and true judgment of Lt.-Col. Gregory ? How does he venture to traffic in the question of extending Lt.-Col. Gregory's term of office ? How is it that we find a district officer commanding descending to work of that kind. 'If you assent to this recommendation ; if you withdraw your qualifications, your term will be extended for one year ; if you persevere in what you believe to be right ; if you persevere in what you believe to be in the interest of the regiment, your term will not be extended.' I think it is high time we had some rule in the militia of this country which would prevent a district officer commanding entering into traffic of that kind. I accept at once the statement of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that he knew nothing of it. But some one knew of it ; Col. Otter was doing this at the instance of somebody. We are not quite fools ; and, when we read this correspondence we understand well enough what it means. And I venture to think it would be very much in the interest, not only of the government but of Col. Otter as well, that some explanation of this most extraordinary correspondence should be furnished to the House forthwith. I can take only one meaning from it. In saying that, I desire to be fair to Col. Otter. I regret very much, in the interest of the militia force, that correspondence of this kind should have been placed before the House.

And let me say that in the additional correspondence that the Minister of Militia brought down to us I have this further confirmation not only of the bona fides but of the wisdom of Col. Gregory in insisting upon further qualification. Here is a letter from Major Glasgow, under date of 17th February, addressed to Col. Otter :

Dear Colonel Otter,—I am forwarding to Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory by this mail a letter asking that I be recommended as second in command of the regiment.

Yours truly,
S. H. GLASGOW.

I do not know whether that is in order. I should suppose that Major Glasgow ought to have communicated with his own lieutenant-colonel. However, he saw fit to go outside of his own commanding officer and to write this letter to Col. Otter. And on this document, at the bottom of the page, is a note—evidently we have not the full correspondence. This note made by Col. Otter says: 'Answered 19th February concurring and advising further qualifications at once.' So, here is Major Glasgow's intimation to the district officer commanding that he is asking to be recommended as second in command, and upon it is the memorandum of the district officer commanding that he concurs and advises further qualification at once. Yet, we are told by the Minister of Militia that Lt.-Col. Gregory was not acting bona fide when he was insisting on this qualification. Was Col. Otter acting bona fide when he advised it? I think the Minister of Militia has done injustice to Lt.-Col. Gregory in describing him as a conspirator—for this was the indictment against him to-day, I think there is not a line, not a syllable, in this correspondence which does not indicate that Lt.-Col. Gregory in taking the course he did, was taking the course which presented itself to his best judgment; and in every single action he took with regard to Major Glasgow he is not only supported by Major Glasgow himself, who admitted the necessity of further qualification, but also by Major Ferguson who, having the same qualification as Major Glasgow, admitted that he must require more if he were to be appointed second in command; and, last but not least, Lt.-Col. Gregory is supported by the direct advice and concurrence of Col. Otter at the time. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that Lt.-Col. Gregory comes out of this with his reputation absolutely unblemished; comes out of it as one who has acted the part of a good soldier and an honest man, one who only retired from the regiment when he found that his usefulness was gone by reason of certain influences which were being exercised against him and which prevented him from giving to the regiment that direction which he thought was its due.

Mr. E. B. OSLER. I would like to ask the minister to answer one question. It is a question which has been raised in this House a great many times during this debate and during other debates on military questions, and one which must be of interest to the country. That question is whether the militiamen of the country, when out of uniform and not on duty, are subject to the control, or the will—control, perhaps, is a better word—of the Minister of Militia or the officers of their regiments? I am asking this question because it is one of public interest. It has been stated positively by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that the militia are not in any way under the control of their military superiors when they are not in uniform and not on duty. I hope sincerely that he is right in that statement, and that such is the fact. The Minister of Militia, so far as I have heard him, has not denied these statements. The question is so important and affects so closely the personal rights of almost every man in the militia, every volunteer in the country, that I think it is due to the force that the Minister of Militia should make a distinct announcement on that question so that there can be in future no doubt about it. It is only fair to the members of the militia that they should get from the minister a statement clear enough to leave no misunderstanding. If they are under the control of the Minister of Militia or of their superior officers all the year round, it had better be known and realized at once.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it would be out of place for me now to make a statement on this point. There may be an opportunity later on. I would refer my hon. friend to Militia Law and Regulations.

Mr. OSLER. I am perhaps in the position of most of the members of this House in not being connected with the militia force and I am not able, certainly without a great deal of study, to form an opinion on the subject. I think surely the Minister of Militia ought to be able to make an announcement on that question that would carry weight all over the country. I do not think it should be left to each member of the militia and each volunteer to interpret for himself, or that they should be obliged to study up the laws, rules and regulations in order to ascertain whether they are entitled to speak their mind freely on subjects which they know they cannot discuss when they are in uniform and on duty. I think it is essential that we should have from the minister a clear, straight statement on that question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If I may say one more word—I am sure that nothing I could say would settle the question; it would still be a question probably for the courts to determine, no matter what I might say.

Mr. OSLER. If that is the case, might I suggest that in the Militia Bill now before the House we should take that question out of the courts and make it perfectly plain, so that there may be no longer any doubt about it. It is the duty of the government not to allow any rules to be put in so vague a manner that the Minister of Militia him-

self says they must be referred to the court to interpret.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. The Minister of Militia is at the head of that department in Canada and is always looked up to as the one who might properly interpret the Militia Law. Let him put an interpretation on it, and then leave it to others to call that interpretation into question if they desire. But a pronouncement from him would certainly carry weight. There are many who desire to keep strictly within the regulations and yet entertain an opinion that they ought to have perfect freedom, when they are not wearing the King's uniform to hold and to express their views on public matters. I think the Minister of Militia should not be reluctant to give us his opinion on this question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If I might ask a question of the Minister of Militia——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can only speak again with the consent of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By permission of the minister I want to ask a question. The Militia Bill comes up again in committee in a short time, and when it comes to its third reading, I would suggest that the minister give us a little notice, then the question brought up by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) can be discussed. I have given the minister notice of a motion that I propose moving on that occasion.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON. Can we not get through our business in this House without so much militarism ? I have been here from 10th of March——

Some hon. MEMBERS. You don't like it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have a right to express my opinion. I have not bothered the House by talking much, and I am very anxious to get away, I think we all are. I think, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada are thoroughly sick and tired of hearing so much talk of military matters in this House. There are other things to talk about. I am prepared to do my share at all times in defence of my country, as well as any other man, but I do wish to protest against so much time being wasted on military matters in this House. There are many other things of very great importance that we should consider, and among them is that of winding up the business of this session so that we may get home. I wish to enter my protest as vigorously as I can, and I hope we will forget for a little while at least that we have such a thing as a militia in this country. Let us get to work and do business.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. If the innocent question which my colleague from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has asked the Minister of Militia is not a proper question to ask and not a proper question to be answered, I am very much surprised. Is it introducing militarism into this House to enter an emphatic protest on every occasion against the prostitution of the militia force to the advancement of party interests ? Will anybody say that the opposition is introducing militarism in the discussion which took place this afternoon, in entering a protest against the treatment which has been meted out to a gallant officer ? The opposition would be derelict in its duty if it allowed this session to pass without taking prompt notice of this matter, and bringing it to the attention of the country. Shall it be said that the hon. member for West Toronto is taking up the time of the House unnecessarily in discussing militarism when he asks the simple question of the Minister of Militia, if a militiaman when off duty, when not clothed in the garb of a military man, is amenable to military discipline ? I think my colleague was endeavouring to put a stop to the imperium in imperio that is being created on the other side of the House, and that he should receive the support and countenance of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). We have some rights in this House, and I think certainly one of our rights is to protect the militia force, to endeavour to keep it what it was intended to be, and to prevent it being reduced to an arm, a political aid and support, of hon. gentlemen opposite. If there is any quarrel between the two sides of the House it is we who are standing as guardians of the militia, who think the militia has a mission to perform, and that that mission can only be performed to the satisfaction of the country by the force being kept out of party politics.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You have had your innings already.

Mr. CLARKE. We have not had our innings yet, but we will have it when the Bill comes up again, and we will see whether a reasonable question asked by my colleague should receive an answer. I think the minister ought to have been able to answer it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I had no reference to that question at all.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that the question asked by his colleague (Mr. Osler) was one of the most important questions that could be asked in this House and I have merely risen to say that although the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) now declines to answer that most important and very proper question he practically answered this afternoon. It will be remembered that this afternoon a letter was read by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) bearing date the 23rd June at which

date it was stated by the hon. Minister of Militia the writer of that letter, Colonel Gregory, was in camp. As a matter of fact he was not in camp and the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence having been called to this fact that not only was Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory not in camp at the time but that he had been actually suspended by the order of the minister himself some three days before the minister quietly added : I do not know that it makes any difference. Every member of this House knows, every militiamen in this country knows that if Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory had been in camp wearing his uniform on the 23rd of June it would have been improper for him to have written that letter to the newspapers. Nobody would question that ; but when the hon. minister states that he did not know it made any difference whether Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory wrote that letter not merely after he had ceased to be a member of the militia but after he had been suspended by the hon. minister himself, it would seem to be such a monstrous doctrine that I, an ordinary layman would not have believed my ears had not precisely the same theory been carried into effect in my own city of Belleville. One of our colonels retired after he had served his time in the regiment and when he was on the retired list, happening to make some observations at a private dinner which were obnoxious to the hon. minister, he was called upon to give an account of his words. The answer was sent by the colonel to the minister with the request that it be laid before the General Officer Commanding and while at the same time courteously answering the letter raising the point whether or not the minister had any control over him now that he was on the retired list, no answer was given by the department and although the colonel has written again and again asking that his questions shall be answered he has been unable to obtain even the courtesy of a reply. I think in view of these two facts, the treatment of Lieutenant-Colonel Gregory and the treatment of Lieutenant-Colonel Ponton, which is an actual fact in the history of the militia force, we do not require any statement from the hon. minister as to what his view is as to his rights or intentions in regard to the militia force. I would like to point out to the hon. minister that while he says that the question before the House is a moot question, that the regulations are there and that every one can read them for himself, everybody knows perfectly well that if it is a moot question it could be made a plain question in two minutes by the hon. minister, and if he is willing to have an Act of this parliament passed declaring that no official of the department has any control over an officer who is not on duty every officer will feel himself free and independent if he is not on duty. The doctrine laid down by the hon. minister brings it down to this that every officer and soldier in the militia, no matter how high or how humble he may be, when he joins the force pledges himself for ever to abstain from politics in so far as supporting the party of the opposition in this House is concerned. But, when it comes to gentlemen in the militia supporting hon. gentlemen opposite it is apparent that they can sign any sort of a document they choose to give a certificate of character to hon. gentlemen opposite and the government does not deem it to be a violation of the King's regulations. But, let any gentleman in the force, no matter what his position in the country may be, express a difference of opinion with hon. gentlemen opposite and he is at once disciplined by his superiors. If that is not a case of dragooning I would like to know what it is.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, Prince Edward Island—Higgin's shore pier, works of construction and repairs, $1,000.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister what is being done at Higgin's Pier ?

Mr. CHAS. HYMAN (acting Minister of Public Works). The departmental estimate for the work is as follows : Face timbers, 25 pounds, $250 ; cross ties, $100 ; face piles, $250 ; one and a half tons iron, $150 ; stone filling, $175 ; gravel filling, $75.

Mr. HACKETT. Is that for the renewal of the old work or is it for a new one ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, for the renewal of the old work.

Mr. HACKETT. You will remember that last year I made a protest against any money being expended on the old work and that I pointed out that if the government desired to accommodate the people of that part of the country they would build an entirely new work.

Mr. HYMAN. The work is there, it is a government work and the government felt they ought to maintain it. Therefore the engineers recommended that this sum be expended for the purpose of maintaining the old work.

Mr. HACKETT. Before I came to parliament last year a meeting of the people of the locality was held and they sent a memorial to the government asking that no more money be spent on the old work but that a new work be commenced some 100 yards away from the old work because the old work was in an improper situation and would never be of any more benefit. I am sorry that the government are spending money on this old work.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to drop the item if the hon. gentleman objects.

Mr. HACKETT. That is the old game of bluff. Strike it out if you dare. I dare you to strike it out.

Mr. HYMAN. I move that the item be dropped.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think perhaps on consideration the minister will realize that he had made a mistake. He wants to throw the responsibility upon the hon. member (Mr. Hackett). I know nothing about the transaction nor as to whether it is a wise expenditure or an unwise expenditure, but I understand the protest of the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) to be that the money was not being spent in the proper place. If the minister had listened to the suggestion of the hon. member, he would have allowed the item to be passed with the intention that if that were not the proper place to spend the money it would be spent in some adjacent location where people of that section of the country approved of it, or the minister himself or his engineers might think it better to expend the money. I have no desire to increase the expenditure of the country or to ask the minister to allow the item to go through beyond the fact that I think it unfair to throw the responsibility of dropping the item upon the hon. member, simply because he made the suggestion that it would be better to spend the money at a place where the people would get greater advantage from it.

Mr. MONET. I do not think there is anything unfair in dropping this item. At the end of every session gentlemen opposite are in the habit of criticising the general expenditure without mentioning a single item to which they object. Just now they have mentioned an item which they believed not to be a legitimate expenditure, and the Minister of Public Works relying upon the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) moves that the item should be dropped. I think that is perfectly fair.

Mr. OSLER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monet) carry out that suggestion a little further, and say that the minister should drop every item to which the opposition object ?

Mr. MONET. If I condemn an expenditure in my constituency, I think the minister should drop the item.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a work which has been in existence. The officers of the department have recommended to the minister the expenditure of $1,000 for repairs of the old work, and the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) objects to the expenditure of this money altogether. It is not a question of spending the money in some other place ; the money is intended for the repairs of this particular work ; and it cannot be expended elsewhere. If the hon. member thinks there should be a new pier, I shall be glad to instruct the engineers to have the matter looked into, but it is not a thing that can be decided at a moment's notice to-night. As I understand, the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) asked that the item should be struck out, and I shall be glad to have the engineer at the first opportunity inquire into the necessity for a new work.

Mr. HACKETT. The people of that section of the country are not in favour of expending any more money on the old work. They want a new work altogether, about 100 yards away from the old work, and at a meeting of the electors held a year ago they passed a resolution that any expenditure made there should be upon the new work, and that it would be simply a waste of money to expend it upon the old work. That is the view of the people, and you can do what you like about it. You may strike it out or you may leave it there. It makes no difference to me ; I am only expressing the wishes of the people when I make these remarks.

Mr. HYMAN. I withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn and item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Prince Edward Island—New London harbour improvements, $5,500.

Mr. HACKETT. What is this vote for ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is to improve the entrance of the channel. The work is under contract ; the contract price being $5,500.

Mr. HACKETT. Were tenders invited ?

Mr. HYMAN. Public tenders were invited.

Mr. HACKETT. Who was the contractor ?

Mr. HYMAN. T. P. Cullen.

Harbours and rivers—Prince Edward Island —Point Prim island wharf, $5,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this a new work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. The estimated cost is $15,000, and tenders have been called for.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this intended to improve the entrance to Charlottetown harbour ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a wharf at Point Prim island, and is to be 1,000 feet long.

Mr. HACKETT. Are the boats that will use it engaged in the deep sea fisheries, or the coast fisheries ?

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose when the wharf is built, any kind of boat will be able to use it.

Mr. HACKETT. Has the contract been let ?

Mr. HYMAN. Tenders have been advertised for but the contract has not been let.

Mr. HACKETT. I am making no objection to this vote at all, but I consider that

there are many parts of Prince Edward Island, especially on the northeast of the island, where money could be expended with greater advantage to the people than at this particular point.

Mr. HYMAN. It is only a question of degree then.

Mr. HACKETT. I at first supposed that this was to improve the entrance to Charlottetown harbour, but it appears now that it is only for a boat shelter. I am in favour of affording every accommodation to the fishermen of the island, and I would like to know whether these boats are small boats or large boats.

Mr. HYMAN. My foresight is not sufficient to enable me to tell what kind of boats will use this wharf when it is built. At the outer end the wharf is six feet at low water, and fifteen feet at high tide, and any boats that come there to use it will be allowed to.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this wharf from the shore towards the island ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is on the island.

P. E. I.—Richmond Bay — reconstruction of wharf near Grand river ferry, $5,000.

Mr. HACKETT. When did this wharf come into the hands of the federal government ?

Mr. HYMAN. The officers of the department tell me that this wharf was purchased from the province a number of years ago.

Mr. HACKETT. I remember when the piers on Prince Edward Island were taken over by the federal government from the local government, and this wharf was left. It must have been taken over lately.

Mr. HYMAN. The question is in regard to the expenditure of money on a wharf which belongs to the Dominion government. I can inform the hon. gentleman that I will have this matter looked into, and if the wharf does not belong to the Dominion government, the money will not be spent.

P. E. I.—Rustico harbour—breakwater on Robinson's island, south side of entrance to harbour, $11,000.

Mr. HACKETT. This is mainly a revote. What has been done there ? Has the contract been let ?

Mr. HYMAN. The plans are all ready, and the tenders will be advertised for immediately.

Mr. HACKETT. We have a great deal of this kind of thing on Prince Edward Island. Immediately preceding an election a large amount of money is voted, but nothing is done. I trust the minister will see that this money will be expended in the interest of the people down there, and that the placing of money in the estimates to be carried until the elections are over will be stopped.

P. E. I.—Souris, Knight's Point—strengthening of breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Who is the contractor for this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contractor is J. Lanigan.

Mr. HACKETT. Anybody else ? The allegation has been made in the press that the hon. member for King's is a partner in this work, and he will be able to deny that statement if it is not correct.

Mr. JAMES. J. HUGHES Does my hon. friend make that statement ?

Mr. HACKETT. I saw it in the press.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Does my hon. friend endorse it ?

Mr. HACKETT. I am not assuming to endorse it

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. When any man makes that statement on his own authority, I will refer to it.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to be perfectly fair to the hon. gentleman. It is not necessary for me to endorse it. I say that I saw the allegation in the press. If the hon. gentleman desires to deny it, I think he should do so now.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I too saw the statement in the press, and I asked the paper which published it to give me the name of the person who made the statement, or publish my reply, and it refused to do either. Consequently until some person will make that statement over his own signature or on the floor of this House, I will take no notice of it.

P. E. I. — Summerside harbour — breakwater, $15,000.

Mr. HACKETT. What has been done there ?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate for the total completion of this work is in the neighbourhood of $150,000. Part of the work was undertaken, but after a small amount had been expended upon it, it was found that the work was not of a substantial enough character to stand the heavy stress of weather there, and therefore only a small amount has been expended as yet. The work will have to be still further looked into by the engineers to see if some other method cannot be found to effect the improvements in the harbour.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. As my hon. friend does not go further than to repeat in this House a statement which is unfounded and devoid of truth, I challenge him to father the statement. It is unworthy of him to

repeat such a silly, unfounded and absolutely untrue statement in this House.

Mr. HACKETT. I regret that I have raised the ire of the hon. member for King's. There is an old saying that a guilty conscience needs no accuser. The statement appeared in the newspaper press of Prince Edward Island some months ago, and I was giving the hon. gentleman an opportunity of denying it. I must accept his denial, but I regret very much that the hon. gentleman did not take the opportunity of denying it through the press. I was waiting simply to give him a chance to show himself on the floor of parliament this evening. Who are the contractors for this work at Summerside ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contractors were Macdonald & Moffatt.

Mr. HACKETT. What was the amount of their contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. The amount paid to them was something like $11,000 or $12,000. The total amount of the contract was $55,000, but the work has been stopped. They have not had very much time since May 17th, when it was found that the work was too light, but it is the intention of the department to take the matter up as soon as possible.

Mr. HACKETT. There is no work being done there now.

Mr. HYMAN. Not at the present moment.

Mr. HACKETT. What kind of work is this ?

Mr. HYMAN. Brush, stone and pile work, protection work.

Mr. HACKETT. Where was the work done, at Indian Point, or near the lighthouse ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work was started at Indian Point, and worked out from Indian Point.

Mr. HACKETT. I notice by the supplementary estimates there is another large amount for this very work at Summerside Harbour.

Mr. HYMAN. The object in putting in a further sum bears out what I have said that the department are acting in good faith in the matter. When the department have $35,000 at their disposal they would feel justified in going on with a heavier class of work.

Mr. HACKETT. I have had a great deal of experience in connection with this work. At every election, local or federal, this work has been taken up, and a certain amount of money put in the estimates for it. Macdonald and Moffatt are good contractors. They entered into a contract with the government to construct this work, and a large amount of money was voted for it. Why was it stopped ?

Mr. HYMAN. Simply because the officers found that the work was not strong enough to stand the stress of weather and it was thought better to cancel that contract, to take a further vote to look into the matter and if necessary enter into another contract at a larger cost. In this the department acted in good faith, and it was only after it was started and the difficulty of the work became known that it was thought better in the interests of the public to put in a work of a more satisfactory and stronger character.

Mr. HACKETT. It is a singular thing ; the same ground and water was there, the same facilities for building a breakwater were there, and I cannot see why the government cancelled the contract with Macdonald and Moffatt. It is looked upon by the people of Prince Edward Island as a mere mockery. I would ask the minister to invite tenders and be serious about it.

Mr. HYMAN. I think the department has proved they were serious ; they did invite tenders.

Mr. CLARKE. Was the work performed according to plans and specifications of the officers of the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. CLARKE. The officers were in error, the work was not strong enough, and so after $11,000 had been expended, the work was abandoned, and new specifications were arranged for ?

Mr. HYMAN. There were two sets of plans, one involving a very heavy expenditure, and another involving a less expenditure. It was thought by the officers of the department and they recommended that in their opinion the lighter work might answer, but after starting the lighter work it was found that owing to the stress of weather it would not be in the interests of the public to continue it. The work done is not thrown away, the material is there, it is simply a question of widening the present breakwater and going on with the extension if it is found to be in the interests of the public that that should be done.

Mr. HACKETT. Have any surveys been made lately in connection with this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This matter has only been settled a short time ago, and no surveys have been made since, but surveys and specifications will be made at once.

Mr. HACKETT. You will require the surveys first.

Mr. HYMAN. The surveys before the specifications, of course.

Mr. EARLE. Is it the intention of the department to carry on this work on the greater plan now ?

Mr. HYMAN. I would hardly like to make a definite promise. I am only acting minister, but if I am in the department for the next month I would like to see the plans and have the reports of the engineers. The good intention of the department was shown by the fact that they have taken a further estimate of $20,000 in addition to this $15,000.

Mr. EARLE. I am asking, for information, if you are going to adopt the greater plan or have further investigation ?

Mr. HYMAN. There will be a further investigation.

Prince Edward Island—West Point wharf—repairs, $1,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Is that for repairs or for an extension of the work ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Before you pass from Prince Edward Island I want to say one word more in regard to the matter which was brought up by the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett). Since the matter was referred to I think it is due to myself to make a still further statement in that regard. I did not expect that that matter would be brought up here at all. My hon. friend if he has read the newspapers of Prince Edward Island at all, must know the facts of the case, and since he has referred to this matter he might as well have the whole statement of the case. He knows that an anonymous writer in the Charlottetown 'Examiner,' the Conservative organ in Charlottetown, who signed himself 'Elector,' but whose identity I think I know, referred to this matter and mentioned my name in connection therewith. The editor of that paper in an editorial stated that he would be glad to publish a reply. I sent a reply to that paper absolutely denying the truthfulness of the statement made by the anonymous writer, but the editor refused to publish my reply. The hon. gentleman who referred to this to-night must have known that as well as he did the other and he might have referred to it. My reply appeared in the 'Patriot.'

Mr. COCHRANE. Gracious !

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. My hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) is the sprightly boy of the opposition and very often engages in these unseemly interruptions.

Mr. COCHRANE. We want to get away, and I do not know that this committee is very much interested in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) may have written in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is due to myself to say that it was not an account of animus against the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) that I brought this question up. He thinks I ought to have known that he had written to the Charlottetown 'Examiner.' How could I tell about that ? The hon. gentleman was attending to his business and I was attending to mine. I cannot see that the hon. gentleman has any grievance against me in that regard.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let us go home.

Mr. HACKETT. Some of these hon. gentlement are very anxious to go home. Some of them, who live within 500 miles of Ottawa, can go home every Friday night ; but we who live 1,000 miles or more away must remain here all session. Let these hon. gentlemen go away. We are here to attend to our duties as representatives of the people. and we are not to be blocked by anybody in this chamber. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in conclusion, that I have no desire to make any personal attack upon him. I hear some hon. member say 'sit down.' I want to tell that hon. gentleman that I will not sit down at his word.

Mr. HOLMES. Nobody asked the hon. gentleman to sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are discussing an item that we passed some time ago. Now, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee this fact, concerning which there seems to be a false impression—each of these items is a subject in itself, and when it is discussed and passed it cannot be referred to again.

Mr. HACKETT. I asked a question with regard to the work at West Point, whether it is the new work, the extension of a pier or repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is repairs to an old work.

Mr. BLAIN. This ends the list of these items for Prince Edward Island. There was a request made by the minister last night to give us a statement of the items that were passed then showing the counties in which the works were situated. May I ask if that statement has been prepared ?

Mr. HYMAN. I gave instructions to have the statement prepared, and I expect to be able to lay it on the table in a few minutes. But, if I cannot get it to-night I will give it to the hon. gentleman in the morning.

Public Works, chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—New Brunswick—Anderson's Hollow—improvements and repairs to wharf, $1,100.

Mr. GANONG. Where is this located ?

Mr. HYMAN. In Albert county.

New Brunswick—Black Brook—(Loggieville)—wharf, $3,500.

Mr. GANONG. Is this to complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. What is the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total estimated cost is $7,000, of which $3,500 has been expended, leaving $3,500 to be expended under the present vote.

New Brunswick—Campbellton wharf—extension and repairs, $20,000.

Mr. GANONG. I notice that this amount was in last year's estimates. Has anything been done since last year in connection with this ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was some difficulty in connection with acquiring the wharf we propose to extend. The matter is still in court. Consequently, although tenders have been called for, the matter not having been settled, the department has not yet accepted tenders for the work.

Mr. GANONG. What is the estimated cost of this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimated cost of the construction work is $35,000, and this $20,000 is on account.

Mr. GANONG. Has it been under the control of the government engineer all the time or is there a local engineer in charge?

Mr. HYMAN. There is the district government engineer, of course.

Mr. GANONG. Who is he ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Geoffrey Stead.

New Brunswick—Cape Tormentine—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Are these improvements intended to give greater facilities in crossing between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am afraid that that is not within the purview of the Department of Public Works. I must ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) to renew his question when the estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries are up.

New Brunswick—Caraquet wharf, $44,000.

Mr. GANONG. We had better have a little explanation about an amount of this kind and what we are going to get for the money.

Mr. HYMAN. The wharf is under contract, with Messrs. Simmons and Burpee, for $59,950. Adding the usual 10 per cent for contingencies, we get a total estimate of cost of about $65,000.

Mr. GANONG. Were tenders called for this ?

Mr. HYMAN. Tenders were publicly called for.

Mr. GANONG. Was there any public accommodation at Caraquet before ?

Mr. HYMAN. No deep-water accommodation, I understand. This is a deep-water wharf.

Mr. GANONG. What is the population of Caraquet ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that the population of the town itself is very large. This is intended to serve the shipping from that point which, I am told, is very considerable.

Mr. FOWLER. There is an item which has been passed to which I ask leave to refer—the Campbellton wharf. Can the minister tell me whether this wharf was purchased from Mr. Shives ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Hyman moves that item 'Campbellton wharf extension and repairs, $20,000' be reconsidered. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt that motion. Carried.

Mr. FOWLER. Was this wharf purchased from Mr. Shives ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand it was.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was paid for it ?

Mr. HYMAN. No money was paid to him. The matter is still in court.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there a suit ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A reference to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the property expropriated ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What special privileges have been granted to Mr. Shives in the wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. None.

Mr. FOWLER. Has he no right or privileges there over other users ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOWLER. I am informed that when Mr. Shives wanted to load freight on that wharf other people had to stand aside.

Mr. HYMAN. That is not the case. If Mr. Shives assumes any position of that kind it is not with the consent of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand an order with respect to that matter has been issued by the department, that some correspondence has passed between the William Richards & Company, Limited, and Mr. Gourdeau, the deputy minister.

Mr. HYMAN. That is in the Marine and Fisheries Department. All we have to do

is to construct the wharf, and we hand it over to the Marine Department.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that there have been certain privileges granted to Mr. Shives over the other users of the wharf.

Mr. HYMAN. Not with the consent of this department.

Mr. EARLE. Will the minister state what amount he offered for the property ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand the Justice Department offered $5,000 for it. Something over $40,000, I am told, was asked for it, and I thought we had better go to court under the circumstances.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand there were two large users of the wharf, the Richards Company and the Shives Company.

Mr. HYMAN. The Marine Department are the only ones who have a right to use the wharf.

New Brunswick—Dalhousie—harbour improvements, $10,000.

Mr. OSLER. How is that money being expended, and what is the nature of the improvements ?

Mr. HYMAN. To build an extension to the present government pier. The estimated cost of the work is $42,000.

New Brunswick—Dipper Harbour—breakwater, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The estimated cost of that work is something over $30,000. No money has been expended on it so far.

New Brunswick—Great Salmon river—groyne and breakwater combined, $4,300.

Mr. HYMAN. I move that we drop that item. The policy of the department is not to make expenditures where the government cannot control the roads to the wharf. I understand in this case there is some difficulty in obtaining that right, in order that we may give the public the free and full use of the property adjoining the wharf. For that reason the department will not proceed with the work.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a very important point, and the breakwater is much needed.

Mr. HYMAN. It is important that the department should own it.

Mr. FOWLER. Why don't you expropriate it ? Down at a place called Grande Vallée, I remember distinctly we spent about $75,000, and the Minister of Justice said they had a right to expropriate the land there. It is not fair to allow one individual who owns this land to prevent a public work being constructed which would be of advantage to the public. I think you had better let that vote stand and expropriate the land.

Mr. HYMAN. As the hon. gentleman thinks it is of some importance, I have no objection to letting it stand. I was only saying that we were unable to obtain satisfactory control of the approaches to the wharf.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know as to the importance of this particular work that is proposed, but I know the place is important. There are large lumber interests there and important businesses.

Mr. HYMAN. We had better drop it and take it up another session.

Motion agreed to, and item struck out.

New Brunswick—Hopewell Cape wharf—repairs, $2,000.

Mr. GANONG. What is the total cost of this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. $2,000 is all that it is intended to spend upon it. It is to repair a wharf that was burnt.

Mr. GANONG. The statement last year with regard to this wharf does not agree with that.

Mr. HYMAN. That was another work. This is not the same work.

Mr. FOWLER. I know something about that locality. There is an old wharf and a new wharf.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the old wharf. It was burned, and it is in the interest of the public to repair it. It only requires a small amount.

Mr. BLAIN. When the item was up before we were told it was under contract.

Mr. HYMAN. It is the new work that was under contract. There are two wharfs in the same place. This is to repair the wharf that was partly destroyed.

New Brunswick—North Head breakwater wharf—Grand Manan, $10,000.

Mr. GANONG. Has anything been done in connection with that work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is rather a large work, and it is estimated to cost $125,000 or $130,000.

Mr. GANONG. $91,000 was given as the estimate last year.

Mr. HYMAN. The difference between the two estimates is that one was for native timber and the other for creosoted timber. The difference is as $91,000 to $120,000.

Mr. GANONG. Has the land been acquired ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think the land has been acquired yet.

Mr. GANONG. Has any effort been made to acquire the land ? They must have located the wharf in order to make the estimate.

Mr. HYMAN. The necessary plans have been prepared by the department for the acquirement of the land.

Mr. GANONG. Can you tell me who owns the land that will have to be acquired?

Mr. HYMAN. No, I have no information as to who the owners of the land are.

New Brunswick—Petit Rocher—breakwater, $6,000.

Mr. HYMAN. Under contract.

Mr. FOWLER. That is in Gloucester county ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total cost of this wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. The amount of the contract is $32,900. The estimated total cost is $36,000. The contract has been entered into with Mr. McGregor of Dalhousie for $32,900. We are taking a vote of $6,000 in these estimates and in the supplementary estimates there is a vote of $10,000, making $16,000, the amount which we will have to pay out during the present year.

Mr. FOWLER. When was the contract let ?

Mr. HYMAN. On the 31st May.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you spend any money last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. OSLER. What business is there at that port to warrant such a large expenditure ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a population in the town of 2,000 and there are large fishing and lumbering interests which use the wharf.

Mr. FOWLER. How many miles from the post office, for instance, would you have to go to get 2,000 people ? There is no such population of 2,000. It is merely a farming community. It is a very thickly settled district but there is no town ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is the parish of Beresford, which has a population of nearly 5,000 to be served by this work.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, in the whole parish.

Mr. GANONG. Will the hon. minister explain why he has increased the cost of this work ? It was stated last year that the contract price was $27,400.

Mr. HYMAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the contract was let for that amount ?

Mr. GANONG. The estimate was $27,400.

Mr. HYMAN. In this case the estimated cost was higher than what was found to be the real cost when the contract was let.

Mr. FOWLER. It was the other way ; the estimate was $27,400.

Mr. GANONG. I think the hon. minister should give some explanation as to why this work is costing $5,000 or $6,000 more than the estimate.

Mr. HYMAN. The explanation given by the officers of the department is that in preparing the estimate there is not as much care taken as when they are preparing plans for the contract.

New Brunswick—River St. John, including tributaries, $16,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The usual vote.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there any applications for wharfs along the St. John river adjacent to King's county ?

Mr. HYMAN. We have an item in the supplementary estimates in connection with the local government.

New Brunswick—St. John harbour—Negro Point breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. GANONG. Is this for repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. What is the total ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is practically a maintenance item. The departmental engineers report that it is necessary to spend $20,000 for repairs and this item has been put in for the purpose.

New Brunswick—Upper Salmon river (Alma pier), $1,300.

Mr. FOWLER. What are you doing there ?

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract and this vote is simply to complete it.

Mr. FOWLER. You had a vote of $4,000 last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. The amount of the contract is $4,964, $3,360 has been spent and that is to complete the work.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec, $723,300.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister take up Ontario instead of Quebec ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry to say that I have not the particulars for the Ontario items.

Mr. BENNETT. As far as we can go. I do not think there will be much objection.

Mr. HYMAN. Very well.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Amherstburg —dredging, $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This work is practically rendered necessary owing to the increased draught of boats that are now going up and down the river. The approaches to the

wharfs would only permit a boat drawing sixteen feet to come up to them. This item is put in the estimates with the intention of calling for tenders to perform work so as to increase the depth of the water and permit larger boats coming into the wharf.

Ontario—Barry's Bay, Madawaska river, wharf, $4,500.

Mr. BLAIN. Explain this.

Mr. HYMAN. The estimate was $4,500; there has been no expenditure; it is intended to prepare plans and call for tenders.

Mr. BLAIN. What do you mean when you say it is a departmental matter.

Mr. HYMAN. I mean that the resident engineer reports to the chief engineer that a certain amount of money is required for repairs, and when the report comes to the minister it is scrutinized and a vote asked in accordance with the departmental report.

Ontario—Bracebridge wharf, $5,800.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total cost, and has the contract been let?

Mr. HYMAN. $7,000 is the estimated cost; the contract is not yet let.

Ontario—Burlington channel pier, $20,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. HYMAN. This is under contract; it is a revote to complete the payment.

Mr. BLAIN. When will the contract be completed?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me that it will be completed in the month of September.

Ontario—Collingwood, improvements in harbour, $50,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has Mr. Coste, the government engineer, valued the Collingwood dry dock, and if so, what is the valuation?

Mr. HYMAN. That is not connected with this item, but I will be glad to get the information later.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely the minister would remember.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it correct, as reported, that Mr. Coste has valued the dry dock at $540,000?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot remember, but I will bring the information down to-morrow.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a matter of very great importance if we have to pay for thirty or forty years 4 per cent on $540,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I will bring the information down to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this item for?

Mr. HYMAN. To complete the widening of the channel which is under contract at present.

Mr. SPROULE. When will it be finished and how much is required to finish it?

Mr. HYMAN. This amount is to complete the work—carried.

Mr. SPROULE. It won't pass in that cavalier way.

Mr. HYMAN. What does the hon. gentleman mean by 'cavalier'? I am delighted to give the hon. gentleman all the information I can.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister should not call 'carried' without replying to the question asked. Collingwood is a very important harbour and it is the duty of the minister to give the information we require.

Mr. HYMAN. The total amount of the contract is $87,000, there was paid upon that $49,000, and this is to complete the balance of the work.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the depth and width of the channel?

Mr. HYMAN. Twenty-one feet deep and 220 feet wide for the whole distance of the harbour and for some distance outside.

Mr. BENNETT. If a boat gets out of the channel what will be the depth of the water at the side?

Mr. HYMAN. It would vary from twelve to fifteen feet.

Mr. SPROULE. The first channel was 110 feet wide, and now it is being enlarged to 220 feet. How much remains to be completed?

Mr. HYMAN. Judging by the expenditure, about one-half.

Mr. SPROULE. This has nothing to do with the bonus for the dry dock.

Mr. HYMAN. Nothing at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the contract?

Mr. HYMAN. C. S. Boone.

Mr. SPROULE. There were a good many complaints last year, but I do not think the contractor was entirely to blame because he had a great many difficulties to overcome. Taking everything into account I think he did very well. Some were very strongly of the opinion that the Minister of Public Works should take the work from him, but I do not think so at all. I think he was making a reasonable effort to get along with the work as best he could.

Mr. HYMAN. I think these complaints were made two years ago. Last year and this year so far as the department is concerned, the work has been proceeded with in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it dredging, or rock work now ?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me that the present work is principally rock work.

Mr. SPROULE. Has Mr. Broone any dredges other than he had last year, or is he working with the same plant ?

Mr. HYMAN. The same plant, so far as the department is aware.

Mr. SPROULE. Is he progressing at the usual rate according to your progress estimates ?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me that the work is progressing satisfactorily.

Mr. SPROULE. Collingwood is a very important port and every reasonable effort should be made to get the work done promptly. The people will be glad to know that the work is likely to be finished at an early date, and that the harbour will be in a proper shape to enable them to carry on their business successfully.

Depot Harbour breakwater, $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total cost of this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total contract is $157,500 and there is some rip-rap work for foundation amounting to $37,500. The contract was let on the 14th of May, 1902, to Messrs. Davis, Haney & Miller.

Mr. BENNETT. What are the dimensions of this breakwater ?

Mr. HYMAN. The addition is 120 feet long, 80 feet wide and from 29 to 50 feet high. It runs from the main land towards the island.

Mr. BENNETT. Practically it is a present to the Canada Atlantic Railway.

Mr. BLAIN. When was that amount first voted ? I see that the same amount was in the estimates last year, and no money was expended.

Mr. HYMAN. The contract was let last year.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the amount of the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. $6,275.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the government purchase the land ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed that the wharf is being built at the foot of a public road, so that there is no necessity for purchasing the land.

Mr. BLAIN. It belongs to somebody, of course ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is open to everybody.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think that follows. On a public road you must get liberty the same as anywhere else.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not suppose that it is possible to close the road, and therefore it will always be open to the public.

Mr. LENNOX. If the minister has obtained an opinion from the Department of Justice to that effect, we must bow to it, but I have very great doubt about it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this to complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, there will be a small amount left.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand why the department does not take the whole amount now.

Mr. HYMAN. We are taking the difference in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. When does the contract for Depot Harbour call for completion ?

Mr. HYMAN. Early this fall.

Mr. SPROULE. The parties who did the work last year were Haney, Davis and Miller. Is that the same Davis who did the Cornwall canal business ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand not. This is J. P. Davis.

Ontario—Gananoque, dredging, $5,000.

Mr. EARLE. Will the minister explain this ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is for the purpose of increasing the depth of the harbour from 10 to 15 feet. The work was commenced this year and this is to complete it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this being done by contract or by days' work ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is being done by a rented dredge at the rate of 13½ cents a yard.

Ontario—Goderich harbour works, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total amount of the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. $20,000. This vote is for repairs to the north pier.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it all for repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. All but about $2,000 for dredging.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended to ask for tender for this work, less what there may be for dredging ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work is made up of some six or seven different items. It is almost impossible to have a work of this kind done by contract. It is being done under the engineers of the department by days' work. There is a special engineer in charge of the work.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount was expended last year and what was the result ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work last year was on the south pier.

Mr. BLAIN. The amount voted last year was not for repairs, but for the construction of a breakwater.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that the vote of last year was for repairs.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman is misinformed or wrong information was given last year. It was to the effect that the vote was to construct 200 feet of a breakwater as a trial. The minister in charge of the estimates said that if that was found to be a valuable work, it would possibly be continued. How was the money expended, and what was the result ?

Mr. HYMAN. $12,000 of this is a revote. $8,000 was spent on the repairs. Only $8,000 is being asked for this year.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there anything in the supplementary estimates for 1905 ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is nothing in this work for the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. For another work there ?

Mr. HYMAN. For the extension of the breakwater there but nothing for this.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there any money expended last year on the breakwater ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not on the new breakwater.

Mr. BLAIN. How was that ? The money was voted for that purpose.

Mr. HYMAN. It is being revoted now and the contract has been let for the work which is now being proceeded with. The timber is being got out for the work but no money has been expended.

Mr BLAIN. What is the length of the pier ?

Mr. HYMAN. 500 feet.

Mr. BLAIN. It would seem to me that when a certain amount of money is to be expended on an important harbour like Goderich there should be some general information given to the committee as to how much money will be required to complete the harbour and make it worthy of the people of Canada. This system of putting in $20,000 this year and $20,000 next year, &c., makes it rather unsatisfactory to the committee and cannot be in the interests of the people of that neighbourhood. Last year the hon. gentleman having charge of the estimates said that it was proposed to spend $20,000 on the new breakwater. The Minister of Public Works at page 13240 of last year's 'Hansard' said :

This matter has been taken up not alone by the Goderich people but by the large business and commercial interests of Ontario, especially from Toronto west who represent in the strongest manner the importance of this work. I am asking for this vote of $20,000 for the purpose of making a trial of 200 feet of breakwater.

There is the statement of the hon. minister. It may be that the hon. gentleman will keep this going for many years. It has been going now for many years.

Mr. HYMAN. The explanation of the item is simply this, that the breakwater to which the hon. gentleman alludes has been contracted for but on the old breakwater certain repairs were needed and $8,000 were expended on this last year. There are two separate works and the intention of the department is to proceed immediately with the construction of the new breakwater which is now under contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Did I understand the minister to say that $8,000 of the $20,000 voted last year for the construction of 200 feet of a breakwater was expended on repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was a larger item $20,000 last year, an item of $36,000, which was in different appropriations and of this $8,000 was expended on repairs to the south breakwater.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the $20,000 voted last year was not expended at all ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Out of what vote was the $8,000 expended ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed that the amount expended for repairs was in the supplementary, not in the main estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. When will the Goderich harbour be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is a somewhat difficult question to answer. The reports of the engineers in regard to Goderich are that before a complete work is made, at least a thousand feet of the new breakwater will be required. The contract which has been entered into by the department at the present time is for 500 feet of that breakwater. If that is not found sufficient it will then be a matter for the department to decide whether they will extend the breakwater to a thousand feet or not.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not want to continue the discussion beyond saying that last year the statement of the minister was that it was proposed to make an experiment here with 200 feet of breakwater at a cost of $20,000. I understand the minister to say the $20,000 was not expended. They are proposing now by the statement of the hon. gentleman to try 500 feet. They are going to make an expenditure very much larger before they ascertain whether the breakwater will be suitable or not. If it was necessary in the interests of the country to

experiment with 200 feet I do not think it is in the interests of the people that the department should now experiment with 500 feet.

Mr. HYMAN. The only explanation I have in regard to the matter is that the engineers of the department reported, after looking into the matter carefully in different states of the weather, that it might require 1,000 feet of breakwater but that 500 feet would be quite necessary in the interests of the department and the public, and a contract was entered into for 500 feet, in the hope that it will be sufficient and that the balance will not be necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the balance of the vote of last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. We are revoting $12,000. Hon. gentlemen will understand that these estimates were made up some time since. This vote should have been for a larger amount than $12,000, but it was expected that more of the vote available in the department would have been expended before the end of the fiscal year and consequently there appears a vote of only $12,000.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Could the minister give any idea of the total amount of this expenditure ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a contract for 500 feet. If my memory serves me the contract amounts to $71,000 or $72,000.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What amount of shipping goes into that port ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the details but I may say that Goderich is one of the most important ports on Lake Huron. There is a large elevator there now which is being served by the Grand Trunk Railway at the present time and the Canadian Pacific Railway are extending their line so as to reach Goderich harbour ; I presume the amount of shipping will increase when they get there. I understand it is the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway to make Goderich a large receiving and shipping port.

Mr. SPROULE. When and to whom was this contract let ?

Mr. HYMAN. Battle & Conlon, the lowest tenderers. The amount of the tender is $74,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many tenders were received ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the information here, but I shall be glad to give it later on.

Mr. SPROULE. Information given after the money is voted is interesting, but it is more interesting when given before the money is voted.

Mr. HYMAN. It was given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the $16,000 spent last year included in this contract, or was that for something else ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was not included. This is a straight contract for the building of 500 feet of breakwater at Goderich. There has been no expenditure under that contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the $16,000 over and above the repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry that I have been unable to explain the matter to the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). It is stated in the estimates that this is a revote of $12,000. The hon. gentleman will understand that these estimates were made up very early in the year. It was then expected that there would be a larger sum expended upon the amount available to the department, that the contract would be let on certain money earned. But the preparing of the plans and calling for tenders took longer than was expected, and the work did not go on. Otherwise the amount would have been larger than $12,000. This is a revote of $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is practically no explanation at all. Last year $36,000 was voted for this work at Goderich. Out of this the minister tells us he spent $8,000 in repairs. That left him $28,000. Now, if $12,000 of that is revoted, that leaves $16,000 that must have been spent for some purpose, because it does not appear in the revote and is not in the estimates. What was it spent for ?

Mr. HYMAN. It may have been revoted. It is not spent. If this item were made up to-day, or if the department had known the exact expenditure that would have been made up to the end of the fiscal year, it would have read ' Goderich harbour works, revote, $28,000.' But $16,000 of the money lapsed.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what you revote.

Mr. HYMAN. We revote $12,000 and $16,000 lapsed.

Mr. SPROULE. But why do you revote $12,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. Because it was thought that the expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1904, would be larger than it actually proved to be.

Mr. LENNOX. If we had known all we know now we would have had a revote of $28,000 instead of a revote of $12,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is practically correct—only $8,000 was expended.

Mr. LENNOX. We voted $36,000 last year and spent $8,000. That would leave $28,000. Should we not amend this item, and make it plain that it is a revote of $20,000 instead of a revote of $12,000 ? In its present form it is misleading. If you change that to a revote of $28,000 you will have to

change the other column to make it correspond. The result is that we are voting less this year than last year.

Mr. HYMAN. Sixteen thousand dollars has lapsed.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it all lapsed ?

Mr. HYMAN. We revote $12,000.

Mr. LENNOX. It is all lapsed except the $8,000 that has been expended. That is correct, is it not ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total vote last year was $36,000, of which $8,000 was spent. We might have revoted $28,000, but we only revoted $12,000 owing to the fact that when the estimates were made up we thought the expenditure would be larger. But we make a revote of $12,000 and an additional vote of $8,000.

Mr. LENNOX. If we are revoting at all, we should revote to the whole extent of the vote of this year, so long as it is within the limits of the lapsed vote. You could revote to the extent of $28,000. As a matter of fact, you are revoting $20,000.

Mr. HYMAN. We are only revoting $12,000. Surely the hon. gentleman will see that of the amount of $20,000, $12,000 is a revote and $8,000 is new.

Mr. LENNOX. The mere fact that the hon. minister puts it down as $12,000 does not make it so. There was a lapsed vote of $28,000. Anything that you vote to-night up to $28,000 is a revote, however it may be put in the estimates. But you should make the estimates accord with the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. That is right—otherwise this is misleading the House. We voted last year so much. At the end of the fiscal year everything voted and not spent lapsed. So, to the extent of the unspent amount, any money voted this year is a revote. If this is done in every case, we know what we are giving in addition to what was given last year. We know what we are doing.

Mr. LENNOX. This ought to be amended——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Carried.

Mr. LENNOX. I want the chairman to understand that if he wishes straight sailing he will have to treat us properly. When a gentleman is speaking it is not proper for the chairman to throw 'carried' in his face. I protest against that. Now, I want to say to the minister, through the chairman, that it is not consistent or proper that we should deal with an item in the way it is here proposed. We have the minister's bald statement that we are revoting $12,000 and making a new vote of $8,000 besides, a total of $20,000. Now, the fact is we are revoting $20,000 of a lapsed vote of $28,000. I submit to the committee that that item should be changed before we go any further if the committee has any regard for consistency or any desire to put the facts on record as they actually exist.

Mr. SPROULE. We have an extra column put in the estimates to enable us to keep track of what money we vote from year to year, how much has been expended and how much is intended to be expended in the future. Now, if this column that is headed 'revote' means anything or is worth anything, we ought to have put down here the amount actually revoted. Contrary to the custom, in a great many cases this year, it is improperly put down, and so the House is misled. It takes much more trouble to get at the information, and even then we do not get it as clearly as if it were put down in the estimates as it ought to be.

Mr. LENNOX. I move that this item be amended by changing so as to show that this is a revote of $20,000.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). This resolution reads 'Goderich harbour, $20,000.' Of that one-fifth has been already voted. We are now asked to vote $16,000, and it is for the committee to say whether that is to be voted or not.

Mr. OSLER. Is it the intention to spend only $20,000 this year ? I understand the position the minister takes, that so much money was expected to be expended by the 1st of July, and that was expended when these estimates were made up. Now I ask whether the government intends to spend the lapsed amount in addition to the $8,000.

Mr. HYMAN. Whatever is in the supplementary estimates. That is the total amount that we are permitted to expend.

Mr. SPROULE. Now that the Finance Minister has come in, I want to appeal to him with regard to these items. For the purpose of enabling the House to understand how the money is voted and used, we have the estimates made up with three columns of figures. One gives the full amount of money voted for the work last year ; the last column gives the amount supposed to be voted this year, and the third column to the left shows how much of the money voted last year is to be revoted this year because it was not spent. In this case according to our calculation, there ought to be a revote of $28,000 because there has been only $8,000 of it spent in repairs ; but it shows in this case a revote of $12,000. Now, either there is a purpose in having this additional column or else it is useless. The purpose has been to enable us to understand how much of the money lapsed at the end of the financial year and how much was spent during the year we require to revote for that work. Now this is misleading, because any one would come to the conclusion that out of this $36,000 all was spent but $12,000, whereas the minister says only $8,000 was spent. We want to know whe-

ther it is the intention to have the estimates made and kept in a proper way, or jumbled up in such a way that we do not know what we are voting.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not heard the explanation of the Minister of Public Works, but I know there is no jumbling up and no hap-hazard way about it. These main estimates were made up months ago. The only judgment to be formed was as to the amount which was likely to be spent during the financial year. My hon. friend says a revote should be made of the money which has lapsed at the close of the financial year. That would be correct if the estimates were prepared at the close of the financial year, when you know exactly how much money you have spent. But when you make up your estimates early in the year, say in the month of January, and the main estimates were begun earlier than that, you can only form a reasonable judgment as to what amount is likely to be spent, and when we reach the end of the financial year it may turn out that the actual expenditure has been different from that anticipated. The statement for the revote therefore made some months ago was made in perfect good faith, but the events of the six months since intervening might largely change the figure, and the actual expenditure might prove to be different from what was expected. There is no lack of good faith I can assure my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. But when the estimates were made up it was in the winter time. You could not do this class of work in the winter time, therefore it was within the knowledge of the minister or the heads of the departments that it was utterly impossible to spend the money for this work for which he is asking money now. Therefore it must be revoted if they intend to use it for the coming year. We would naturally expect that the amount of money not spent would appear as a revote ; otherwise what is the purpose of having a column of revotes ? It does not give the House any intelligent information if it is made up in that way, and we might far better have no column to show the revotes.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend forgets that when the estimates were made up, say in the month of January—probably the appropriations began to be made up in December—the officers of the departments might reasonably expect that in the months of April, May and June, a very large proportion of this money would be expended ; and if it turned out that less was expended than they expected, that certainly would not show any lack of good faith. It would simply show that the officers in the winter could not say how much money would be expended up to the 30th June. But they might make a fair estimate and say : If the season is favourable we may probably spend so much. That would be a fair way to deal with it. The estimates begin the 1st of January, or in December, because we aim as soon as parliament meets to have the estimates ready. As soon as the beginning of the new year we commence to urge the various departments to prepare their estimates, and some of them are prepared as early as the first week in January. The estimates are not finally brought down until parliament meets. Speaking generally, we urge the various departments to prepare their estimates in January in the hope that parliament might be able to meet in January, and I am sorry that it was not able to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister will see that his explanation does not apply to this case at all. The Minister of Public Works tells us that this contract was let recently. Now the work was of such a nature that it could not be undertaken in the winter time, therefore the money could not be spent, they had not made any provision for letting the contract. It was only let very recently, and the minister is not sure whether the contract is signed. So it must have been apparent to the minister that that money could not be spent before the 30th of June, as there was no contract let and they were not prepared to let it. Therefore, whatever money they required that was voted last year on that contract for the coming year and was not spent, must be a revote and it could easily be known that it would be a revote, even at that early date.

Mr. FIELDING. It is conceivable that the engineers preparing their figures in January expected this work would be let and would be begun in the month of April, though they might not have ben correct in their anticipation. But preparing their estimates in January, it would be reasonable for them to assume that this work would be commenced in April and during the next three months they would spend so much money. They can make only an approximate estimate.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Finance has expressed exactly what I claim ought to be expressed. I am not making any charge of bad faith. I was pointing out that we voted last year $36,000. It has been ascertained now, though it could not be known at the time the estimates were made up, that the whole expenditure was $8,000. That left $28,000 expended. Now up to the extent of the $28,000 which lapsed, I say that would be a revote, and finding we have actually spent only $8,000 they are asking for another vote. Now the $12,000 I see in that column should be changed to $20.000, that is a revote of the whole amount the government is asking for. That $16,000 we are taking to-night is part of the $20,000, the total estimate for this year. When we vote the $16,000, that, with

the $4,000 voted the other day, makes up $20,000, and every dollar of that is a revote, because it is part of the balance of $36,000 voted last year. It is only a question of getting the matter right, and I move that the item be amended in the revote column by changing the amount from $12,000 to $20,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman will see that we cannot do that. The revote column is not before us for the action of the committee. It is given for the information and assistance of the House and we are not legislating on the revote. We are dealing with the specific sum in the estimates. It is really of little or no consequence whether it is a revote or not.

Mr. LENNOX. I will take the statement of the hon. minister and if there is any difficulty about it technically I will not urge it at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister came down last year and asked for $36,000. The House voted it. Now he comes down and says that out of that $36,000 he has only spent $8,000 which would leave a balance of $28,000 to be expended under the estimate of last year. He says now that he does not want that $28,000, that he is only asking for $20,000. If the hon. Minister of Finance will look at the vote before us he will see that there is a discrepancy; either the hon. Minister of Public Works asked for too much last year or he is not asking enough this year.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, that may be correct. If he is not asking for enough the hon. gentleman should not complain. If the hon. minister wants to have a fit of economy why should we not allow him?

Mr. TAYLOR. But he should not have asked for $36,000 when he did not want it, because it was stated last year that the estimate was based on the engineer's report.

Mr. SPROULE. These figures are placed in the estimates for the purpose of enabling us to understand what we are doing, and what we complain of is that the House is being improperly misled. While that cannot be avoided now we are drawing attention to it because we have the same thing occurring frequently this year. This is a thing that we have rarely had to complain of before but we have had this trouble several times this year and it is suggested that the estimates have been gotten up very loosely and carelessly.

Mr. FIELDING. These estimates were not got up carelessly or loosely. At the time this estimate was prepared it was a fair and reasonable estimate, but it was prepared on the assumption that these votes would be dealt with long ago. It turns out, however, that we are, at a late stage of the session, dealing with estimates which were prepared many months ago.

Mr. SPROULE. But if that applied to this year it would apply to every year where the session extended beyond the 30th June.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it would.

Mr. SPROULE. And we would have the same thing to contend with every year. Until this year we have rarely found this condition but this year we have found it very often.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec, $723,300.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister answer a question as to Midland? Is the government dock at Midland rented and was any rent derived last year from it?

Mr. HYMAN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to ask the Department of Marine and Fisheries, because docks, immediately they are employed, are placed under the control of that department.

Mr. BENNETT. I might explain to the hon. minister that that dock has not yet passed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He can ask the deputy minister whether it was rented last year or this year to any person, and if so, what rent is payable.

Mr. HYMAN. The deputy informs me that he has no knowledge of the dock being rented.

Mr. BENNETT. The department are not receiving any rent for it?

Mr. HYMAN. This department would not receive rent from the dock.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a letter here which I will read to the minister and which will show that this department are dealing with it. There is a valuable dock in the possession of this department, they have not handed it over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and last year an offer was made for the dock and the warehouses on it on the following terms:

Ottawa, 28th April, 1903.

Gentlemen,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter asking whether this department would accept an annual rental of $450 for the use of the storehouse and docks belonging to the government and which were lately purchased by the town from Messrs. Burton Bros.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
FRED. GELINAS,
Secretary.

This is addressed to the Midland Mercantile and Trading Company. The hon. minister will see that last year this company offered $450 in rental for the dock. It has been in the occupation of other

parties. Surely the deputy must be conversant with the case. The docks and buildings are being used by Playfair and Company. Is that correct or not ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no information in regard to the matter. I will look into the matter and let the hon. gentleman know all about it when the item comes up.

Mr. BENNETT. I may not be here when the item comes up. Surely the deputy must know something about it. These docks have been in use by this company for two years and there are large warehouses on them. Surely the deputy must be able to inform the committee whether Playfair and Company are paying rent or not ?

Mr. HYMAN. Playfair and Company are paying no rent to the department.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I expected. May I ask the hon. minister, just on the question of this Midland item, if the department have received anything from any persons in Midland for dredging done by the government dredge there ?

Mr. HYMAN. At the request of the hon. gentleman I took up Ontario. I shall be very glad to answer any questions in regard to Ontario, but the Quebec votes were the next in order, I have the explanations in regard to Quebec but I am not prepared to give the explanations in regard to the rest of Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. I am only asking the hon. minister as to whether anything has been received for the dredging done there and as his deputy is sitting there surely he could give the information.

Mr. HYMAN. The deputy informs me that he cannot remember the circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure nothing has been paid either for the dredge or the dock.

Mr. HYMAN. That may be your statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. When we asked the hon. minister to forego Quebec it was for the reason that none of the members from that province on this side of the House were present. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will be here to-morrow. We understood that we would take up Ontario. I always thought the minister had his book with all the explanations for the whole of the estimates with him at every meeting of the committee so that he would be able to go on. I think the hon. gentleman should go on and give any explanations that are necessary.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot. I have not the book here and I cannot do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, do I understand you expect to get through with Quebec to-night?

Mr. HYMAN. I expected to go on with Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have gone now as far as you can go with Ontario ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was simply at the request of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that Ontario was taken up. The understanding with the hon. gentleman was that we should take up Ontario, proceed as far as we could and then turn back to Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are we to understand that when we do Quebec that is as far as we can go ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, there are lots of other things.

Mr. TAYLOR. What other things ?

Mr. HYMAN. We can take up telegraphs, dredging and certain capital expenditures which we passed over.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend is prepared to go on with Quebec we will go on.

Mr. MORIN. Go on. I am ready.

Quebec—Anse aux Gascons—extension of wharf, &c., $6,000.

Mr. MORIN. Where is that ?

Mr. HYMAN. Bonaventure county.

Mr. MORIN. It is bound to be either Bonaventure or Gaspé.

Quebec—Baie St. Paul—repairs to wharf at Cap aux Corbeaux, $1,000.

Mr. MORIN. Is this wharf used by the Richelieu and Ontario steamers, and if so, do they pay wharfage dues ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Public Works Department builds a wharf when it is required, and then it is handed over to the Marine Department which takes control of it, appoints a wharfinger and collects the tolls.

Mr. MORIN. Does any one collect dues at this wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Minister of Marine is not here just now.

Mr. MORIN. I have no objection to the government building a wharf, but the Richelieu and Ontario Company are rich enough to pay for the use of it.

Quebec—Bonaventure East, breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that to complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work is under contract for $15,690 ; the contract was let on the 27th of April last.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why do you only take $5,000 ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a further amount in the supplementary estimates.

Quebec—Caplan, breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The contract for that has been let; it amounts to $13,700. There is a balance to complete in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. These are all let by public tender?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Quebec—Chambord wharf, $8,000.

Mr. HYMAN. Tenders are advertised for and according to the estimate this is the full amount. This is on Lake St. John.

Quebec—Champlain—wharf, including repairs and additions, $8,200.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for?

Mr. HYMAN. It is asked to provide for the purchase and repairs to a wharf. The matter is now with the Department of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are you purchasing the wharf from?

Mr. HYMAN. From Messrs, Arkoff and Champlain.

Mr. CLANCY. How is it divided?

Mr. HYMAN. $1,000 is to be paid for the purchase of the wharf and the balance for improvements on the property.

Quebec—Chateau Richer, harbour improvements, $3,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this vested in the Crown, or is it private property?

Mr. HYMAN. It will be vested in the Crown.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not acquired yet?

Mr. HYMAN. The actual deed is not passed, but an agreement has been made for the purchase from a private individual.

Quebec—Deschambault wharf, $9,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this?

Mr. HYMAN. It is proposed to call for tenders and the plans are almost ready. The estimate given by the officers of the department for completion is $11,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. How did you come to spend $5,000 on this last year; that would make it $14,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The $5,000 last year was for repairs to the present wharf, and this is for an extension.

Quebec—Father Point—landing pier, $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The contract for this work, amounting to $44,300, was let on the 23rd of May, 1904, and the work is to be completed next year.

Quebec—Grande Vallée—pier, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Does this complete the work, and what is the total cost?

Mr. HYMAN. This is to complete the work. The amount of the contract is $53,900. The estimate of the total cost is $58,500.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has been paid?

Mr. HYMAN. $38,559.

Mr. LENNOX. How much was spent last year?

Mr. HYMAN. Up to the 30th of June last year, $22,559.25. The expenditure during the last fiscal year was $12,000 odd.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there was some trouble about the proprietorship of the land.

Mr. HYMAN. That has been settled. The ownership has been vested in the Crown.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did we pay for the land?

Mr. HYMAN. Nothing at all.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the importance of the expenditure at this place?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course, the vote that is being asked this year is simply to complete a work which is under contract.

Mr. INGRAM. But we are spending a large sum of money, and there has never been a satisfactory explanation give to this House in regard to this Grande Vallée pier. It is simply a matter of politics. The vote was put in the estimates to satisfy a political friend, and it is an expensive way of doing it. We on this side of the House are frequently taunted in the country with allowing estimates to pass this House without reasonable criticism. I wish to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that in allowing these estimates to pass as they are doing to-night, we are not doing our full duty; but if hon. gentlemen want to get through before the snow flies, I suppose we shall have to let them go through holus bolus. I do not want to stay here all summer; but if I am taunted in the country for allowing the estimates to go through, I shall have my answer.

Mr. MORIN. I never heard of a pier costing $58,000 in my life. What is this for?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a wharf.

Mr. MORIN. What is the use of the government building a wharf for a man who carries on lumbering operations? In the first place, the gentleman got his property cheap enough, and he could very well build his own pier or wharf. Why does the government do so much for one man and so little for others? If a poor farmer was to come here and ask for $10,000 to clear up a farm he would be kicked out of the House but if a man comes here who is worth a

whole lot of money and asks for $58,000 to help him in his business you turn around and give it to him, and then you go to the country and say that the opposition is detaining the House. Who is to blame? It is the minister or the ministers. Whenever some one goes to any minister to ask for a thing of that kind, if the minister did his duty he would say to that man: Clear out. I will not give it to you. That would be the proper course but it is not done in that way. Whenever the government is afraid that they cannot carry a county they are going to bribe that man and that county if they can do it. That is the way it is done and I know it and I can prove it.

Mr. FOWLER. This I understand was a matter of contract; in order to get a candidate in a county in the eastern townships it was necessary that this wharf should be built and I suppose the government is simply carrying out its bargain. That seems on the face of it to be a rather commendable thing to do.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend knows where Grande Vallee is. It happens to be a place on the lower St. Lawrence on the north shore of the Gaspé peninsula and if my information is correct that is the only wharf on the whole south shore of the St. Lawrence, between Perce and Matane, a distance I am sure of several hundred miles. It is the only wharf in the whole of that locality. This is rather an important place. My hon. friend is aware that quite recently an important lumbering industry has been established there and it is for the purpose of affording the people on that shore some place to which they can have access for their boats that this work has been done. It is perhaps also in the knowledge of my hon. friend that there is not a single mile of railway in the whole of Gaspé or for several hundred miles on the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Father Point down to Gaspé.

Mr. FOWLER. This matter has been discussed on other occasions in past years, and the whole subject was gone into very thoroughly last year on this very estimate. It was shown very conclusively that the only people who are accommodated by this wharf are people connected with the lumber industry at Grande Vallee, that a certain gentleman, a member of this House, who I understand was not a member of this House at the time he made the purchase, bought this property, this seigneury of Grande Vallee in which there is a large timber limit, and in order to make that timber limit profitable it was necessary to have a wharf constructed at a very large expenditure. He found that if he had to construct this wharf at his own expense he had a white elephant on his hands, and so the government came to his rescue and constructed this wharf which is built solely and entirely for this gentleman's use in connection with this lumber business. This man, a member of this House, afterwards transferred this property which had become valuable owing to the expenditure which the government had agreed to make in connection with this wharf and it was stated in this House that the building of this wharf was the result of some sort of understanding between some person acting on behalf of the government and this gentleman in order to induce this gentleman to become a candidate for the federal House for a certain county in the eastern townships. Comment was made at the time that on every occasion when this item came up that person made it convenient to be out of the House during the discussion and on one occasion at least this item was held over in order that that gentleman might be present, but that gentleman still found it convenient to be absent when the matter was discussed. I remember on one occasion, the gentleman was in the House just as the item was called, and quietly slipped out as soon as he knew it was being discussed. It seems to me that is a matter for fair comment. In order to give that gentleman a chance, if he is unavoidably absent to-night, it would be well to allow it to stand in order that he may be here to speak for himself.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a post office at this place.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed there is a post office.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many people are living around this wharf? What is the population of the place?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know how many people are living in this immediate locality, but I do know that this locality is now being developed by lumbermen who have gone in there and to whom this work is a necessity. But in addition to that the people living in the locality who frequent that coast are entitled to some consideration. Here you have hundreds of miles on the south shore of the St. Lawrence without any means of access. We want to open that country, and create facilities if facilities do not exist and if there is not population in there we want to draw it. We can only do that in so far as we provide proper facilities for them.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Justice seems warm on this. He must certainly feel a deep interest in it. I would be sorry indeed to withhold from these people anything to which they are entitled, but it is a well known fact that this whole transaction savours very much of a big political job. That has been admitted for years and that is the reason why we look with a good deal of suspicion at any additional grant of money to these people. I think the minister should come out frankly and tell us how

many people live in that section, and how many lumber firms there are who are interested in it. So far as my recollection goes we have never heard of anything but the one lumber firm being interested in the construction of this pier. That was the firm of gentleman referred to by the member from New Brunswick, who gave us a little of the inside history of this transaction. Is this government going on year after year expending additional sums on this pier simply for the same purpose that was in view when it was originally suggested ? If it is, I think it is time the committee should call a halt and until we are given at any rate some assurance that we are spending this money for a proper purpose. There may be a very large range of coast on which perhaps no public money has been spent ; there is a large range of coast that could not be improved even by a very large expenditure of money. We know little of the character of the country down there. We do not know anything of the extent of this lumber industry. It has been looked upon for the last two or three years as a mere farce, and I think we should have some information as to the number of people living there, the number of lumber mills there and the number of industries that are being carried on in this place. There are plenty of other portions of the country where large industries are carried on which would be glad indeed to have an expenditure of this kind. I want to be perfectly fair to this county, I think it is the county of Gaspé. But we want to know that the money is being spent for a legitimate purpose and not simply to gain a party advantage, which we were led to understand some years ago was the reason of the whole transaction.

Mr. BOURASSA. I happen to be in a position to give the committee some information as to this place, because I have been there. There is quite a village at Grande Vallée—a church, a post office, and a population which has been waiting for communication for years and years. The reason they did not get it before this industry was established there was because the wharf was to be more costly than those of almost any other place in the district. The people petitioned for years to get communication. I have been there a couple of days, and have seen the freight gathered by the boat that passes once or twice a week, and I know that this wharf will be a great relief to the people there. Since the establishment of a wharf the village has been increasing in population. Not only is this industry a thriving one, giving employment to the people of the village and thereby increasing population, but since the wharf is being built settlement is going on as it never did before. Formerly the people had no local markets and they could not get to Quebec with their produce. They have now both their local market and communication with Quebec. Speaking without regard to party, and as one who has no interest in the industry, I can say that this wharf is one of the most useful made by the government on that coast, the whole of which I have visited.

Mr. SPROULE. We were told last year that there were no farmers there.

Mr. BOURASSA. They are just going in.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. My hon. friend is laughing. But if he knew that country well he would not laugh. I represent a similar county myself, and I understand the conditions. There is a seignory there, and the government townships are a little distance from the coast. The government could not see their way to making an expenditure, because the people would not go in on the government townships before the seignory was settled. It is only after the seignory land was settled that the Quebec government could get the settlement to go into the back townships.

Mr. TALBOT. There is a population of 400 in the village.

Mr. BOURASSA. In the village itself. The wharf is more costly than it would otherwise have been because of the sandbank at the mouth of the river, which prevented boats going up and loading there, and people have to go six miles to a smaller place to get their goods shipped and to receive goods that come in.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year we were told there was not a wharf within a hundred miles of this place. And now the hon. gentleman says the people have to go only six miles.

Mr. BOURASSA. There are places within six or eight miles where the small sailing boats go. But the steamers do not stop there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a steamer that plies between Montreal and Gaspé, calling at Quebec and other points. And, between Matane and Gaspé, this is the only place they can call. There are small ports where the sail boats go.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure we are much obliged to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) for the information he has given us. I do not wonder that he spoke of the growth of the town. We were told that its population was 300, and very soon after a voice from the back benches said that it was 400. Evidently it is growing very rapidly. At the same time, I notice that the total revenue from the post office there for twelve months was only $97.17.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is for the twelve months ending 30th June, 1903, I suppose. I have just told the hon. gentleman the population was increasing very rapidly, especially since last year, because it was only last year

the boat began to stop and people began to go in. I was there when the first or second boat stopped there in the month of August.

Mr. BLAIN. These towns do not spring up quite so rapidly as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) suggests. I have just stated that the postal revenue there for the last fiscal year was only $97.17. The hon. gentleman I am sure will not regard that as a great revenue. However, I will not pursue that point. What amount of dues is paid by those using the wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. The wharf is not yet completed, much less transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Therefore, no dues have been paid.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention to collect dues at this wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. The law provides for that. When the wharf is completed and transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the collection of dues will be provided for.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is a scientific farmer. Probably he would like to farm in that district. Would he describe the country for us ? I suppose it is nice and level—a beautiful country ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) wish me to go into the landscape painting business ?

Mr. INGRAM. I am sure the hon. gentleman will be able to find a beautiful landscape view there. The hon. gentleman was not in the House when this item came up first, and nobody seemed to know about it. I believe that the government had no authority to build this dock where they did, for the land belonged to private parties. That is the reason why this expenditure was brought about in the first instance—it was a political reason. Hon. gentlemen opposite can colour it as much as they like, but that was the fact. I can understand that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), with an election in view, would try to put the best face on it.

Mr. SPROULE. It was shown last year that the land in that seignory belonged to one individual, and there were not even highways to the wharf. It was shown that the owner was a gentleman who was carrying on this lumber industry. The hon. member for Labelle speaks of bringing in produce to the wharf, but it was shown that there were no highways to the wharf, and the people could not get there without trespassing on private property, all the land belonging to the owner of the timber limit and the mill. We might as well be honest about it, and say fairly and frankly that this is a political job which is costing us about $58,000.

Mr. BOURASSA. The great maritime road which runs through the counties of Rimouski and Gaspé, runs through this seignory and close to the wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. How far ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Half an arpent—just a few feet.

Mr. SPROULE. But there is no highway ?

Mr. BOURASSA. That is a highway—the provincial highway.

Mr. SPROULE. But for the trade to the wharf there is no highway ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a road, vested in the Crown.

Mr. SPROULE. When ?

Mr. HYMAN. Now—since last year.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there a good road built ?

Mr. HYMAN. I presume there must be a road. They are bringing the material to the wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister does not know that as a matter of fact ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a matter of fact, as I am informed by the officers of the department, and that is the only way a minister can get information on these subjects. The materials for the wharf are being carted on this road.

Mr. BOURASSA. And I have driven on the road myself.

Quebec—Grondines wharf, $7,500.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is asked to make provision for the completion of the proposed reconstruction and enlargement of the present wharf. The estimated cost of reconstruction and enlargement is $5,000. Improvement to bridges, stone lifting, &c., is estimated to cost about $10,000. $7,500 have been expended on the wharf and there is a revote of $2,500.

Maritime Provinces—Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $20,000.

Mr. MORIN. This item appears to have a very wide scope. Where are these harbours, rivers and so forth ?

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is taken for emergency repairs. It is often found that wharfs become damaged through storms or otherwise, and this general vote is taken to make those repairs. It would not be expedient to wait for a special appropriation.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister state what was done last year with the $20,000 then voted ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have a long detailed statement here of small items which I will read if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. LENNOX. Give us the large items amounting to $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no item in the whole number anything like that amount.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was there anything more than $20,000 spent under this head ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, there is nothing to be taken out of this year's appropriation.

Quebec—Lake St. John—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How is the dredging done on this wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a government dredge there, and this vote is taken to pay for its maintenance.

Mr. HENDERSON. Since the departments have been rearranged, has the Marine Department taken over the dredging plant belonging to the Public Works Department, or will it be necessary for the Public Works Department to supply itself with an entirely new outfit of dredging plant and all the paraphernalia necessary to carry on their operations, or will they borrow from the Marine Department, or is it the intention of the Public Works Department to purchase or construct new dredges ?

Mr. HYMAN. The transfer which has taken place from the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine and Fisheries which require dredging covers only the St. Lawrence channel. When that work was taken over the dredges that were transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries were the dredges which were at the time working in that particular branch. The transfer affects in no way the policy of the Department of Public Works in regard to dredging generally, nor will the transfer of dredges that were taken over affect in any way the question of dredging generally, which belongs to the Public Works Department.

Quebec—Laprairie ice piers and protection wall—works of reconstruction and repairs, $15,500.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a new work, and this sum is estimated to complete it. The total amount of the contract is $29,650.

Mr. BLAIN. Do you expect any revenue from this ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. This is a protection work from which there will be no revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. Why is a work of this kind required and who will be served by it ?

Mr. HYMAN. These works were built a number of years ago, and this is practically a revote for their protection.

Mr. BLAIN. Did they get out of repair altogether ?

Mr. HYMAN. They were decayed, this is practically a renewal.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there ever been any revenue from this place ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is purely and simply for protection. I am informed this particular work protects the whole village of Laprairie which otherwise would be flooded.

Quebec—Lotbinière wharf, improvements, $12,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract, and this vote is expected to complete it. The total amount of the estimate was $19,800. The Public Works Department is obliged to construct all the wharfs, and after a wharf is constructed it is handed over to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. BLAIN. When the committee are asked to vote a large amount of money we should have some information from the hon. gentleman in respect to the revenue.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the estimated revenue ?

Mr. HYMAN. The question of the revenue derived from a wharf lies entirely with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. As far as this department is concerned we have no estimate of the revenue.

Mr. EARLE. I simply rise to suggest that if we are to get the information we are entitled to with reference to items of this sort it will be necessary for the hon. Minister of Public Works to have the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries here to give it. We have no opportunity of getting that information unless we get it upon the items we pass. It is absurd to tell the committee that the government have no information to give us on matters of this kind and if it is necessary the hon. gentleman should have the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries present or the item should stand.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems a very strange thing that the Department of Public Works should decide upon the construction of a wharf without having any information as to the estimated revenue to be derived from it if it is usual to get a revenue from these wharfs.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, wherever it is possible.

Mr. FOWLER. That ought to be one consideration upon which you agree to construct the wharf. One thing is the accommodation of the public, another is the advantage to that portion of the public which is served by the wharf and another is the advantage to the general public by means of the revenue derived from the wharf when constructed. This is the only opportunity we have of getting the information, and I think the hon. gentleman should have it.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman will understand the difficulty of arriving at any

estimate in a matter of this kind. It is purely a new work and until the work is completed it would be almost impossible to arrive at any estimate that would be of any value to the committee.

Mr. FOWLER. I can hardly agree with that. It seems to me that you could easily estimate the revenue to be collected from the importance of the place, the amount of business that is done and the amount of shipping that comes there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler), who, I know, has gone up and down the river very frequently between Montreal and Quebec, will have noticed on the south side of the river St. Lawrence after leaving the harbour of Quebec and getting above Cap Rouge that the country is very populous. Lotbinière is about twenty miles above St. Nicolas and above Cap Rouge, and taking the whole country from St. Nicholas, or from the harbour of Quebec, there is no railway within thirty miles of the settlement on the river side. The Drummond county railway and the Grand Trunk pass in the interior, and I am sure there must be at least twenty miles at some points from these settlements on the river front to the line of railway inside. These are probably the most prosperous parishes we have in the province, in the district of Quebec at all events. These are parishes which are thickly settled. The river front looks like a village extending over the whole territory once you leave the harbour of Quebec. Lotbinière is the centre of that district, and in addition to being a very important farming centre from which centre farmers come down to Quebec in the ferry-boats three times a week, there is a large brickyard in that locality. It is a very important brickyard. I know that some of the bricks from that yard have been sold in Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that where the brickyards are on the St. Lawrence ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is one of them ; it is on the south side of the river. There is an immense beach at that place. There is a rise and a fall of tide in that locality of from fifteen to eighteen feet and when the tide goes down all the villages along there are inaccessible. This wharf will be located at about the centre of the most thickly settled portion of that beautiful country. I can understand that my hon. friends may say that in so far as Quebec is concerned we are very well supplied with wharfs and that our demands are numerous, but you must realize that the old settlement of Quebec is on the river front. All the villages and churches are on the river front and once they leave the city of Quebec the lines of railway on both sides of the river diverge and go inland. The Canadian Pacific Railway does not run a long the north shore of the St. Lawrence until it comes almost to the neighbourhood of Three Rivers. It is the same thing on the south side with the Drummond county and Grand Trunk. To enable these people to get to market it is necessary for them to have this convenience and I know that market boats coming to Quebec at times, in order to take advantage of the tide, are obliged to leave the night before. These people would be able if they were provided with these facilities to come to Quebec within an hour and a half or two hours whereas they are obliged at the present time to leave sometimes the night before to get into Quebec in the morning and they are obliged to wait until the next night to get back because they can only go back when the tide suits. My hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) knows these facts as well as I do. He lives among these people and it is under these circumstances that we appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to allow these items to go through, because they will surely realize that they are works of absolute necessity in so far as the people in the neighbourhood of Quebec are concerned.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sure we have been delighted with what the hon Minister of Justice has told us. It has been very interesting to me and I have no doubt to others but I do not wish the hon. Minister of Justice to think for one moment that we have any objection to these wharfs being built. I think there is necessity for them, but we would like to know about them. We would like to know for what purpose the money is being put that we vote and I think it was a reasonable question as to what revenue was being derived from this wharf. I am not sure that there is any revenue derived.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no public wharf at that place now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought this was for repairing an old wharf ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, this is for a new wharf.

Mr. HENDERSON. Personally I am not opposing these people getting the improvements that are necessary to carry on their operations wherever there is a population that would call for them. I think that parliament is here to provide for the necessities of the people, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice what the policy of the government is in reference to such wharfs. Are they free ; or is there toll charged vessels which may load or unload goods at these wharfs ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not here to explain the policy of the government but I can tell my hon. friend that under the law the Department of Public Works is merely a contracting department.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite understand that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When a wharf is deemed necessary the Department of Public Works build the wharf and after it is built it is transferred for its management and control to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Marine and Fisheries are obliged to collect tolls. I have a very small wharf at Beauport and I have endeavoured time and again to get that wharf transferred to the municipality which would take control of it and be responsible for the repairs ; but on looking into the law I find that it is not within the power of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to transfer these wharfs because they are public property and they cannot hand them over. If my hon. friend will look at page P—134 of the Auditor General's Report he will find lists of the wharfs in the different provinces and the revenue derived from each of them.

Mr. FOWLER. The item as it appears states that it is for improvements. The hon. Minister of Justice says there is no wharf there. Is this a new work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The explanation of that is that there was an isolated block built and this is to connect it with the shore and make a wharf.

Quebec—Magdalen Islands, breakwaters and piers, $20,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer tells me that this will complete the work, but it may be necessary to ask another small amount.

Quebec—Murray Bay—increasing height of wharf, $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Why have you to increase the height of the wharf ? Is the water higher than it used to be, or did you make a mistake the first time ?

Mr. HYMAN. The wharf was originally not built high enough and in heavy weather the water flows over it.

Quebec—Newport breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is under contract.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Gaspé county.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought Grande Vallee was the only expenditure in Gaspé county.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Gaspé is a promontory that juts on the St. Lawrence and the Bay de Chaleur. Grande Vallee on the St. Lawrence side and Newport is on the Bay de Chaleur side.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are there farming operations on the other side as well ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course. It would do my hon. friend good to visit that country. He would find in Bonaventure and Gaspé on the Bay de Chaleur side as fine a farming country as there is in all Canada.

Quebec—Perce wharf, $9,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Gaspé.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad we are doing something for Gaspé. By the way, the minister is constantly saying that some of these items are departmental. I would like to know on what authority the department goes on making expenditures. We have constitutional government in this country, and it is the minister who is responsible, but it would appear that the minister knows nothing about this expenditure.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not say that I knew nothing about it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand it is an expenditure recommended by the engineer, and it would seem as if the department was run by the chief engineer and not by the minister.

Mr. HYMAN. The word departmental is possibly a word of my own. There is a resident engineer in charge of the public works in each district, and he reports that certain repairs are necessary, and the chief engineer brings these reports before the minister who considers whether the repairs should be made or not. The responsibility is altogether on the minister. When I say departmental I mean that the report has reached the minister entirely through the channel of the resident engineer in charge of these works.

Quebec—Pointe St. Pierre—breakwater, $6,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is that ? I understand there are a great many places of that name in Quebec.

Mr. HYMAN. This is in Gaspé county. This is under contract, the total cost is $24,000 of which $22,000 is the amount of the contract and there is something for superintendence.

Quebec—Rimouski, extension of piers, &c., $30,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for repairing the present piers ; it is a very important place.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did you expend last year on that ?

Mr. HYMAN. When these estimates were prepared no money had been expended, but during the fiscal year there were $75,000 expended.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this $30,000 complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. It will complete these repairs.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there something else in view ?

Mr. HYMAN. An extension and several other improvements have been asked for, and the applications are before the department. This is all that has been asked for and all that the department will spend in the meantime. It completes the repairs on that wharf.

Quebec—Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) harbour improvements, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What improvements are being made here ?

Mr. HYMAN. As a matter of fact, this vote is taken in anticipation of the expenditure, to enable the department to enter into a contract. There has been some difficulty in regard to acquiring the site.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Is it the intention of the minister to go on with this portion of the work at an early day ?

Mr. HYMAN. The whole question in regard to the harbour is under the consideration of the department, including the question of acquiring the site.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are you acquiring the site ? it is private property ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. There is already one wharf there, the approach to which is owned by the government. The report of the engineer is in regard to another wharf ; but before that can be started it is necessary to acquire the property in order to get an approach to the wharf. These two wharfs are intended to form a harbour of refuge after dredging between the two wharfs.

Mr. LENNOX. There appears to have been $3,500 of last year's vote expended. How did that occur ?

Mr. HYMAN. That would be on repairs to the other wharf.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not what the vote was for. The minister will not say that under the expression harbour improvements we are voting money for repairs.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, I will say that under the wording of this item it is quite in accord with the custom of the department to spend a certain amount of money for repairs.

Mr. LENNOX. Then I submit the custom of the department ought to be changed. It is quite unfair to the committee to use the word ' repairs ' at certain times, indicating repairs that are to be executed, and then, under the head of harbour improvements, at the sweet will of the department, to spend money for repairs. There should be a reasonable definite meaning to the language employed. If that has been the practice of the department, it is just as well that it has come to light, and I think it should not occur again.

Mr. HYMAN. In this particular instance, besides the repairs, it is intended to improve the harbour by building a new wharf. Where the item is for repairs only, it is so stated. When it is for harbour improvements, these may include repairs.

Mr. LENNOX. What are we to understand by this particular item ? Is it for improvements only or for repairs ?

Mr. HYMAN. It may include both.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount has been used for the purchase of land

Mr. HYMAN. The matter is under negotiation between the owners of the property and the department. There has been no decision arrived at.

Quebec—Ste. Famille — extension of pier, $6,000.

Mr. HYMAN. There is a contract in this case amounting to $17,764. The total probable cost will be $19,500. In addition to this vote it will require $13,500 to complete.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the $4,000 spent for last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a question of estimates, $4,000 was not expended. At the time the estimate was made up, it was expected it would be.

Quebec—St. Godfroi de Nouvelle—breakwater, $6,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What about this one Mr. Chairman ?

Mr. HYMAN. That amount is under contract. The contract was $19,300, the total probable cost $21,300. There is $6,000 in the main estimates and the balance in the supplementary estimates.

Quebec—St. Jean des Chaillons wharf—$12,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is this ?

Mr. HYMAN. Tenders have been called for. There are $5,000 in the supplementaries for it, and the total estimated cost is $28,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that we have done a good day's work and as some of our friends who are absent wish to discuss some of these remaining items, I think we should adjourn.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. We may take some of the Bills still on the order paper but at

an early stage we will go into supply and continue the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 28, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

THE PACIFIC BANK.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON moved that Bill (119) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada be placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Friday, July 29.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON. I think the hon. gentleman is making a mistake. That Bill was last night referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The Clerk informs me that this Bill has already been given second reading and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. There would therefore be no reason for adopting his motion and I would suggest that he withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

QUESTIONS.

NORTHERN FISHING PRIVILEGES.

Mr. BOYD asked :

1. Has a license been granted to any person or persons giving the exclusive fishing privileges on lakes north of Lake Winnipeg ? If so, what lakes ?
2. If such license has been granted, to whom granted, for what term of years, and what is the fee paid, if any ?
3. Was there any Dominion license granted to parties to fish on these waters previous to the granting of the exclusive lease ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

I may state that these licenses will be laid on the table of the House during the afternoon.

GRAIN CARRIED ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. How many tons of grain and grain products were carried by the Intercolonial Railway from south-west of Montreal to St. John, for other Bay of Fundy ports during each month commencing September 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904, and how many tons of the same articles from points west of Montreal were carried during the same time to the same port for local delivery ?
2. What are the respective freight rates for such products from points west of Montreal to St. John, when intended for local delivery, or for distribution to other Bay of Fundy ports?
3. Is the Department of Railways and Canals aware that grain and grain products from points west of Montreal have been delivered in St. John for local delivery after having paid the export rate of freight only? If so, to whom have these products been delivered, in what amount, and what is the reason for the discrimination ?
4. What means are taken by the department to make sure that freight delivered at St. John by the Intercolonial Railway at a special rate for export is really exported and not detained for local delivery ?

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

1. No grain or grain products were carried by the Intercolonial Railway from southwest of Montreal to St. John for other Bay of Fundy ports from September 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904.

The following tonnage of the same articles was carried from points west of Montreal during the same time to the same port for local delivery :

	Tons.
September, 1903	1,427
October, 1903	982
November, 1903	919
December, 1903	963
January, 1904	562
February, 1904	716
March, 1904	614
April, 1904	798
May, 1904	662
June, 1094	672

2. As grain and grain products are shipped from many points, rates can only be ascertained by obtaining copy of billing of each shipment. Generally speaking, the rates from main line points west of Toronto to St. John for local delivery is 21 cents per 100 pounds, and for furtherance to Bay of Fundy ports, 13½ cents per 100 pounds.

3. The Department of Railways and Canals is not aware that grain and grain products from points west of Montreal have been delivered in St. John for local delivery after having paid the export rate of freight only.

4. The usual means adopted by all railways, viz. : the delivery of the freight to the steamship line upon which the through bill of lading is drawn.

POONAMALIE DAM.

Mr. LAVELL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the dam at Poonamalie, on the Rideau canal, been at any time rebuilt since the construction of the canal ? If so, when ?
2. What repairs have been made to the dam, or any part of it, in the last fifteen years ?

3. When was the protecting dam removed, and why was it not replaced ?

4. After the boom was removed, was anything done to protect the dam from injury from ice ?

5. If so, what was it, and when was it done ?

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

1. The dam has been entirely rebuilt since the construction of the canal. It was rebuilt in 1870.

2. The dam has twice been partially rebuilt within the last fifteen years. A new weir having been put in, and a new top and braces having been built. The dam was last repaired in 1899.

3. Not aware of any protecting dam having been removed. There certainly has been no such protecting dam for the last twenty-two years.

4. There was a boom for catching flood wood which was removed over thirty-five years ago, as there was no further necessity for it.

5. Is answered by No. 4.

BOUNTY ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that there shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund a bounty of one and one-half cents per gallon on all crude petroleum produced from wells in Canada on and after the 8th day of June, 1904, and on crude petroleum produced from wells in Canada and held in storage tanks or other storage receptacles on that date.

2. Resolved, That the Minister of Trade and Commerce may, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, make such resolutions as he deems necessary respecting the payment of the said bounties.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF COL. GREGORY.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). As some doubt was expressed in the discussion which took place yesterday as to the correctness of my statement regarding the occurrence immediately preceding the passing of the Order in Council extending the time of Lieut.-Col. Gregory, I wish to carry out the promise which I made to bring down the original 'Gazette' for the inspection of the House.

DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. Would the right hon. gentleman say what he has done about the tobacco question, as I did not catch his remarks. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked me to remind the right hon. gentleman of his promise not to proceed with this question until the return of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked us not to proceed with the resolution of the Minister of Finance in his absence.

REPRESENTATION ACT, 1903—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill (No. 149) to amend the Representation Act of 1903 be read the third time. He said : In the discussion in committee yesterday my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked that the third reading be postponed until to-day so that I might procure some maps that he thought were in existence, showing the boundaries of the electoral constituencies in Ontario. I have given him the information.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought there were maps of each constituency in Ontario, but the minister writes me that there are no such maps.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

ARBITRATION WITH THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill (No. 152) respecting an arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada be read the third time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has been good enough to send me a telegram from Mr. Cook, who appears to be an official on the Intercolonial.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, he is counsel for the government in the arbitration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. From the nature of the telegram I supposed he was an official on the Intercolonial. It appears from this telegram that there are no data by which the government are able to estimate the amount of freight diverted. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would have no objection to my reading the telegram.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. None at all. In fact I shall have a letter to-morrow which will give fuller information. I am willing to allow the matter to remain over until that letter is received.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps that would be the better course, and if the hon. gentleman would let me have such information as he sees fit in the meantime, I would be very glad.

Motion withdrawn.

BANK ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 160) to amend the Bank Act—Mr. Fielding—was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In introducing this Bill some days ago I fully explained its purpose. Though it is a repeal of a statute of 1899 and its reenactment, this is done entirely for the purpose of drafting, so that the Bill may be in good form. The actual change is very slight. Existing legislation provides that our banks doing business in colonies other than Canada shall have power to issue notes in those colonies. We have made provision for the issue of notes in pounds sterling and in Canadian dollars. But a case has arisen in which it is found that a bank which desired to issue notes in another colony discovered that its currency was slightly different from the currency of Canada. Although the currency of both countries is in dollars and cents, that slight difference is enough to prove an obstacle. The case arose in the colony of Trinidad, and the British government, through the colonial office, expressed the desire that the matter should be dealt with by legislation in the parliament of Canada. What we propose therefore is that a bank doing business in any British colony shall have a right to issue its notes in that colony in the currency of the colony in actual commercial use. That is the whole matter. There are only a few words changed in the Act.

Mr. OSLER. Is there any provision in the Bill as to what proportion of the circulation is outside of Canada ? That might perhaps be of importance.

Mr. FIELDING. We have never required it. But of course under the general provision calling for a special return, we can obtain it at any time. Perhaps my hon. friend is right in the suggestion, it might be desirable information ; but the Bank Act gives power to obtain it by calling for a special return.

Mr. SPROULE. When the minister spoke before I asked if these notes would be legal tender in the Dominion. We give them authority to issue the notes.

Mr. FIELDING. No, they would not be legal tender in Canada. In fact, except under special conditions, a bank note is not a legal tender. Here we provide simply that the notes shall be redeemed in the colony in which they are issued, so long as the bank does business in that colony ; but if for any reason business is suspended, then they must be redeemed in Canada. The idea is that the circulation of the notes shall be confined to the colony in question because, as they represent a different currency, it would be rather confusing to have their notes circulated in Canada. They are not a legal tender.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

SUPPLY.—WHARF AT CAMPBELLTON, N.B.

Hon W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GEO. W. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, there is a matter which I wish to call to the attention of the government in connection with the public wharf at Campbellton, Restigouche county, N.B. It seems that there is just one public wharf at Campbellton, which all the shippers of lumber, particularly at that port, are obliged to use, but it seems that one corporation have been granted a preference in the use of this wharf by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, without any good reason therefor. The wharf is necessary for the economical shipment of lumber at that port. An order was given, a copy of which I have, and which I will read, by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, dated June 16, 1904, addressed to Mr. Asker, who is the wharfinger at Campbellton. It is as follows :

Sir,—I am to instruct you to see that ships taking cargo direct from the cars on the government wharf at Campbellton are given the railway or wharf berth. It has, the department understands, been the custom in the past for the first vessel in to get the choice of berths but in future precedence is to be given in this connection to vessels loading from the cars.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) F. GOURDEAU,
Deputy Minister M. and F.

To Mr. G. E. Asker,
Wharfinger, Campbellton, N.B.

As a matter of fact at this government wharf there is only room for one steamer to load at a time, and the complaint is made that the corporation known as the Shives Lumber Company have the right under this order, which is given here, to take the wharf and to take this berth whenever they choose, no matter whether other vessels are in before them or not. Complaint was made to the department in a letter written by the William Richards Company, Limited, under date of June 23, 1904. That letter is as follows :

Campbellton, N.B., June 23, 1904.

F. Gourdeau, Esq.,
Deputy Minister M. and F.,
Ottawa, Can.

Dear Sir,—In reference to inclosed copy of your instruction of June 16 to Mr. Asker, warfinger at this port, we hardly think that you know or are at all aware of the condition of affairs at this port or you would not have issued the order in question. We will, as briefly as possible, give you the condition of affairs. At the port of Campbellton there are only two shippers that have been shipping deals over the government wharf, they being the Shives Lumber Co. (Limited) and ourselves, and in fact up to this year have been the only ship-

pers from this port in recent years. We, as a rule, load the bulk of our cargoes from lighters, while the Shives Company load theirs from cars and lighters, but this year they will load the most from cars, whereas we will load none from cars, and they shall have full charge of this government wharf under this order. As far as the order is concerned, the wharf is the only berth where steamers can load with safety, and if the Shives Lumber Company are given the full control of this wharf it means that our company have to carry deals on lighters to Point le Garde, some ten miles below Campbellton, which is the only safe berth for a steamer to load within the port of Campbellton, excepting the government wharf. If such a state of affairs continues it means that this company, in order to do business, must do such business at a great loss to themselves, as well as doing injury to the port, as there is no safe berth within the port, and there are days when you cannot load a steamer at Point le Garde, because it is an open and exposed roadway, and lighters cannot put alongside the ship. We feel that if this order is carried out as intended, and we have no rights to the use of the government property at this port, and it is given over to one shipper for their absolute use and benefit, it means that we cannot see any course left open to us but to stop doing business and shipping from this port. We might further add that we have a very valuable plant situated at this port and are large employers of labour and make more use of the wharf than any other shippers, as by reference to the customs here you will ascertain. We would therefore ask that the said order be cancelled forthwith and that both shippers be given equal rights in regard to the use of government wharfs and property at this port and that the old state of affairs be restored, namely, that the first vessel arriving to have the preference of the use of the government wharfs on payment of the proper tolls, and we would thank you to give this matter your serious and prompt consideration, as we can asure you that it is a very serious matter as far as this port is concerned. Awaiting your reply.

We are, your respectfully,
(Sgd.) WM. RICHARDS & CO. (Ltd.)

To that letter the department replied by the following letter bearing date of July 2nd, and addressed to Wm. Richards & Company, Limited :

Your letter of the 23rd of June has been fully considered. Instructions were given Mr. Asker, wharfinger, to give the preference to vessels loading from the cars. It was understood that Mr. Shives, at considerable expense, placed a siding on the wharf in order that vessels might be loaded from the cars.

I am instructed that that is absolutely untrue ; I am instructed that Mr. Shives did nothing of the sort ; I am instructed that Mr. Shives expended no money upon the government wharf after the expropriation proceedings were taken.

In view of the fact and the expense to which Mr. Shives has been put——

Remember, this is the sole ground upon which this preference is granted according to the letter of the department.

In view of the fact and the expense to which Mr. Shives has been put, it seems reasonable that vessels that have been loaded from the cars should be given the preference with regard to the berth. It was also understood that two vessels being there together owned by different firms would rarely occur, and consequently any other firm shipping lumber would not to any extent suffer. The department does not wish to place any obstacle in the way of yourselves in loading lumber from the wharf, and would be pleased to consider your interest as well as that of Mr. Shives. It is understood that there will be a large expenditure for wharf accommodation at your wharf in the future, and that there will be abundance of room for lumber dealers to load and unload lumber in Campbellton.

That is a case of : live horse and you'll get grass.

In the meantime, I do not consider that the instructions to Mr. Asker can be at this stage cancelled unless you are able to prove that you are suffering severe damage.

In reply to that, the Messrs. Richards and Company addressed another letter dated 6th July in which they say :

Re inclosed correspondence, we would like to add that since this order has been issued and it has become known, it has already compelled us to pay extra freight over the other shipper from this port, as the steamship owners are fully aware that when a steamer moves to Point le Garde, that it involves a lot of extra expense; we might say that we have recently had to pay 5 per standard on account of this order, and think that in all decency and fair-play it should be cancelled.

This means, that if Richards and Company cannot have the use of the government wharf they must load their steamers at Point le Garde which is ten miles distant, and in an open roadway which in storms from certain quarters is very dangerous for steamers. It is impossible to carry on the loading there under certain conditions. The steamer is detained therefore much longer than would be necessary, if she were at the government wharf and in consequence Richards and Company have to pay higher rates on the shipments of deals. The letter continues :

We also have a steamer in port since last Friday, and on Saturday the writer requested the harbour master to allow him to have the berth after the Shives steamer sailed, and the reply he got was this, that Mr. Shives had a sailing vessel, that he wanted to load at the wharf, and if he wanted the steamer to get the berth we woould have to arrange with Mr. Shives. Our steamer is some 1,600 tons and is loading from lighters in the stream, and the Shives barque is only 800 tons and loading from lighters in the stream, and we are informed that most of her cargo is coming in lighters. The barque could load safely where she is. as she is only geting 35 M. of dry boards per day and our steamer is loading at the rate of 200 M. per day, and if she does not get the berth as soon as vacated by the Shives steamer on Friday will have to proceed to Point le Garde to take in balance of

her cargo, which will likely be one million. At present there are in port one steamer and one large sailing ship for us and one steamer and one sailing ship for Shives, as well as a number of schooners that cannot get a berth at all. You will see at once that our claim is fair and just, and we cannot see how the government or department can give over public property like this to one concern and debar the rest of the public. We trust that the department will at once cancel this order or it will be not only very injurious to ourselves, but to the port and public in general.

It seems that the Shives Company had a wharf alongside the government wharf, and that in order to reach the government wharf it was necessary to cross the Shives wharf. Expropriation proceedings were taken by the government to get the Shives wharf ; the government offered Mr. Shives, or the corporation of which he is the head, some $5,000 for the wharf, but $40,000 or $50,000 was demanded, and the award of the arbitrators was $35,000, which I understand the government has appealed, and it is now before the Exchequer Court. But it does not appear from anything on the face of this correspondence or from any other evidence, that the Shives Company has any right to any preference. The point is made that the Shives Company is loading lumber from the cars, but I fail to see how that could give them a preference on this government wharf over other shippers. I am informed that the allegation that any expenditure has been made by Mr. Shives for a siding on this wharf is absolutely untrue. Anyway, what right would Mr. Shives have to run a railway track upon the government wharf ? It seems to me that whoever is in charge of that public wharf would be derelict in their duty if they allowed any private individual or corporation to make such use of government property. In view of the strong statements made in this letter and in view of all the circumstances, it seems to me that this order—a very improper order in the first place—should be cancelled, and that fair play and equal rights, what we call British justice should be meted out to each man who desires to use that wharf—and who is willing to pay tolls for that use.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) does not expect me to give him the information without any notice whatever being given in advance. If the hon. gentleman had wanted the information to-day, he should have certainly given me notice last night or yesterday. I know nothing whatever about this matter, but will make the necessary inquiry and bring down the information.

Mr. FOWLER. I mentioned this matter yesterday in supply, and I stated that I would bring it up again at the first opportunity. I would suppose that was sufficient notice. I did not intend to be guilty of any discourtesy in not giving notice.

Mr. FOWLER.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals.) My attention has not been called to this matter, but as the question of a railway siding is involved I wish to say that there was an appropriation last year for laying rails and ties on a siding connecting the new industry at Campbellton established by the Shives Lumber Company, with the Intercolonial railway. The Shives Company graded the siding and we put down the rails and ties with the view of securing to the Intercolonial railway the products of that mill, which they would ship by water if this were not done. The products of the mill are brought down over the Intercolonial railway and shipped from the public wharf at Campbellton. An extension of that wharf is arranged for whereby a turntable will be used, and I have no doubt that within a very short time provision will be made for more vessels than one. That of course will be done at the expense of the Intercolonial railway, in order that it may have the advantage of the traffic, and not at the expense of any individual or corporation. Do I understand the Richards Company lighter their material to the wharf and then load it from the lighters, or do they haul it on to the wharf and have it shipped ?

Mr. FOWLR. I do not know, but I presume the latter.

Mr. EMMERSON. Their mill is on the line of the Intercolonial railway, but I do not know whether they utilize the railway or whether they haul their lumber.

Mr. FOWLER. They do both. Sometimes they haul by the railway and sometimes they carry by lighter.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I would like to inquire of the government whether or not they have any further information as to the date on which the report of the commission appointed to investigate certain matters in the Yukon will be laid on the table of the House. So far as I am aware, it has not been laid on the table up to the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend refer to the report of Mr. Justice Britton ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it has not been laid on the table yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There seems to be an extraordinary delay in this matter. The instructions to the commission were issued in June of last year, some thirteen months ago. The commission had not a wide scope, although a promise was made by the member for the Yukon in the election campaign that certain charges of fraud would be investigated as soon as par-

liament met. The hon. gentleman's health was not such as to enable him to be present till some time after parliament met. I am not saying that in reproach to him; but in his address to the electors of the Yukon there was a promise made that charges of fraud would be thoroughly investigated. That promise was ratified last year by the Postmaster General, when the matter was first brought up by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. T. Chase Casgrain). I do not propose to go over the discussion which we had last year on the instructions to the commission which were brought down by the government—instructions which did not admit of the investigation of the circumstances attending the granting of the concessions. We on this side of the House demanded that wider powers should be given, so that all those circumstances should be investigated by the commissioners. Although that investigation had clearly been promised by the Postmaster General, the promise was afterwards withdrawn; and the instructions to the commissioners were carefully framed so that no such inquiry could be made. The inquiry, such as it was, proceeded before two commissioners—Mr. Justice Britton, of the bench of Ontario, and Mr. Bell. The inquiry, so far as it went, was concluded, and from that time to the present we have had no report; although, if I remember rightly, the inquiry was concluded in November or December last. This House has now been in session nearly five months, and it was not unreasonable for us to expect long before this that the report of Mr. Justice Britton should have been received. I do not know whether any report, or any draft report, from the other commissioner, who met his death by a deplorable accident, was ever received by the government. It is well known that Mr. Bell stated before his death that his report had been drafted. No trace of it has ever been found, and I assume that no copy of it, certainly not the original, has come into the hands of the government. If it was ever received, its nonproduction merits the severest criticism. Its disappearance has undoubtedly been very mysterious, because I believe no trace of it has been found among Mr. Bell's papers. Since Mr. Bell's death the matter has been before Mr. Justice Britton, and I should have thought he could have made up his report ten times during the period at his disposal. I am saying that with all respect to the necessity of his performing his judicial duties; because, if his judicial duties are of such a character that he has been unable during the seven or eight months which have elapsed since the investigation was closed, to prepare his report to parliament on this subject, then he should never have been appointed on this commission. The whole inquiry has been absolutely farcical. It was farcical, to begin with, because that which had been promised to the people of the Yukon during the election campaign by my hon. friend who represents that constituency was not granted. It has been farcical, in the next place, because seven or eight months have elapsed since the investigation was completed, and apparently parliament is to be prorogued without having an opportunity to consider that report. I desire to place on record my protest against this method of conducting the public business. There was a very unanimous cry—not a party cry, but a cry from one end of the Yukon to the other—to have, not only the investigation which the government has given, but an investigation of a very much wider character. The limited investigation that was given, was given thirteen months ago, and from that time to this we have not heard one word of what that investigation amounted to, or what the opinion of the commissioners was. I do not think the government are to be congratulated on the way in which they have dealt with this subject, and I conclude by once more asking the Prime Minister whether or not we are to have, even in the closing days of this session, any report from Mr. Justice Britton?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I think I can fairly say that the matter which my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House is no longer an issue, and has been disposed of more than once on the floor of this House. It is quite true, promises were made at one time by parties who were not in the government, but who spoke in the interest of common justice, that certain charges of fraud, which were made in the Yukon, would be investigated. The government expressed its willingness to have such an investigation when particulars were given; but we refused to authorize a blanket investigation into charges which were not formulated. Such being the intention of the government, expressed more than once in this House, a commission was issued last year to Mr. Justice Britton and Mr. Bell authorizing them to investigate, not the charges of fraud which had been made, but the nature of the concession, the needs of the Yukon, and especially the wants of the miners as to water. The death of Mr. Bell was most disastrous in many respects. It is stated that his report was drafted. That may be, but, so far as I know, the draft never reached the government. In the absence of the Minister of the Interior, I would not say any more. With regard to the report of Mr. Justice Britton, I do not know that he has made his report as yet. He has been communicated with once more to hasten it, so that we may have it before the House rises. I may say that the necessity which existed at one time for this investigation has been removed by the fact that the Treadgold concession, which most of the complaints had reference to, is no longer in existence.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. It seems to me that the very fact that the Treadgold people have abandoned their privileges is all the more reason why this matter should be investigated. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that members of the House were sent again and again copies of newspapers which support the government from the Yukon making the most serious and damaging allegations. Public opinion seemed to have been aroused at the enormity of the transaction; and the commission having been appointed, it seems most unfair, notwithstanding its limited power, that parliament should be prorogued without having the report of Mr. Justice Britton. It is seven or eight months since the commission ceased taking evidence, and Mr. Justice Britton has either had time or has not had time to make his report. I understand that he has been in Ottawa several times during the last three or four months. Has the government received any information from him as to what progress he has made with his report? I understand that no report has been received by the government from the late Mr. Bell. Has the government received any information as to the progress of this report, and is there any possibility of our having it before prorogation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say off-hand whether that is possible or not, but will inquire.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. That seems an extraordinary reply, in view of what has taken place recently. The Treadgold concession has been cancelled by the government because no doubt of some information conveyed to it through some channel that it would be improper to continue it or carry it out. That is the only conclusion which we can reach. Through what channel did that information come? The government have their own channel, and were inquiring into the charges made with reference to that concession. The charges were of a most specific character. They were not made by opponents of the government, but by their own friends. Letter after letter is in the possession of members on this side, written by friends of the government, complaining that they had made every representation possible, and could get no redress. These friends of the government complain that they elected a representative to this House, who became dumb from the day he entered it up to the present, because, so far as they knew, he has never opened his mouth in this House to bring to the notice of the administration the complaints which people were making, and the difficulties under which they were labouring.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He ran away.

Mr. SPROULE. The government promised to have a full investigation, and the member elected promised his constituents to have an investigation made as soon as he reached parliament. That member has been in parliament a long time, and if such an investigation were made what information has reached the government as the result of it. We are utterly in the dark regarding what took place. It is true that one of the commissioners is dead, but the other is still living. Can it be possible that he is so busily engaged in his different duties that he is unable to make a report? He was appointed to inquire and report, so as to put parliament in possession of the information which parliament ought to have in order to deal intelligently with the question, yet during the whole of this session, which has lasted nearly five months, this commissioner has given up most of his time to his ordinary duties, and has so far made no report to parliament. That is treating parliament with contempt. It is not treating parliament with that courtesy to which it is entitled from its own officials, and this commissioner is really an official of this parliament. It is treating the representatives of the people with contempt. It is treating the people of that country, who have made complaints regarding the condition of affairs, with great contempt. I have in my possession a letter describing the kind of inquiry which was made. I do not know the gentleman who writes the letter, but he is represented to me as an intelligent, respectable, law-abiding citizen. He says that the inquiry was a perfect farce, that he was called down by the commissioner several times for doing what his counsel advised him he had a perfect right to do. He endeavoured to place information before that commission, but the commission refused to receive it or allow him to give it and would only receive just such information as the commissioners asked for. Following that procedure, an indictment was made against him and he was told that if he did not conduct himself better he would be dealt with for contempt of court.

An hon. MEMBER. Dragooned.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, dragooned for contempt of court. His answer to this threat was that he did not see how it was possible for any one to have greater contempt for the court than he had in view of the way in which he had been treated. But out of that grew some other trouble for which he was put in prison; and as far as I know, he has been lying in prison ever since. He was refused the common justice of being judged by his own peers. He was refused a jury trial. He was deliberately thrown into prison, and is there yet. He writes to know if anything can be done, and if that commission has reported. He was indicted on another charge which, I believe, arose out of this matter before the commission—the charge of taking logs which he thought he had a perfect right to take. He was denied trial by jury, and tried by a stipendiary magistrate, and is now in prison.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that some one was thrown into prison by order of the commissioner for contempt of court ?

Mr. SPROULE. Not by order of the commissioner ; but he was indicted before a stipendiary magistrate, and thrown into prison, and is there yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That happens everywhere.

Mr. SPROULE. If that kind of inquiry is enough to satisfy the government, it is not enough to satisfy the people out there. If that kind of justice satisfies the government, it is not what will satisfy lovers of British justice in any part of the British empire. It is a high-handed proceeding, which is devoid of the essence of fair play or justice. These things require to be ventilated, and the only opportunity we have is to discuss them in parliament, and to do that properly we should have the report before us. We are now in the closing days of the session, and we want to know whether it is the intention of the government to lay that report on the table, and give us an opportunity of considering it. Is the government going to content itself with the cancelling of the Treadgold concession ? What is the reason that the government does not dare to bring down that report, or give parliament the reasons why it has cancelled the Treadgold concession ? Parliament is entitled to know why. On what information has the government acted ? That information should be given parliament, and above all things the commission appointed over a year ago ought to have had its work done long ago and reported to parliament, so that we might deal with this question in the light of all the information available.

Mr. JAS. CLANCY. Has any communication been had with Mr. Justice Britton regarding this report ? The right hon. gentleman will perceive the pertinency of this question when he remembers what took place in the Senate a few days ago. The government has declared that the Secretary of State was not warranted in the statement he then made that the remaining commissioner would not report. Has Mr. Justice Britton been requested to make a report ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can inform my hon. friend that Mr. Justice Britton has been communicated with.

Mr. SPROULE. What is his reply ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is more than I can say at present. The Secretary of State made a statement some time ago in the Senate, to which attention was called, and he then communicated with Mr. Justice Britton, and instructed him to take his letter as not written, and hasten his report.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. B. JACKSON.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT The other day, when the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce were being discussed, I brought up what is known as the Jackson matter in the province of Ontario, namely, the appointment of Mr J. B. Jackson, formerly of Ingersoll, to the position of commercial agent in Leeds, England. The minister stated that when an item was reached under the heading of commercial agencies, the matter might be taken up. As the hon. minister saw fit to discontinue his estimates, no opportunity to discuss it was reached, and I am bringing it up now.

Some few years ago a general election was held in the province of Ontario, and as the result of the death of one of the elected members, the Ross government found itself with a majority of only one. All the sacrifices which had been used in Ontario for many years had been resorted to, and then the government, staggering under what was a decisive defeat, saw that something had to be done. Their only hope was to resort to the courts. After looking over the field they seized on South Oxford which had for many years been a Liberal stronghold and they thought if they could succeed in unseating the Conservative candidate there they could win that riding. A close study of the whole situation revealed the fact that they could not by legitimate means unseat Donald Sutherland, the Conservative member, who had been returned by a majority of about 150. There lived in the town of Ingersoll in the county of Oxford J. B. Jackson, a particular friend of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a gentleman whose name has figured very conspicuously in those hand to hand encounters which have signalized the entrance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce into the party conventions of that riding, and there can be no doubt that of all the men who have done yeoman service for the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the bitter, acrimonious fights to secure the nomination, none stood closer to the minister than did Mr. Jackson. It was notorious in Woodstock, Ingersoll and all that neighbourhood that Jackson was carrying in his pocket the appointment of county judge of the county of Huron. That was rife and well known there. This and other offices had been promised to Jackson and I can only produce in substantiation of that, Jackson's own sworn testimony. He was asked referring to certain offices which had been mentioned, and said :

> Well there are several in my mind and have been for several years.

And being asked if several positions had been the subject of discussion, he replied :

> Well, I do not know that.

He was asked :

Will you swear to that, that have been mentioned between yourself and those in whose gifts these officers are ?

He replied :

Oh, I suppose that conversations have taken place between me and others in regard to that in the last few years.

So it is quite clear from the statement in evidence of Jackson that he expected something from this government. It is clear that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was solely responsible for this man's appointment because the Minister of Public Works speaking at Woodstock when complaint was made as to Jackson's appointment said :

I have heard since I came home something in reference to acts of Mr. Jackson that were not creditable to him ; but his appointment was a departmental matter, under the minister, Sir Richard Cartwright, and I have no doubt that he had no idea there was anything wrong.

This statement was made by Hon. Mr. Sutherland last winter and it cannot be expected that the public will be so gullible as to believe that a man of the ability of the Minister of Trade and Commerce had not heard of the peculiar and improper acts of Jackson as commented upon at the time. It is true that Hon. Mr. Sutherland here refers to some improper acts. I do not know that he means, because he does not say specifically, Jackson's action in connection with this trial. He may refer to some other actions that were discussed in that neighbourhood. There was a prosecution of this same Jackson on a charge of forgery before the courts of Oxford which was dismissed owing to the fact that in some mysterious manner the very document that was the basis of the charge disappeared. I shall not refer to other charges that are rife there. but I assume and it is fair to assume that what Hon. Mr. Sutherland referred to as improper acts on the part of Jackson are those acts which were condemned and rightly condemned by one of the trial judges. I have before me the evidence in this case as heard before Mr. Justice Britton and Mr. Justice Street when after days of fishing and days long drawn out of evidence given, the court had only two cases before them and on these two cases, most trival in their nature, one judge was in favour of acquittal and the other in favour of unseating. An appeal was taken to the court of appeal, but the appeal court decided that an appeal did not lie where two judges disagreed in that manner and Mr. Sutherland was sustained in his seat. I shall not advert to the judgment which Mr. Justice Britton gave, but it was an unfortunate thing for that judge coming fresh from politics wherein no one will say that he had not been a bitter partisan, that on two most trifling charges that were backed up by evidence of a scatly character Judge Britton should have decided against Mr. Sutherland while Judge Street decided in his favour. Be that as it may Mr. Donald Sutherland was sustained and I am going to refer to the facts which led up to the prosecution or persecution of Mr. Donald Sutherland. There have been many election trials in this Dominion but no other trial can be compared to this one. Jackson was the solicitor in the case, living in Ingersoll, right in the centre of that well populated riding. He was conversant with all the adjacent towns. He had carte blanche and unlimited funds to find evidence, whether true or false, as sworn to by witnesses, to unseat Sutherland.

Now what is some of the evidence that proves that I have here the sworn evidence of this Mr. Jackson ? Jackson goes through that riding and one approach that he makes is to Mr. Chambers in Woodstock. I need not give a verbatim account of the evidence but briefly it is this : He approached Chambers in Woodstock, a man whom he had practically not known up to that time, goes into his place of business, addresses him in a familiar way and after serving him with the subpoena says : We will require you at the trial. He then invites him across the street to have a cigar. As soon as they reach the hotel he asks Chambers to adjourn to a private room and once there starts at Chambers with a most astonishing proposition. He says that he is prepared to spend an almost unlimited amount of money in order that evidence may be secured against Sutherland and his agents in order to effect his downfall. Chambers mentions $5,000 and, after a little parley, it is arranged that this man Jackson shall come from his own home in Ingersoll to Woodstock and at the house of Chambers discuss the terms upon which Chambers shall produce evidence, whether true or false, that will bring about the defeat of Sutherland on the protest and his consequent unseating. Chambers was a man of prominence in the community and he at once went to certain friends of his and divulged the whole affair. The result was that, true to his promise, Jackson turned up at Woodstock on a subsequent evening. On this occasion Chambers had taken the precaution to have two responsible gentlemen conveniently situated where they could overhear what was said during the interview. Chambers was not going to trust himself to the tender mercies of Jackson, for prior to this time Jackson had a most unsavoury reputation. These two gentlemen heard everything. Jackson's proposition as admitted in his own sworn evidence was that he would pay $375 to Chambers if evidence was forthcoming, perjured or true, and $375 more should be furnished to Chambers if eight charges were proven. They go on further and discuss it and Jackson further makes this offer that if the charges were successfully proven $1,500 might be paid to Chambers. It was necessary in order to get evidence to resort to

witnesses who knew nothing whatever of the matter, but who could be suborned to perjure themselves. Chambers had furnished certain names of men as Chambers was right in the game. He knew nothing of any improper wrong doing and consequently Jackson did not call any of these men into the box because he found subsequently that he had been hoaxed and had been deprived of $375.

But Jackson turns in another direction, and that seems to have been a very fertile field in the riding of South Oxford, namely, to resort to the most abandoned characters, men who were proved by the records of the police court to have been time and again arrested on criminal charges. One man who is a strong witness against Sutherland on the personal charge, had served a term in the Central Prison at Toronto. What is some of the evidence of this man ? A man named Charles Parker testified that a brother-in-law of his, named George Fournier, came to him and asked him if he would swear that he got money from a man named Joseph Clark ; and he was given the further option that if he did not want to swear that he got the money from Clark he could swear that he got it from a man named Sindon, and if he did'nt want to swear that he got it from him he could swear that he got it from a man named Davis. He was offered the option of three different men from whom he could swear that he got the money. There looms up then from the office of Kerr, Macdonald & Grant, Toronto, who seem to be engaged in all these election protests, a fellow named Sullivan or Sutherland, who is notorious as a part of the machine in the province of Ontario. This Sutherland had been celebrated in a certain provincial election trial in the county of Lennox, and Sutherland makes the further admission that he went to this man and swore it on Sindon or Johnson, or a third man whose name I forget. Now the house will wonder why he was given the option of three men to swear it on. The reason was this, that Clark was a coloured man, and everybody knows there is a certain amount of prejudice against men of colour. Therefore it was decided by this foxy Sutherland, after a good deal of consultation with Jackson and the rest of the gang, that this charge was to be put on this man Clark. But it would not be well to have Clark go into the box and swear that he had received a sum of money from some reputable man in the town of Oxford —because this took place in the county of Oxford ; and in that case it would be necessary to swear that it was got from some man whose word would not avail him, and something more than that was necessary to have the other parties opportunely turn up and be able to swear that they heard the conversation. So he got Fournier to promise that he would be on hand and would swear the story true. He also says another man named Keir is to be on hand in order to corroborate the story. Now Fournier swears that he had conversations with Jackson, repeated conversations in Jackson's office, and although we are not able to prove that Fournier and Jackson were in combination, because neither of the two will admit that they tried to bribe this man Parker, still we do know that Jackson admits that he paid $5 to Fournier himself, that he paid $5 to Parker himself, although Parker says he got $10 from Jackson. Then he was to swear that the coloured man had paid him $5. Then Parker meets again this man Sutherland in Jackson's office, and there he is promised by Sutherland that he will be paid $20, and in the event of his losing his position in the city hospital where he was employed, he would secure him a position on the government canal. Now if the story of this man Parker were not true, it would have been fair for them to have called Sutherland, and to have denied the statement made by him. But Sutherland although a short time prior to that was in the city of Woodstock, could not be found, and Sutherland's solicitors were unable to find him and put him in the box either to corroborate or deny the statement of Parker. Then there was another man who figured prominently, one named Anderson, county constable in the town of Tilsonburg. Then a man named Fick was given by Jackson a considerable sum of money, some $250, and he employed himself in going about the country and attempting subornation or perjury, and witness testified that he received money from Fick, and yet when the trial comes on Fick, also flies from the country and cannot be found. The result was that they could get no denial from Fick and no corroboration of the witnesses called by Sutherland. Then they called a man named Frederick Avey and he testifies :

> One Hewlett cancelled store account of $40 for signing a declaration. Jackson told me to say nil as to the account. Jackson came to my house at Norwich.

Now the game followed out was this : Prior to holding the trial these men Sutherland, Jackson, Fick, Wright and Hewlett would go to these abandoned characters in the police court and get declarations from them that they had received certain sums of money, and then they would afterwards be able to confront these men with the declarations and say : You made this solemn declaration, now we expect you to swear it through. In the case of this fellow Hewlett who cancelled the $40 store account, he will swear that he received from a Conservative a certain amount of money. Jackson acknowledges himself the fellow who went to his house at Norwich, and Jackson further asks him to say nothing as to the account, to say nothing as to having got the

$40 for making this declaration, and which declaration Avery replies was untrue. Another man named Pollard says :

Hewlett paid me $25 for declaration. I was promised $75 and protection from law. Jackson saw me at Norwich and told me to say nil about the declaration.

That is what is guaranteed in the province of Ontario to those who give testimony in election trials where wrong doing has been committed, namely immunity from prosecution by law. The same thing was done in the West Elgin trial, and in all these trials in the province of Ontario men who have been wrong-doers have never been brought to book, everything has been covered up. No wonder that this man Pollard, when he was sure of protection against the law, and that the Attorney General of Ontario would not prosecute him said he believed the statements made by Hewlett,. Then a man named W. A. Young is called and he says :

Sutherland of Kerr's office told me he would give me $25 if I would stick to charge on respondent.

So it goes all through the evidence. Witness after witness is called who testify that they received money for making those declarations, and then afterwards when they were brought to book in court, openly admitted that they knew nothing at all as to the truth of these charges, that they were false, that they had not been paid this money for making the declarations. Now it cannot be argued that Jackson did not know who these men were. They were all living not far from each other, and they came into contact several times with the solicitor of the government. He must have been making inquiries. What is Fournier's record :

Convicted August 12, 1901 of being drunk and disorderly, fined $5 and costs. Convicted 22nd January, 1898 of assault, fined $1 and costs. Convicted 8th June, 1894 of assault and battery, fined $1 and costs. Tried July 17, 1896 on a charge of perjury, dismissed on a technicality as explained in the evidence of Mayor Sinclair.

Another man named Keilor, who was one of the corroborative witnesses, had been committed to three months in jail for vagrancy. Another man named Mustard was convicted of theft and again of being drunk and disorderly. A man named Collins, who swore a charge on Mr. King of Ingersoll, was convicted of an indecent assault and fined $50 and costs. Again convicted of being drunk and disorderly, again drunk and disorderly, convicted on three different charges of theft and sentenced to four years in Kingston penitentiary ; charged by his wife with attempting to commit suicide. A large number of witnesses swore his reputation was so bad that they could not believe him on oath.

Mr. BENNETT.

Then there was John Henderson who swore this charge on Johnson in corroboration with Parker. Henderson was convicted of being drunk and disorderly ; again convicted of breaking and entering a shop of John Christophers and stealing goods therefrom, sentenced to 18 months in the Central Prison. Isaiah Wright, who swore to charge on Johnson, was convicted on October 15, 1890, of being drunk and disorderly, sentenced to 30 days in jail ; again convicted of larceny, sentenced to 365 days in the Central Prison ; another charge of drunk and disorderly, 30 days ; convicted of assault, $1 and costs ; another charge of drunk and disorderly, 30 days ; another charge of drunk and disorderly, 10 days; another charge of drunk and disorderly, 20 days; another charge of drunk and disorderly, 20 days ; convicted of theft, 3 months in common jail ; disturbance, 6 months in Central Prison ; non-support, 6 months in Central Prison ; theft, 29 days in Central prison ; drunk, $1 and costs ; drunk and incapable, $2 and costs ; drunk and disorderly, 30 days in common jail ; drunk, $1 and costs. And these are the men who are the confidants, friends and accomplices of this Canadian representative in Leeds today. But what was the whole condition of this matter ? It is all very well to make comments here but we have the comments that a gentleman made, who was right under the guns, so to speak, who was holding the inquiry into the fact. When this matter was before the court and when man after man had been placed in the box, the comment of Mr. Justice Street, as reported in the 'Globe' of October 20, 1902, was as follows :

Judge Street interposed saying : 'Mr. Blake was quite within his rights in calling attention to the means that have been taken to procure evidence in this case. One of the difficulties I have in this case is the knowledge of the improper and reprehensible means and large expenditure which have been proven to have been devoted to an absolutely improper purpose. It is impossible to follow the ramifications of such an expenditure, and in dealing with the last case I cannot get out of my mind the possibility of the course of the inquiry having been affected by the expenditure of a very large sum of money. Here is Mr. Jackson, a lawyer in Ingersoll, here is this man of the lowest possible character, as far as appears from what has been said about him, and one knows of the desperate efforts that have been made to prove the charges. Nothing was ever heard in my experience before like it. It is impossible to trace out all these underground influences.

And yet this is a sample of the men who to-day are to be found in Great Britain as the representatives of this country. Mr. W. T. R. Preston certainly had an unsavoury reputation in this country, but even his reputation is as the rose compared with that of this man Jackson. How did Jackson act when he was in the box ? There is no doubt that Jackson was trying to save himself as

much as he could. When he was driven from pillar to post, he was forced to admit that he had never kept any record of these moneys that he had been paying out. He had paid Chambers $375, Fick $250, and a considerable amount to Hewlett as well as paying all these other individuals one after another as they came into his office, different small amounts. What does he say ?

Q. And have you got no book in which you have entered that ?
A. I have not.
Q. How do you keep track of such payments ?
A. Well, I sometimes paid by cheque but I generally tried to keep track of such payments.
Q. In what way, I am asking you ?
A. Well, in my mind.
Q. In your mind ?
A. Yes.
Q. Are all your cash transactions done in the same way ?
A. Not my business transactions.
Q. This you did not call a business transaction ?
A. Well, I was paying him and I think I gave him about $150 and about $100 besides to pay for subpœnaing some 46 witnesses.

Then he was referring to Fick :

I was not asking you that ; you told me you paid him $150 and now you tell me you paid him another $100, that is $250. I asked you what track you kept of it and have you any entry in any book of that ?
A. I have not any entry in any book of that.

What does all that show ? It shows that Jackson knew that he was being involved in a discreditable and disgraceful proceeding. What is going to be the end of this sort of thing if it is to go on in this country ? It would seem that Jackson was supplied with funds to an unlimited extent and there is no statement on his part that this was his own money. It is incredible to think that this was his own money. Chambers in his statement says that Jackson told him that he was going to Toronto to see some members of the government and I think he said Mr. Ross amongst them, although I will not say as to that, and that when he did come back he did see him about it, and all the information that we have about Jackson's circumstances is decidedly of the nature that would go to show, that $375 was not an amount of money to be found every day on the person of Jackson. Then it must be positively the fact that this money was furnished from headquarters. I am not going to say that Mr. Ross, or whoever supplied him with the money, was aware of the purpose for which it was to be used, but here is the money on Jackson who was able to secure command of this money and here is the conclusion of the judge after hearing the evidence, who says, that the conduct of Jackson was in every way most disgraceful and discreditable. Two charges were brought against the respondent Sutherland, one a question of disqualification for giving an hostler a fifty cent tip, and these were the subject of a disagreement between the judges. Men were found to give the evidence and accomplices turned up to corroborate their statements. The plan was so laid that there was always corroborative evidence. In face of the fact that this matter was commented on publicly at the time in the newspapers it is idle for the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to say that he never heard of it. It would be incredible on the part of any reasonable person to believe that the right hon. gentleman never heard of the South Oxford election trial. He must have read these comments of the judges. As a party man, he was interested in the South Oxford riding. As to the success or failure of his party in South Oxford whether in federal or local affairs it goes without saying that he would be interested. He has been the representative of South Oxford for a great many years in this House, and there is no reasonable man who will ever be got to believe for a moment that the right hon. gentleman did not read the comments of the judges on the evidence adduced at the trial. So that, at the time of the appointment of this man Jackson, it is impossible for us to believe that he was not aware of his wrong doing on that occasion. As to the matter of the appointment we must not forget that the hon. Minister of Public Works has declared that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is solely responsible for the appointment and employment of this man Jackson, and I think the right hon. gentleman owes it to the country and to the House to explain why Jackson in the first instance was ever secured by the government to perform the duties of the office that he now fills and in the next place why, in face of the allegations that have been made against this man in the House and in the face of the means that the right hon. gentleman has had of gaining access to the records which will prove the truth or falsity of these statements, his services have not been dispensed with.

Right Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is perfectly right when he says that I am responsible and I accept the sole responsibility for the appointment of Mr. J. B. Jackson. I have not the slightest desire to shelter myself under any diversion of that responsibility. I may add, that, knowing Mr. Jackson very well, I know him to be a very intelligent, capable man, I know that he has filled his office well and will, I think continue to discharge his duties well. As to some of the points to which the hon. gentleman referred I have one or two things to say. There is no doubt whatever that the circumstances connected with the election of Mr.

Sutherland, to the local assembly for South Oxford were such as to naturally excite a very considerable amount of suspicion in the minds of those who are acquainted with the history and the details of that country. South Oxford is and has been for a great many years a persistently Liberal county. Mr. McKay, the local member who was defeated, had been returned at the last election by a majority of some 400 or 500—I forget which at the moment. I myself had been but a short time before returned for these portions of the constituency which were afterwards carried for Mr Sutherland by a very large majority also. Very unexpectedly, very suddenly, we discovered the large majorities for the Liberal candidate were turned into a minority. There was no doubt whatever that large funds had been put up, not by Mr. Sutherland, but by the supporters and friends of Mr. Sutherland, for the purpose of defeating the Ross government, and there was perfect justification for the suspicion that very improper means had been used to elect Mr. Sutherland. Mr. Jackson who was very well acquainted with the constituency, knew who were likely to be concerned in this; he had been making inquiries and had come on a number of clues that pointed to the fact that a certain gentleman by the name of Chambers knew all about the matter. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) said that Mr. Chambers was perfectly unknown to Mr. Jackson.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chambers lived at Woodstock and Jackson came in and served him with a subpœna and invited him across the street to an hotel and up to that time they were perfectly unacquainted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection and information is totally different, and as I represent South Oxford I know something about it. Mr. Jackson and Mr. Chambers were exceedingly well acquainted with each other. Now, I am not pretending to say that Mr. Jackson's zeal in this matter did not outrun his discretion but every one knows—I am not addressing a girls' school in this matter—that when you have to obtain evidence for a contested election it is absolutely impossible for you to obtain it from highly respectable members of society. The parties who have received bribes are not as a rule men who are of the very highest standing, and if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to lay down the proposition that it is an immoral act to offer a man money for making a declaration, all I can say is that you may as well issue a proclamation of amnesty from that time out, to every man who chooses to use money to carry an election. I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Jackson was not by any manner of means discreet in dealing with Mr. Chambers. He knew perfectly well that Mr. Chambers was a Conservative heeler of high standing, and before he had anything to do with Mr. Chambers he ought to have been very careful, he ought to have looked behind the door, he ought to have looked under the bed; he ought to have looked up the chimney; he ought to have taken every imaginary precaution to know that he was not being entrapped and hoaxed, that he was not being induced to pay money for evidence which was entirely bad and unreliable. The hon. gentleman has quoted from a newspaper report of the judge's charge; he has quoted some remarks of Mr. Justice Street with respect to this evidence.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the trial report in the 'Globe.'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The trial report in a newspaper is not the judge's charge by any manner of means.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is it not the judge's statement?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The judge's statement it may be, but it is not the judge's statement corroborated by the judge himself. My hon. friend knows very well that these newspaper reports are not to be taken as absolutely reliable on all occasions. I accept what the judge states from the bench as very good evidence of what the judge thought, but I am informed that when the matter came to be reviewed—the trial was conducted before Mr. Justice Britton and Mr. Justice Street—neither of these gentlemen commented on Jackson's proceedings.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to say that I was present and heard the statement made by Judge Street, and that report is as near as can be, word for word of what he said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGT. Was that his final charge?

Mr. INGRAM. There is no final charge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The judge delivers his judgment.

Mr. INGRAM. No. I have the statement here from the evidence itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that were the statement corroborated from the shorthand notes taken before the judge, it undoubtedly would be entitled to regard; but, if it is a simple statement in the newspaper it is not entitled to equal regard no matter what that newspaper may be.

Mr. SPROULE. It is in the friendly 'Globe.'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it does not matter. If Mr. Jackson had committed an offence punishable by law there were plenty of parties who would have de-

sired nothing better than to prosecute Mr. Jackson.

Mr. COCHRANE. You got him out of the way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No they had months and months, and months, and they would have prosecuted him had he committed a criminal offence. I made inquiries about the matter and I was informed that whatever indiscretion he may have been guilty of, he had committed no offence contrary to the laws of the land, and I know that these people would have prosecuted Mr. Jackson if he had so done. Nor do I notice that either one or other of the judges stated that Mr. Jackson had left himself open to a prosecution in any shape or way.

Mr. CLANCY. You seem to think that Mr. Jackson was a mere martyr.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Jackson no doubt finding that this constituency had been carried in a very suspicious fashion, and finding that the tracks lay in a particular direction, did go to the party whom he had reason to believe was the most thoroughly acquainted with the whole details, and he did offer him a considerable sum of money it appears for the purpose of obtaining that evidence; but Mr. Jackson did not suborn nor did he attempt to suborn testimony.

Mr. BENNETT. I quoted from the sworn evidence of the person who said that Jackson asked him not to mention anything about this matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All that came before the judges and the judges did not make any such imputation upon Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson did attempt to obtain evidence, but he did not attempt to suborn testimony.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know how you are going to obtain evidence in these election trials, unless sometimes men are prepared to pay sums of money for the obtaining of evidence. I venture to say that there are mighty few election trials which are brought to a close in this country in which something of the kind has not to be done. I do not mean to say that it is nice work; I do not mean to say I like it; I do not mean to say that it is good work, but it is work that has to be done unless you are going to allow these parties on either side to go from one end of the country to another using money for the purpose of illegitimately influencing the electors. You have two choices; you may prohibit the use of money for obtaining evidence, but if you do, as I said, it practically amounts to granting an amnesty to all parties concerned, to go and bribe just as they please. In this matter Mr. Jackson offered a sum of money to a party whom he thought could obtain evidence which would unseat Mr. Sutherland. How, and in what way I would like to ask, is Mr. Jackson, morally speaking, more censurable or more culpable than the gentlemen who—unless my memory fails me—offered rewards of several thousand dollars to all parties who would obtain evidence against Liberal candidates at this very same general election? I think a public advertisement was used; I think large sums of money were offered; I think every possible inducement was given to get up cases against the Liberal members. I never heard hon. gentlemen opposite object to that. I never heard these hon. gentlemen dissent from that being an illegitimate means of employing their money, and I cannot for the life of me see in what respect, morally speaking, Mr. Jackson's conduct was worse than the conduct of those very respected and honourable gentlemen who publicly advertised that they were prepared to pay large sums of money to obtain such evidence as would unseat Liberal members.

Mr. COCHRANE. Such rascals did not get government appointments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; my hon. friend knows something about government appointments in past times, as the records of the House will show, unless I forget.

Mr. COCHRANE. You need not forget. I am here and if you want to make that charge, come up into my riding and make it. You are looking for a constituency now, and you can come up to my riding and tell all you know about it, and that won't take you long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is on record, and my hon. friend need not distress himself. The matter has been discussed in this House.

Mr. COCHRANE. The riding has spoken several times, and if you are not in accord with the verdict, come up and try it yourself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend must find the cap to fit very tightly, or he would not be so irate at being reminded of what he did in reference to government appointments. It is not the first time, and I suppose it will not be the last on which we shall hear from hon. gentlemen in reference to this matter. No doubt, as I have said, the means that are adopted for obtaining evidence in these election trials are of a character which I suppose no man on either side of the House wishes to see employed. At the same time, I must point out that the judges stated that in their opinion Mr. Jackson, whatever he had done, had not brought himself within the precincts of the law, nor did the parties who,

were disposed, if they had a fair chance, to prosecute Mr. Jackson, attempt to take any proceedings against him. Unless I am entirely misinformed, these same parties did not put Mr. Chambers into the witness box at all.

An hon. MEMBER. Why ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The evidence, such as it was, was obtained by Mr. Jackson himself. Why did they not put him into the box ? If I might suggest, they abstained wisely from doing so because in all probability he knew too much. However, be that as it may, I desire to be clearly understood. I exonerate my colleagues entirely in this matter and take the full responsibility of Mr. Jackson's appointment. I say he is a capable man, and if he continues in his office, I think he will justify his appointment. Already I have received on more than one occasion testimony to the ability and diligence with which he is conducting his work. The hon. gentleman did not conclude with a motion ; but I have given him all the information in my power. Such of his facts as were correct I have admitted ; and I have called the attention of the House to the fact that if Mr. Jackson did wrong, his assailants might avail themselves of the courts, but they did not choose to do so, which is the best proof that they knew that whatever faults Mr. Jackson committed, he did not bring himself within the purview of the law.

Mr. BENNETT. I received the following from the evidence :

Q. Do I understand you to say that Jackson told you not to say anything about the declaration if you were asked ?—A. If anybody asked me, he told me not to say anything about it.

If he was asked at the inquiry if he had made such a declaration, he was to answer that he had not. There is the evidence of half a dozen other witnesses that Jackson interviewed, and each one of them, when asked that question, presumably at the trial, was to answer that he had not made any declaration. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his view of political morality in this country.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. I was rather amused to notice that when the right hon. gentleman rose in his place he received the applause of his friends ; but I was very much pleased to notice that when he took his seat, his friends did not see fit to applaud him for the stand he had taken.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The professionals applauded him.

Mr. BENNETT. They hope to get their jobs.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for South Oxford says that Mr. Jackson is a very capable and intelligent man. I quite agree with that. Some years ago my right hon. friend had some difficulty in securing the nomination in South Oxford, and he appealed to this capable and intelligent man to manipulate the convention as against his friend Mr. Janes, from the city of Toronto. Mr. Jackson was successful. I do not know whether he encouraged all the criminals that he could get in South Oxford to assist him in securing that convention ; but I do know that he was successful in securing it for the right hon. gentleman, and he is well able to carry out successfully anything he undertakes in the political line. The hon. member for South Oxford says that the constituency is a very safe one. I would ask the right hon. gentleman, from his own experience in politics, whether he would advise his friends to expend large sums of money in a constituency which he claims to have been carried sometimes by hundreds, some times by thousands, and sometimes by acclamation. The right hon. gentleman would not advise his friends to do anything of the kind. That kind of thing is not done on either side. But what occurred in this case ? The representative, Dr. McKay, had paid very little attention to his constituents. In a measure he had ignored them. There was a rumour circulated to the effect that he only required to run his election in order to obtain a government position. Many of his supporters, who had been loyal to him up to that time, disliked that kind of conduct and when Mr. Sutherland, who is a farmer—it is largely a farming constituency—went round the constituency, large numbers of the electors agreed to support him instead of Dr. McKay. These were sufficient to roll up a majority of a hundred or more for Mr. Sutherland. Now, nobody has ever charged Mr. Sutherland with corruption in that election. The proof is in this fact that the trial started on the 15th of October and continued to the 18th, when it was adjourned to December 1st, 2nd and 3rd, after which the argument was adjourned to the city of Toronto. Will any hon. gentleman in this House say, after a careful search made by men like Mr. Jackson, who was connected with the firm of Messrs. Kerr, Davidson, Patterson and Grant, after securing all the assistance which they could by hook or crook, from constables and others, all these days of trial in the city of Woodstock, that Mr. Sutherland was guilty of any charge of corruption without having that charge brought before the judges of the court ? It is simply absurd for any hon. gentleman to talk in that way. There was only one charge proved against Mr. Sutherland's friends ; that was, the hiring of a livery in the town of Ingersoll. I think that pretty conclusively proves the statement of my hon. friend if there was anything suspicious in connection with that election in South Oxford, it is not borne out by the evidence which was brought out in the court held in the city of Woodstock. Now, if my hon. friend's statement is correct that

large sums of money were supposed to have been spent in the case of Mr. Sutherland to corrupt the vote, this is the only instance. With reference to Mr. Chambers being practically unacquainted with Mr. Jackson, let me say that Mr. Chambers was acquainted with Mr. Jackson and Mr. Jackson was acquainted with Mr. Chambers.

At One o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. INGRAM. When you left the chair at one o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was leading up to the difference between the explanation of the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce and that of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), regarding degree of acquaintance between Mr. Chambers and Mr. Jackson. The hon. member for East Simcoe was quite right in assuming that these gentlemen were not well acquainted with each other. When he read the declaration of Mr. Chambers, he found these words in it:

> He then asked me to come with him to the Dufferin Hotel and have a smoke. When we reached there, he asked if there was a private room, and on being shown one we both went in alone. He talked with me very familiarly, calling me by my first name.

From these words one would naturally conclude that Mr. Jackson had assumed a familiarity with Mr. Chambers which he had not been in the habit of doing, and consequently the hon. gentleman was quite justified in concluding that the two men were strangers. I know from my personal knowledge that they were acquaintances, but I am quite well satisfied that they were not familiar acquaintances. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce tried to make a point out of the fact that the respondents counsel did not place Chambers in the box on that occasion. But he did not say why Chambers' evidence was not admissible. His evidence was offered in court, he was called, but the fact of Mr. Jackson not being the respondent in this case and not being on trial, rendered Chambers' evidence not admissible. In other words, it was collateral evidence and not admissible on that occasion. But I can go so far as to say that if the evidence of Messrs. Chambers, Francis and Smith had been admitted, they would have proven beyond doubt that Jackson had made the statement that he was prepared to pay for any evidence which would unseat Mr. Sutherland, whether that evidence was true or false. I was amazed when my right hon. friend, in his jocular way, condoned the conduct of Mr. Jackson. I was amazed to hear him condone the obtaining of evidence in that way. I was grieved to hear the right hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) view it in that light, and I must confess I had a better opinion of my right hon. friend. It is a well known fact that judges do not approve of statements being taken down by lawyers on behalf of witnesses. It is well known that they do not approve of lawyers taking affidavits or declarations. They prefer that the witnesses should be placed in the box and give evidence themseives and be free to state what they believe to be the truth; but my right hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems to approve of the solicitor for the petitioners in this case obtaining affidavits from men—who are telling the truth. Now, the sole object was to obtain affidavits from men who, Mr. Jackson knew, were not to tell the truth, and he was paying them to make such affidavits and to be prepared to stick to them, should they be called into court as witnesses.

There is another case, that of Mr. King. The hon. member from East Simcoe mentioned Mr. King. Mr. King is a highly respected citizen of Ingersoll. He is a merchant and a gentleman whom the citizens honoured by electing him as mayor, and he represented that town as mayor for some time. Well, what do we find Mr. Jackson doing? We find him going to a man of the name of Collins, whose criminal offences have been quoted in this House, and inducing that man to make a statement against one of the most respected citizens of Ingersoll. And who did Jackson get to corroborate this statement of Collins? No other than Collins's wife, who was also a criminal, as was shown in court. And we have these two criminals giving evidence against one of the most honoured and respected citizens of the town—one whom the people of Ingersoll, largely Liberal, elected as their mayor, although he is a Conservative, thus showing their confidence in his honesty and ability. Yet in order to unseat Mr. Sutherland, these two criminals were brought in to swear falsely against a respected citizen of the town of Ingersoll. Why was all this done? Because the Ontario government was only sustained in the general elections by two of a majority, and owing to the death of Mr. Munroe, of Renfrew, that majority was reduced to one. In order to save themselves they attacked Mr. Sutherland in the county of Oxford. They attacked him in order to unseat him, because, as my right hon. friend has said, South Oxford has a Liberal majority, and they thought, if they could unseat Mr. Sutherland by any means, good or bad, they would be in a position to elect in his place a supporter of the Ontario government. That is what the Ontario government had at stake. And what had Mr. Jackson at stake? He had a judgeship at stake. He was working for his reward from this government. There is no use trying to deny the facts. We have in this House a gentleman, occupying one of the highest positions in the government of Can-

ada, honoured by the imperial authorities with a title (Sir Richard Cartwright), coming forward and admitting that he knew all the facts in connection with the case and took full responsibility. Was this the reason why this government rewarded this gentleman? I do not believe that it was the sole reason. I am inclined to believe that services rendered, untold events which occurred in some years gone by—and which Mr. Jackson threatened to expose, if not rewarded—had something to do with his appointment. Mr. Jackson knew that he could not secure a judgeship. He knew that the Ontario government dared not with its small majority of one, appoint him to any position under it. He therefore came to Ottawa, and inside of a year was appointed to an important position in England. What was that important position? I find this inquiry put by the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell in the Senate:

Whether a man by the name of J. B. Jackson, of Ingersoll, Ontario, has been appointed to any position in England or elsewhere, by the government of Canada, or any member of said government?

If so, what are the duties assigned to him, and what salary or remuneration is he to receive for the performance of such services?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—J. B. Jackson, of Ingersoll, Ontario, was appointed by Order in Council of date October 31st, 1903 (appointment to date from 1st November, 1903) commercial agent to Leeds and Hull, England.

His duties are to report monthly, or more frequently, if necessary, to the Department of Trade and Commerce upon all trade matters which may be of interest to Canadian exporters, and to use his best endeavour to further Canada's market in the district to which he is assigned. These reports are published weekly and are sent to any business men in Canada desiring them.

Mr. Jackson's salary is $3,000 per annum, and office and contingent expenses.

I have made hard statements about this man. I call upon my witnesses to substantiate the statement I am making and if the right hon. gentleman will communicate with Mr. Ball, county Crown attorney for Oxford, I believe that he will get some information about Mr. J. B. Jackson. He will find that Mr. J. B. Jackson was charged with forgery or perjury and that owing to the theft of a certain document during the night Jackson escaped being committed for the crime with which he was charged. If my right hon. friend will communicate with Mr. Ball, Mr. Ball will tell him that Jackson is a scoundrel. And yet, Sir, this gentleman whom I find in the 'Parliamentary Companion' to bear this title:

Rt. Hon. Sir Richard John Cartwright, G.C.M., P.C.

Privy Councillor, who has received one of the highest titles in the gift of the imperial authorities as bestowed on Canadian subjects, a gentleman who has filled the important position of Finance Minister of Canada, and who to-day is filling a responsible position of Minister of Trade and Commerce, has appointed this man Jackson to an important position. I ask my hon. friends who have heard the evidence that has been shown in this House to-day, after witnessing the flippant manner in which that right hon. gentleman spoke in connection with the appointment of this man Jackson, do they think it will be a very nice thing for the imperial authorities, who have bestowed this title on the right hon. gentleman, to read the evidence in connection with J. B. Jackson? Do hon. gentlemen think that the imperial authorities will consider that the title has been well bestowed upon a man who by his own assertion to-day has condoned the purchasing of perjury and offences of this kind? Reference has been made to the confusion of Ontario and Dominion politics and the Conservatives in this House have been blamed for dragging in the provincial government in matters of this kind. I remember in days gone by when the Liberal party in this House condemned the Dominion and local authorities for travelling in couples. I remember those days quite well, but, Sir, who were the first to drag into the same arena local and Dominion issues and make them as one? The very party of which the right hon. gentleman is one of the chief leaders. Who are they selecting as candidates for this country? I go to London and find that the governor of the county jail in Middlesex is the Dominion candidate in North Middlesex. I go to the constituency of my hon. friend from Halton and find opposing him the public school inspector receiving pay from the Ontario government. I go to Dundas, and find as the Liberal candidate the provincial inspector of jails and asylums, Dr. Chamberlain. These men drawing money for their services from the local government are now candidates for this House on behalf of the Liberal party. And yet hon. gentlemen talk to us about associating local and Dominion politics!

There is another important question. As I said the hon. gentlemen opposite applauded the right hon. gentleman when he rose to reply to the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), but I wish to congratulate hon. gentlemen behind him upon the fact that they did not applaud the right hon. gentleman after he made his explanation in this House, and I am sure when the statement made by him is quoted against him in this country—and it will be because it deserves to be—showing the depth to which these hon. gentlemen have descended, and showing the disregard they have for what is proper and right and the degradation that will attach to any man who is a member of a party whose leaders express such sentiments. This chamber has rung day after day during this session because we have found that a government

employee of this country had the audacity to write a letter or to find fault in connection with certain political interference with his duties connected with his office. We were told by the Liberal press that these officials had disgraced themselves. The people of this city were only the other day warned not to join in a procession in honour of a man who had disgraced Canada by finding fault with the political influences used in his department. Every word of that paper was in condemnation of those who turned out to give a send-off to that man because he had disgraced himself. I have yet to learn that Lord Dundonald has arrived at the stage of having bought perjured evidence in this country to unseat a good man. What he has done has been an honourable thing. He is condemned for that and yet we find praise and reward for the man who had purchased perjured evidence. Now, Sir, I do not wish to pursue this matter any further. The right hon. gentleman has relieved us from believing that he was not aware of what occurred on that memorable occasion and I have only to say to him that the electors of South Oxford will not compliment him for saying that money was put into that constituency for the purpose of purchasing the honest electors of South Oxford.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. There was a time in the history of Canada when the Reform party were credited with standing for honour and honesty if for nothing else. The people of the country believed that the more prominent men of the party were men of sterling honour and sterling integrity and certainly in the public life of Canada so far as Canada knew they were examples of honesty, examples that might well be copied by the rising generations. But unfortunately of late years they seem to have drifted away from their moorings, and those who were the leading lights in the party in the past appear to vie with each other to-day in their degradation and their lowering of the public life of Canada, in discrediting the honour of Canadian public men and disgracing party politics. That is the position as it appears to-day. What is the qualification for appointment to office to-day ? Appointments to office are made strictly I believe for party purposes, and I am speaking advisedly when I say so. If I were requested to give an example I might name them by the dozen and the greater the scoundrel, the more successful he has been in wrongdoing for his political party, the more successful he has been in accomplishing in an improper way what they desire to have accomplished, the success of the party, the greater seems to be his qualification for a position of trust and of honour. Need I give examples of it ? Take, for instance, the one that we have been discussing this afternoon. Take Mr. Preston, if you like, who occupies a very prominent position as an immigration agent of Canada to-day. For years and years, to the disgrace of the party and the disgrace of Mr. Preston, he was one of the most unscrupulous men, I believe, not only in the province of Ontario, but in the Dominion of Canada, a man whose word was of no account, whose honour seemed to be so light that no person respected it, a man whose own uncle went into court and produced not less than ten or twelve respectable witnesses who made affidavits to the effect that they would not believe him on his oath. That is the reputation of the man who has been honoured by being appointed to a prominent position and to-day he is pensioned on the country at a salary of $3,000 a year and office and other expenses, as an immigration agent in England.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And he is one of the best we ever had.

Mr. SPROULE. One of the best we ever had according to the judgment of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell). And when the country knows that, I need say no more.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They do know it.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that that man who came back here and entered a suit against a party in this city to vindicate his character——

Mr. BENNETT. His what ?

Mr. SPROULE——and he dared not go on with the suit for fear that his character which he wished to vindicate would only be shown to be blacker than it was considered to be up to that time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If Mr. Preston was here you would not dare to say that to him outside the chamber.

Mr. SPROULE. I have said the same thing to Mr. Preston face to face. I do not need to hide behind the privileges of parliament. Mr. Preston knows it too well, and the hon. member knows it too.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You are very bold in the House of Commons, but you would not be so bold outside.

Mr. SPROULE. I may be told that had the suit been tried Mr. Preston would have been cleared. What are the facts ? The record stands to-day in the courts of this country that twelve presumably honest men went into the court and swore they would not believe him on his oath, his own uncle and other witnesses to the number of ten or twelve. This is the man who did the dirty work for the party for years, and travelled in filth and mire up to his neck ; and this is the man who to-day is honoured by holding the high position of representative of Canada in England, and who is writing letters to discredit a man like Lord Dundonald. This is the

civil servant who did the dirty work of the party and whom they celebrated to-day, he believing that he will be shielded by his party as he has been in the past. That is an example of what is going on in our decaying and decadent public and political life in Canada as a consequence of the party who are in power to-day.

Then we take Jackson whose case is before the House for consideration at the present time, and we hear an hon. knight declaring: I assume full responsibility for Jackson's appointment, and I defend it. And what does he add? He is an intelligent and capable man? On hearing that I said mentally: It is a great pity he could not say that he is an honest and truthful man. Could he do it? No, he dare not risk his reputation by saying that, because there is too much on record to prove the contrary—a man who stands disgraced before the public of Canada to-day, a man who has not only perjured himself but endeavoured to purchase others to commit perjury as well, a man who is a forger himself, and had the documents not been improperly stolen or taken away from the public office, documents that are in the custody of friends of the hon. gentleman, that would have been proven in court, and I presume Jackson would have been in the penitentiary to-day instead of receiving the salary that he does over in England. And this is the man of whom the knight says: I assume the full responsibility of his appointment, I am prepared to assume it. Then if we go back in history a little, what do we find? We are told this is the man who succeeded by his peculiar methods in political life, or who helped others to succeed in getting the knight elected in South Oxford, for the last time—the Wandering Willie of his party, who, like Noah's dove, found no rest for the sole of his foot until he found it in South Oxford by virtue of the machinations of such men as Jackson, who to-day is reaping his reward. No wonder the hon. gentleman assumes responsibility for his appointment. There is a debt of gratitude due to Jackson from the hon. gentleman that he dare not withhold. Jackson knows too much to be left in the cold and friendless world, he must be taken care of, and he is taken care of, and the hon. member to-day assumes the full responsibility of his appointment. I can tell him that, talking a short time ago with some of the honest Reformers in South Oxford, they declared publicly to me that it was one of the most disgraceful appointments ever made in Canada, and on no man does that disgrace rest with greater weight than upon the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Prime Minister is responsible.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and every other member of that cabinet, and they must be held responsible for it to the public of Canada, because that is what they have brought upon Canada by such appointments. Then we take others of the same ilk, because they are hunting in couples to-day, they are employing the same degraded characters to do the dirty work for the party in the Dominion as well as the provinces. Take Pritchett, take Tom Lewis, take the notorious Grant, who has always been the handy man of the party, ready to do their dirty work, take Captain Sullivan, take Frank Sullivan, take the whole gang of them, and what are they? Every one of them, the deeper they are steeped in political crime in the service of their political party the more eligible they are for high appointments in the gift of the party.

An hon. MEMBER. Masters of the administration.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and some of them threatened publicly that the government dare not do otherwise than defend them, because they knew too much. We are justified in coming to that conclusion because the government are obliged to take these men up, no matter how deeply they are steeped in filth, and defend and support them otherwise disclosures would take place which might be very uncomfortable for the government and for the party. Now the hon. member for South Oxford says: What is the difference between a man who endeavours to buy a witness to commit perjury in order to prove a case, and the man or the society who offers a reward for the prevention of crime? He puts them in the same category—the man who, when a crime is committed, offers a reward for any one who will give such evidence as will lead to the conviction of the guilty party—he puts that man in the same category with Jackson who goes and deliberately hires the down-trodden of the earth, the scum of creation, the jail birds, the penitentiary birds, to swear and perjure themselves for the purpose of making an innocent man guilty. And the hon. member for South Oxford, the Knight of the country who holds his title from the Queen, declares there is no difference in his judgment between the one or the other. Is that his sense of right? Is that what the country expects of him? It seems to me it is a degradation that no person ever expected that either he would reach or any one of the prominent men of his party.

Now then, what has been the result of all this? For it has been going on for many years. Take the province of Ontario, and I speak more especially with regard to that, because I know the history of the political party in that country better. I say it openly and above board to-day, that these things have tended to demoralize the courts of our country, and they are demoralized in the eyes of the world, disgraced in the eyes of

the world. They have tended to destroy the administration of justice, and there is no faithful and honest administration of justice in the country to-day. Take political offenders before the courts to-day and what is the result ? Why, if you took them before magistrates anywhere to-day you could not convict them. You might bring the most direct evidence in the world, and they would be liberated on their recognizance, or be dismissed, or if they were committed they were released immediately afterwards, they never served any time, they never received any punishment for their crimes because they were released. The courts seem to have been manipulated from the magistrates court up to the highest courts in the land, and to-day the honest conviction in the minds of the people of Canada is that you cannot go into the courts and get justice. The criminal is often shielded by virtue of the machinations of the politicians who seem to be able in one way or another to control and manipulate the courts. That is a hard thing to say with regard to our courts, but the history of what has taken place for the last twenty years in Canada justifies me in saying it, and I say it here in the precincts of parliament, so that it may be disseminated in the widest manner, that the people of Canada and the world may know it.

The time will come when a long-suffering people will not tolerate it any longer, and I can tell those who are the perpetrators and abettors of it, like the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, that if it continues much longer it will result in a rebellion, because they are driving the people to that extremity. I give the right hon. gentleman and his friends timely warning, when I say that the shot-gun will do what the courts do not do ; that is, punish criminals, because they are destroying all respect for law and authority in this country. They are practically shielding criminals, they are putting a price upon rascality, and they invite others to commit offences. The result is that there is no honour in the land, and that public men are not respected. They are lowering and degrading public life, and this degradation is being upheld by one who, by virtue of his position, ought to be an example of probity, honour, truthfulness and character. But when public men come out like the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and defend criminals, and justify and support crime, can we expect the common people of the country to look up to these men as examples of what is right, proper, honest and truthful ? Is it to be wondered at that the sneak thief follows his nefarious calling, when we find men in public life justifying and defending it ? I say it is not. This has been going on from year to year, until the public life of Canada has been lowered to such a degree that the people do not respect public men, or the word of public men, or their honour. Who are responsible for this ? No class of men in Canada are more responsible than the present party in power and their friends in Ontario. The history of these transactions has been accumulating and growing worse and worse every year. There is no possibility of getting an independent verdict from the people because of the nefarious conduct of the party who control the situation, and control the courts as well. I say the time is rapidly coming when the people will take the power into their own hands, and will defend themselves and the ballot box if the courts of the country will not do it, or if the party who are responsible for the administration of affairs do not do their duty, as they have not been doing it for the last twenty years in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has accepted the full responsibility for the appointment of this gentleman to the lucrative position which he now holds. It may be advisable for us to review that appointment very briefly in the light of what was disclosed at the trial which has already been referred to. Mr. Jackson, who was a solicitor, had charge of the petition, and his chief assistants in the local preparation of the case were a constable named Ellis Fick, of Tilsonburg, another man named Charles Hewlett, a prominent Liberal worker in the riding, and a professional machine man, as he is called, in the riding, named George Sutherland. The trial opened at Woodstock on the 15th October and continued for several days. The evidence and declarations which I have in my hand disclose the following facts in regard to Mr. Jackson :

He personally paid money to George Fournier, a criminal character, one of his witnesses in the protest. A man by the name of Parker, another named Elijah Harp, and others, swore that Fournier offered them money to swear to falsehoods. I have the evidence for that under my hand, and I have the pages to refer to if any hon. gentleman sees fit to deny or discredit that statement. Jackson paid Charles Parker $10, or, according to his own admission, $5 for similar purposes. I have the evidence to give in answer to any person who will undertake to contradict that statement. He paid Ellis Fick, by his own admission, $250, and according to the evidence of Charles Parker and William Abraham Young and others, Fick endeavoured to bribe them to swear to falsehoods. The right hon. gentleman has referred to witnesses not being put in the box. Let me remind him that when this evidence was given in this case the petitioner did not put Fick in the box to contradict this statement, but, on the contrary, Fick was found conveniently absent as soon as this evidence had been given. Mr. Jackson had Charles Hewlett and George Sutherland assisting

him in preparing the protest, and he himself interviewed witnesses, F. R. Avey and Lincoln Pollard, who admitted on oath that Hewlett had paid them money to make declarations. A large number of witnesses, among them Parker, Young, Avey, Pollard and Mustard, admitted on oath that Hewlett and Sutherland had bribed and attempted to bribe them to give evidence, and their statements were not attempted to be denied. In fact, the evidence shows that Hewlett and Sutherland absented or concealed themselves, so that the respondent could not subpœna them for the adjourned trial. It should also be remembered that Sutherland did a great deal of his work in the office of Mr. Jackson himself.

Mr. Jackson himself paid Edward Chambers $375 cash, and promised him $375 more on condition that Chambers should get evidence which would prove eight charges. This agreement with Chambers was to be private; in fact, there was a written declaration drawn up that nothing was to be said about it. Mr. Jackson admits that the last $375 was to be paid only on condition that Chambers would prove eight certain charges. Jackson told Chambers that it did not matter whether the evidence was true or false so long as it answered the purpose. Mr. Chambers is corroborated on oath as to this by two other reputable gentlemen of Woodstock, Mr. Vaughn Francis and Mr. Samuel Smith, who declare that they overheard Jackson distinctly tell Chambers that it did not matter whether the evidence were false or true, so long as it unseated Sutherland. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is now willing to accept responsibility for that. I should say, in justice to Mr. Jackson, that he denied this statement, but he was met with the distinct statement to the contrary of no less than three witnesses. He disbursed an enormous amount of money in connection with the campaign, and he states that he kept no record of his disbursements. He interviewed Frederick R. Avey, a bribed witness, at Avey's house, and, as Avey swears, told Avey he was not to say that he had been given anything for giving his evidence. He interviewed Lincoln Pollard, another bribed witness, and, according to Pollard, told Pollard if any one asked him about it to say nothing about making the declaration. I would be inclined to think that the right hon. gentleman is accepting a pretty fair share of responsibility when he undertakes to shoulder all that.

Let me call his attention to some of the sworn evidence, to which I will just briefly refer in order that this evidence may impress itself a little more upon him. Edward William Chambers made a sworn declaration on the 11th October, 1902, from which I shall read. On Friday evening, before the trial opened, and the trial opened on the 15th October, he had an interview with Mr. Jackson. He told Mr. Vaughn Francis of the proposed interview, and he arranged to have Mr. Francis and Mr. Samuel Smith come to his house on that Friday evening, in order that they might hear what Mr. Jackson had to offer. He goes on to say that they were in a position to hear what took place, and he details in his affidavit the conversation as follows:

> After a general conversation Jackson wanted me to sign an agreement not to divulge the conversation, which I refused to do, and then Jackson wanted to know how much I wanted to get him evidence to unseat Sutherland. I told him $5,000. He said that was out of the question. He then said that he thought $500 down, and $1,500 additional if the evidence was sufficient to unseat Sutherland.

That is paragraph 4 of the declaration and paragraph 5 is as follows:

> I then asked him what class of evidence he wanted, whether false or true, and he said it mattered not to him whether it was false or true so long as he could unseat Sutherland. He said he would lose his gown if this conversation was divulged.

Let me point out to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that by the sworn declaration of Mr. Vaughn L. Francis under date of 11th October, 1902, that statement is expressly and absolutely confirmed, and by the sworn statement of Mr. Samuel Wm. Smith under date 11th of October, 1902, that statement is also confirmed. I shall refer to one or two passages in the evidence taken in the trial. I quote from the evidence of Chas. Parker.

> Q. What proposal did he make to you?
> A. Well, he asked me if I received anything for my vote and I told him I did not.
> Q. What next did he say to you?
> A. Well, he asked me if I would say that I had.

This was not a proposal made by Mr. Jackson himself but it was a proposal made by one of the men whom he had hired and paid for the purpose of obtaining evidence in this case. In the evidence of Mr. Jackson himself he was asked with reference to his conversation with Mr. Chambers.

> Q. Didn't he ask for $5,000 or $10,000 or a larger amount?
> A. $5,000 may have been mentioned, but I am sure that $1,500 and $2,000 was mentioned.
> Q. How much did you promise to give him?
> A. I gave him $375 and I promised to give him $375 more if he could produce evidenec to substantiate the eight charges he gave me.

Further on:

> Q. You paid him $375 down and you were to pay him the balance on what condition?
> A. On condition that the eight charges should be proved.

Let me point out to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he himself has stated that applications of this kind are made to persons of a certain character; persons

who are not to be too much trusted, and here is this gentleman for whose appointment the minister takes full responsibility, going to one of these men so characterized by the Minister of Trade and Commerce—although I believe him to be a reputable citizen—Jackson goes to this citizen who is supposed to be influenced, and he pays him $375 down and promises him the same amount in addition if he will produce evidence that will unseat Mr. Sutherland. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has no adjectives to apply to conduct of that kind, except 'indiscreet.' That is all that the English language will furnish the right hon. gentleman for conduct of that character and for an occasion of that kind—his vocabulary is not so bare on other occasions. In the evidence of Mr. Frederick R. Avey, is to be found the following :

Q. Do you know Mr. Jackson, the lawyer of Ingersoll ?
A. Yes.
Q. He stated to you as I am instructed that you were not to say that you had been given anything for swearing for them ?
A. He did.
Q. When was that ?
A. Well, it was a week ago last Tuesday night, or two weeks.
Q. Where did he give you these instructions?
A. At my house .

Further on :

Q. Did he speak to you about the declaration which you had given to Mr. Hewlett ?

Mr. Hewlett was one of the paid agents of Mr. Jackson.

A. Yes.
Q. What did he say about that ? He knew all about it then ?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he say about it ?
A. He said : If they ask did you make a declaration, you need not tell them ; somthing like that.

Further on :

Well, he says, if they ask you whether you got anything for it or not, tell them that you did not.

Further on another witness whose name I do not recollect was examined by Mr. Watson counsel for petitioner.

Q. There is just one question ; in the meantime do I understand you to say that Mr. Jackson told you not to say anything about the declaration if you were asked ?
A. If anybody asked me he told me not to say anything about it.

And so on, and all through this evidence one could quote ad libitum statements of precisely a similar character. It seems to me that the position which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has taken with regard to this matter is of an extraordinary nature. In fact he has invented a new decalogue ; so far as the commandments forbid, he would abolish them all and insert instead : 'Thou shalt be discreet so that thou shalt not be found out.' The Minister of Trade and Commerce has no word of criticism upon Mr. Jackson for asking these men to procure evidence, whether true or false, so long as it should unseat Mr. Sutherland. He has no word of criticism with regard to that, but he has a reproach against Jackson because he did not look up the chimney, because he did not look in the cellar to see if any one was listening ; in short, because he was indiscreet. In other words if we are to take the right hon. gentleman at his own valuation he is perfectly content that Mr. Jackson should purchase evidence that he should incite these men to procure evidence whether true or false ; and the only requirement necessary for promotion in the civil service of Canada is that it shall be done so that it cannot be proven. Well, the right hon. gentleman is eloquent sometimes ; he is severe sometimes ; I think he told us since last session that on this side of the House we were a lot of nobodies, heard of nowhere outside of our own parishes. I say to the right hon. gentleman the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that it had been better for him as a public man in this country if he had retired to the isolation of his own parish and been heard of no more, before he made the declaration which he has to-day made in this House. I believe, Sir, that there never was in the public life of this country or of any other country a more damnable doctrine more unblushingly avowed. I do not understand how a gentleman who has had his experience in public life, who has in the past preached lofty doctrines with regard to purity of public life and in the administration of public affairs, could ever have found it in his heart to stand up in this House of Commons, and to make the avowal which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has made to-day. It was bold ; it was more than bold, it was unblushing, and if I were not transgressing parliamentary decorum I would say that it was utterly shameless. That this man, so stigmatized by Mr. Justice Street, should be promoted to the public service of Canada, and that the Minister of Trade and Commerce speaking for the government should not be ashamed to stand up and justify him, is an unheard of degradation in our public life. We are indebted to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) for bringing the matter to the attention of the House, and in my opinion, it deserves grave consideration from the House and the country. To testify my appreciation of the importance of the question, I beg to move :

That all the words in the resolution after the word 'that' be omitted and the following substituted therefor :—

That in making appointments to pubic offices, and particularly to those of a representative nature, party services should not alone be considered, but selections should be made

with regard to capacity and to personal character.

House divided on amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kemp,
Armstrong,	Kidd,
Barker,	Lancaster,
Bell,	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Lefurgey,
Birkett,	Lennox,
Blain,	McGowan,
Borden (Halifax),	Morin,
Brock,	Northrup,
Clancy,	Osler,
Clarke,	Porter,
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Earle,	Robinson (Elgin),
Erb,	Rosamond,
Fowler,	Sherritt,
Ganong,	Smith (Wentworth),
Gilmour,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Taylor,
Halliday,	Vrooman,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Hughes (Victoria),	Wilson—43.
Ingram,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Bazinet,	Lavergne
Beith,	(Drummond & Artha.)
Blanchet,	Lavergne (Montmagny),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	LeBlanc,
Bourassa,	Lewis,
Brodeur,	Logan,
Bruneau,	Loy,
Bureau,	Macdonald,
Calvert,	Mackie,
Campbell,	MacLaren
Carbonneau,	(Huntingdon),
Charlton,	Macpherson,
Christie,	McEwen,
Copp,	McGugan,
Costigan,	McIsaac,
Delisle,	McLennan,
Demers (St. John),	Marcil (Bagot),
Douglas,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Emmerson,	Matheson,
Ethier,	Mignault,
Fielding,	Morrison,
Fitzpatrick,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fortier,	Préfontaine,
Geoffrion,	Puttee,
Gervais,	Riley,
Gibson,	Rivet,
Gould,	Roche (Halifax),
Grant,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Harwood,	Ross (Yukon),
Heyd,	Stewart,
Hughes	Sutherland (Essex),
(King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tucker,
Kendall,	Turgeon,
Lang,	Wright—70.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Cowan,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormack,
McColl,	Ward,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Tobin,	Ball,
Thompson (Hald.),	Roche (Marq.),
Law,	Casgrain,
McCool,	Avery,
Paterson,	Maclean,
Galliher,	Calvin,
Holmes,	Clare,
Ross (Ontario S.),	Donnelly,
Girard,	Léonard,
German,	Johnston (Card.),
Scott,	MacLaren (Perth),
Sifton,	Tarte,
Smith (Vancouver),	Robinson (Nord.),
Oliver,	Lavell,
Hyman,	Bruce,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wallace,	Tisdale,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Lovell,	Kendry,
Haszard,	Daniel,
Wade,	Kaulbach,
Davis,	Boyd,
Bickerdike,	Roddick,
Gallery,	Broder,
Johnson (C.B.),	Carscallen,
Guthrie,	Culbert,
Russell,	Hackett,
Tolmie,	Seagram,
Demers (Levis),	Monk,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Fisher,	Hale,
Stephens,	Thomson (Grey),
Malouin,	Tolton.

Amendment negatived. Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Public Works—harbours and rivers—Quebec—St. Siméon wharf—extension, $3,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Please explain this item.

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). This is for the extension of the wharf, the estimated cost of which is $15,000.

Quebec—Seven Islands—wharf, $60,000.

Mr. BELL. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the completion of a wharf at Seven Islands.

Mr. BELL. Is it at the place called Seven Islands ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is in the bay.

Mr. BELL. How far east from Seven Islands ?

Mr. HYMAN. Just at the entrance, about four miles across the bay.

Mr. SPROULE. When was this wharf begun ?

Mr. HYMAN. In November, 1903.

Mr. BELL. What is the population ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know anything about the population there now, but

there seems to be quite a number working in that locality. The bay of Seven Islands is the only harbour of refuge practically on the north shore of the St. Lawrence from Tadousac down to the entrance of the Straits of Belle Isle. It is immediately opposite the western end of the island of Anticosti on the north shore. It is getting to be a very important business centre. Several industries have been started there, including one of the largest pulp mills in the world, belonging to the Clark Paper Company, composed of capitalists partly from Toronto and partly from New York.

Mr. BELL. Did the government begin this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. BELL. We would like fuller explanation.

Mr. HYMAN. This matter was discussed last session. The North Shore Power and Navigation Company began the work. The government acquired from that company the work, which was in an uncompleted state, for $34,433.99. Since then the government have been engaged in completing the wharf. This item of $60,000 is to complete it.

Mr. SPROULE. What was paid for the site ?

Mr. HYMAN. Nothing was paid for the site. The site was given free of charge.

Mr. BELL. Is this work under contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, the local engineer is in charge of it.

Mr. MORIN. Will this wharf be the property of the company or of the government ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is the property of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the engineer carrying on the work—by contract or day labour ? The law provides that any work over $5,000 must be let by contract after calling for public tender. That law seems to be entirely ignored in this matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will realize how futile it would be to call for tenders for the construction of a work at this place. I have explained where the Bay of Seven Islands is situated. It is in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. The firm interested are men well known in Toronto, Clark Bros., who have an establishment also in New York where they carry on a large printing and publishing company. They bought a large tract of land down the north shore of the St. Lawrence for the purpose of developing a pulp industry. In addition to the Clarks, there is a firm there from Ontario, called the Mossie, Boyd Company. They are the adjoining proprietors. The only harbour down there which can be used by these different persons developing that pulp industry is the harbour of Seven Islands, and the Clarks got possession of the best location in the harbour and set to work to build a wharf. It is desirable that the wharf should not be the property of any particular company, but of the government and be used by all those who want to do business in that locality. The Bay of Seven Islands is the only harbour on the whole shore from Tadousac down, with the possible exception of Pentecost, where we are now attempting to create a harbour. Last year the government undertook to acquire this wharf from the Clarks. We had an estimate made of the work done, and on that estimate took over what work was done and the materials and supplies and arranged with the Clarks that the latter should complete the work according to plans and specifications prepared by the department and under the supervision of the government engineer who was down there. They will supply all the vouchers for the material before they get paid. These people are in possession of the locality and are the only people who can supply the lumber and labour. They have a great many people employed there at present. If you were to call for tenders, they would get the work practically at their own price or at any price they chose to offer.

Mr. SPROULE. They are getting that anyway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I submit they are not. They are to be paid solely for the actual expenditure they make for materials and labour, and it seems to me we are getting the benefit of the work carried on there by this private corporation——

Mr. CLARKE. Have you any agreement with them ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. minister bring it down ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. CLARKE. If they agreed to furnish materials and labour at cost, that is very reasonable, but we should see the agreement.

Mr. OSLER. Is the government quite sure that the development of the pulp industry is going on ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. Because we have all over Canada as we know a great many pulp industries which have started and many of which have not been a success. I must say that I quite agree with the proposition of the minister that if this large work is going on and the government are to build a wharf there, perhaps the best way to build that wharf is in the manner suggested, with proper supervision to see that the govern-

ment are not charged too much. I think, however, the government should be very certain that the private works are going on and will likely be permanent before spending this large amount.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am speaking now of my own actual personal knowledge, and I say that over a million dollars has been expended and that it is expected that the pulp mill will be in operation this autumn.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is not this island owned by some individual ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You are thinking of Anticosti, owned by Menier. This is the Bay of Seven Islands on the coast of the St. Lawrence ; the Island of Anticosti is opposite it.

Mr. BELL. It is evident in this case that the government is building a wharf for a private corporation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not for one, for several.

Mr. BELL. The minister states that there are some others, but he has not given particulars. My information is that there is not a house or dwelling at this place.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. BELL. There is a settlement, an old Hudson's Bay post, nine miles distant from this work, and the fact is evident that the government are repeating here what they did in Grande Vallée, furnishing a wharf for private parties. Under these circumstances we cannot allow an item of this kind to go through without information. We must have the contract. If the government are disposed to put it through they have the power to do so, but it is our duty here to bring out all the facts. In the first place it is evident that the company spent $34,000, and then the government took the work off their hands, and now when they propose an expenditure of $50,000 more, instead of letting the work by contract the government are simply paying the bills of this private corporation, settling such accounts as they choose to render.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not a correct statement of what is done. Ask Mr. Osler of Toronto, a business man what his view is of this.

Mr. BELL. The statement of the Minister of Public Works was that the department were paying—

Mr. HYMAN. The actual expenditure under the supervision of a government engineer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is a government engineer in charge of the work if we have not voted money for it before ?

Mr. HYMAN. We have voted money before.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. BELL. $25,000 and nearly $10,000 more than that amount has been spent upon it. The minister said a few moments ago that $34,000 had been expended.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the amount. We have not paid it, but we have become liable for that amount.

Mr. BELL. That is practically expended now and this work will cost $85,000 which is a large sum even for the Dominion of Canada. There is no guarantee that $85,000 will complete the work, because this corporation may extend the work indefinitely, and apparently all they have to do is to pass the accounts to the government through the engineer in charge and have them paid. We cannot allow this to go through without having the information.

Mr. HYMAN. What information ?

Mr. BELL. We want to know what the contract is. If the government of Canada have entered into a contract with these parties without inviting tenders or making any effort to get them, I think it is essential that we should know what the contract is.

Mr. CLARKE. What wages per hour are being paid these men ? What is being paid per thousand for the timber that is being used, and what advantages are to be secured to others than the gentlemen who commenced the construction of the wharf ? Would it not have been better for the government to give a round sum with all these conditions securing facilities for others and with certain obligations imposed upon the builders ? Surely the government will not expect this item to pass without laying the contract on the table ? I think that request is so reasonable that the item should stand.

Mr. HYMAN. The wages paid are the current wages in the district, whatever they may be.

Mr. CLARKE. What are they ? Does the fair wage officer fix the wage ?

Mr. SPROULE. The minister stated that you could not let a contract here because it is remote from the settled sections of the country. There is no force in that because contractors go all over the country.

Mr. HYMAN. How could a contractor from outside compete with local men who are the owners of the mills and all facilities ?

Mr. BELL. If tenders had been advertised for, then we would know that the local men got it by open competition. In the first place there is a deliberate violation of the law.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend has forgotten the amendment of last session.

Mr. SPROULE. I forget the amendment of last session. There was a violation of the

worthy principle that in the expenditure of public money the work must be let by contract. I am told that in this case only two firms are getting the benefit.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For the present, but there will be others.

Mr. SPROULE. Men go in and get timber limits and they want the government to come to their aid and provide facilities for working these limits. They commence work for themselves, but afterwards induce the government to buy the works for $35,000. $35,000 will pay for a good deal of material supplied in a place like that which is almost a forest and the little work that has been done, and I have no doubt that they have been paid a large figure for everything. The government now, instead of turning round and endeavouring to economize public money by advertising for tenders, give the contract to the same individuals regardless of price, practically, because where there is no competition they can charge us any price and we cannot help it. This money is being expended simply for their purposes, just as in the case we dealt with last night at Grande Vallee. Possibly in the future there will be a town or village, but that settlement will be the aggregation of people brought in by the company to do their own work, to handle the timber and manufacture it as they are supposed to do. We do not believe it is right to allow public money to be voted in that way and we would like to know what contract there is between the government and those parties to do the work.

Mr. MORIN. I think that the government has too much love for those Clark fellows at Seven Islands. In the first place we all know that the Clarks are very wealthy men.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. MORIN. And they have millions of dollars to spend.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are spending it too.

Mr. MORIN. They were building a wharf there. Why not leave them alone and let them build their own wharf ? Let well enough alone. Do you not think that is better ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend who has some knowledge of the local conditions will no doubt answer this question as to whether there exists at the present time a harbour on the north side of the St. Lawrence, taking in the Island of Anticosti, in which a ship can find refuge at any point between the entrance to the Saguenay river and the entrance to the Straits of Belle Isle ? Is there a single place outside the Bay of Seven Islands where a ship can get refuge in the whole of that territory ?

Mr. MORIN. In the first place, there is no reason for any ship going there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There were no less than four wrecks there this spring.

Mr. MORIN. There are places where small vessels land, but steamships or sailing ships never go to the Seven Islands at all. Vessels stop along the coast, and have been stopping there for years, and they will keep on doing so. I think in this case there must be a nigger in the fence.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no objection to let the item stand. I have sent for the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Last year $65,000 was voted on this item and the explanation given was :

> This is to make provision for the construction of a deepwater pier on the west side of Bay of Seven Islands. The pier will run out in a northerly direction, nearly at right angles to the shore, and it will have a total length of 1,325 feet, reaching a depth of 48 feet at low water spring tide. The estimated cost is $65,000. The reason for the work is that there is a most important development going on at that place, and there are now large pulp mills in that district which was up to a year or so ago almost unknown.

It would look from that as if the government intended to construct a deep water pier. The information we have to-day is that the people are building a deep water pier themselves, and having spent $34,000, the government are now taking it off their hands, paying for it, and allowing them to do the work at their own price.

Mr. HYMAN. That statement is not fair, The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that is not in accordance with the statement given when he says they are allowed to do it at their own price.

Mr. CLARKE. At what price are they doing it ?

Mr. HYMAN. The price is controlled by the department.

Mr. CLARKE. What control has the department over the price ?

Mr. HYMAN. The department knows what price they pay themselves. They have an engineer in charge and he has certified that these prices are fair.

Mr. CLARKE. According to the statement I have read, there was no development and no improvement on the water front there a year ago. Now what kind of work did the department get done there a year ago ? How can they compare the price being charged here with the price the company paid themselves ?

Mr. HYMAN. The work is done by the company as I understand.

Mr. CLARKE. When this vote was taken last year there was a different statement made altogether. The government

said they proposed to construct the pier in deep water at low spring tide.

Mr. OSLER. When was the contract made for the purchase from the private individuals ?

Mr. HYMAN. The agreement is dated February 8, 1904.

Mr. CLARKE. The appropriation last year was passed in October. It seems to have been an afterthought, after parliament had voted this money, for the government to construct this pier and take it off these people's hands. Surely we ought to have all the particulars, all the correspondence and negotiations for the purchase mentioned here, and some reasons in addition why the government should allow the company to go on and complete their own pier. They must have had the work more than half done because, according to the evidence given us last year, the work was to cost $65,000 and the company had $34,000 worth of work done.

Mr. HYMAN. Allow the item to stand, I have sent for the contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I might draw attention to the fact that last year the member for one of the Victorias, speaking of this particular locality, said it was a very good work and deserved to be commended.

Mr. OSLER. It would appear from the discussion at that time that there was no information given to the House that any work had already been done there, it looked as if it was an entirely new work. From the information that is given to us now it is evident that at the time this item was under discussion a large amount of work had been done and the government must have had in contemplation, not the new work undertaken by the government, but the purchase of the work done by private individuals. That must have been contemplated by the government then, though no intimation of it was given last session.

Quebec—Three Rivers harbour—additional deep water wharfs, $60,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract, which was made on the 16th of June, 1902.

Mr. OSLER. What is the estimated total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course this is a large work, in a place like Three Rivers. The amount of the contract is $280,000 and there is an additional contract for the substitution of concrete for timber in the superstructure, for the sum of $50,000. Including sums for contingencies the whole amount would be $355,400. $81,564 was spent up to the 1st of December. With this at the disposal of the department they will be able to pay $169,914 of the total $355,000, leaving an additional amount required to complete the work of $185,400. The first contract was let on the 16th of June, 1902. I am informed by the engineer that at that time the general policy was, and has been since, wherever it was possible, and the matter is always taken into consideration by the engineer, to substitute concrete for timber. The price seems to be fair in view of the alterations made.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely two years ago that policy prevailed in the department. It strikes one as peculiar that the contract should be let in June, 1902, after which a change was made involving an additional cost of $50,000 or $60,000 for concrete. To whom was the contract awarded ?

Mr. HYMAN. Part of the work had been done before the change made by the department.

Mr. CLARKE. How much money had been paid to the contractor before this change ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am unable to say the exact amount. About $80,000 had been expended on that work when the change was made. The change was made on the 7th of December, 1903, and the expenditure up to the end of December was $81,588.

Mr. CLARKE. Was a vote taken last session of parliament for the increased cost owing to the change made from timber to concrete ?

Mr. HYMAN. The supplementary contract was made on the 7th of December, 1903. The hon. gentleman will understand that it was impossible to take a vote last session because the House rose in October.

Mr. CLARKE. This additional expenditure was contracted for notwithstanding that parliament had been advised that the work called for a certain sum and was been expended in a certain way. It seems to me to be out of the usual course of business to change the character of a work from timber to concrete involving the country in an expenditure of $50,000 or $60,000 without having an appropriation from parliament.

Mr. HYMAN. The change was made at the request of the harbour commissioners. The harbour commissioners made the request to the department and the department upon taking into consideration their request, decided that it would be in the interest of the country to have the change made. Almost every day matters of this kind come before the department. Work is contracted for and very often it is found in the interest of the public to make some change. After the work has been started and a certain amount of money expended the engineers find upon consideration and as a result of suggestions having been made

there are changes which can be advantageously made.

Mr. TAYLOR. Generally in the interest of the contractor.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that that is exactly fair. I think the interests of the country are very well looked after by the engineers of the department.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be reasonable to suppose that these gentlemen would be able to advise in the first place in respect to the best means of doing this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. They always try to do that.

Mr. CLARKE. They thought the wooden pier would be all right until some one suggested that the work should be done in concrete. It seems to me to cast a reflection on the ability of the officer who would make such a recommendation.

Mr. BUREAU. The harbour commissioners of Three Rivers and the chamber of commerce demanded this change. We have docks at Three Rivers. The current runs inland and every year, these docks being floored with deals, the deals come off and the front of the docks is torn up. The result is that it is necessary to make extensive repairs every year after the ice floats down.

Mr. CLARKE. Were the engineers aware of the local situation which the hon. gentleman describes when they made this recommendation ?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know. The docks at Three Rivers are under the control of the harbour commissioners and they have their own engineer. The commission reports to the department when they want to borrow any money, because under the law it is necessary for them to have their plans ratified, formerly by the Department of Public Works, but now by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The money has been expended on an ice-breaker that was built 150 feet long by 50 feet wide in a depth of 30 or 32 feet of water. They had to make it very strong because coming out of Lake St. Peter the St. Lawrence brings the current and the ice inside of this spot at which they are building the dock. It was at the instance of the commissioners that I went to the department and recommended a change being made from a wooden to a concrete dock. This is a dock 2,020 feet in length. It extends up the river and it has to resist the force of a rapid current and the ice which comes down with it.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that in regard to this work involving a very large expenditure one would have expected to have received better advice from the engineering staff. They should have made themselves familiar with the local situation, because it is not business after a work has been commenced to allow alterations of this character to be made. If it were necessary in view of the local situation to have a particularly strong wharf, it seems to me that the engineers should have made the recommendation in favour of concrete in the first place, and not have had this change made involving this large additional cost ?

Mr. SPROULE. What is the additional cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The additional cost involved by the substitution of concrete for wood is $50,239.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the hon. minister get a report from his own engineer before he ordered the change ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, there was a report from the resident engineer to the chief engineer and this was concurred in by the chief engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the resident engineer the government engineer or is he the resident engineer of the harbour commisioners there ?

Mr. HYMAN. The government engineer.

Mr. OSLER. Is that man a resident of Three Rivers ?

Mr. HYMAN. The resident engineer at Three Rivers has charge of the government works.

Mr. OSLER. Was it the resident engineer at Three Rivers who prepared the plans that were submitted to the government in the first place for a wooden dock ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. The plans were prepared by the department under the supervision of the chief engineer.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the department have had any experience with reference to this concrete work ? Are they sure that with the ice jamming around there these piers of concrete will not break as well as timber ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not only have the department had considerable experience, but they have the advantage of knowing what the experience is all over the world. This is the age of concrete. Concrete is being used more freely in all works. In this case it was adopted on the report of the resident engineer because it was considered to be in the interest of the general public.

Mr. CLARKE. We are desirous of seeing this work properly done, if the hon. gentleman will give us any good reasons why the change should be made; but are we to understand that the gentlemen at headquarters here prepared these plans for this work and offered their advice without consulting the

engineer in charge of the work in the district of Three Rivers ? Did it strike this gentleman at Three Rivers that, after a large sum of money has been spent on the work, the plans should be changed and the work done in concrete ?. Surely it is not paying a very high compliment to the engineering skill of the engineer at Three Rivers to say that he would allow that work to go to a certain stage, and that then it would strike him all at once that concrete would be a better substitute ? It is possible that the gentlemen at headquarters did not know the local situation. The hon. gentleman who represents that district (Mr. Bureau) has explained the great pressure from the ice and water, but the local engineer ought to have known all about that ; and if he was familiar with the conditions we would have expected that he would have advised before the work had been let that it would be in the public interest to substitute concrete for timber. It does not look to be a very healthy state of affairs, having such a multitude of councillors as the hon. gentleman has, that he should be obliged, after the work is half done, to call for new plans. It does not seem to be a business-like method of procedure. He has an engineer at Three Rivers as well as engineers in his own office here, some of whom ought to know the conditions required in the construction of the pier or wharf, and who ought to be able to say which is the better material to be employed in the construction of the work.

Mr. HYMAN. At the time these plans were prepared in the Department of Public Works there was no resident engineer at Three Rivers. The resident engineer at Three Rivers only became the resident engineer after this work was started. The plans for the work were prepared in the office of the department here by the engineer and that engineer was placed in charge of the work. This gentleman who is the resident engineer and who has charge of the work made the recommendation to the chief engineer of the department in favour of the change, it was concurred in by the chief engineer and upon their joint report the change was made and the extra contract entered into. There was no resident engineer of the department at Three Rivers at the time the original specifications were made. If there had been he would have been consulted by the department. The gentleman who is now the resident engineer at Three Rivers was at that time on the staff at Ottawa. It was only on the commencement of the work that the resident engineer was sent there to specially supervise that work.

Mr. CLARKE. And since he has been there he has been impressed with the magnitude of the undertaking and with the desirability of making it more substantial by using concrete ?

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. HYMAN. That is it exactly.

Mr. BELL. What amount was spent on this work up to the time the change was made ? I understand that about $80,000 worth of work was done before the change was made. Is that $80,000 absolutely lost in consequence of making the change ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no loss to the country at all. There is $80,000 worth of work completed. When you construct a pier you start at the bottom. The piles have to be driven. After this $80,000 worth of work had been completed the engineers as a result of their discussions and the consideration of their reports decided that it would be in the interest of the country that an increased expenditure of $50,000 should be made upon this work by substituting concrete, in this way very much increasing its durability. The minister acted on the report of the engineer's department that the public interest would be better served by a substitution of concrete for timber.

Mr. SPROULE. What foundation did they make for the concrete ?

Mr. HYMAN. The same foundation.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the foundation built ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am not an engineer, but I know that they have a solid front and that spiles are driven, and the solid front is fixed on to these big spiles with iron rods, and on top of that they construct their concrete work. The $80,000 was spent in dredging and levelling. At the head of the dock there is an ice-breaker that rises thirty or forty feet above the water. It is built of square timber cribwork filled with broken stone. The country did not lose a cent by the change, because if the dock had been built with a wooden superstructure everything that was done at the time of the change would have to be done all the same. They utilized every particle of the work done under the first contract for the second contract.

Mr. SPROULE. You are building a concrete superstructure upon wood and stone ?

Mr. BUREAU. Exactly.

Mr. SPROULE. Wood must decay in time.

Mr. TALBOT. It never decays under water.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may know a good deal, but there are others as old as he and with quite as extended experience. Certain kinds of wood will last longer under water, but they will decay in time, and no one will argue that this work would be as permanent as if it were built on solid concrete from the bottom. Now, I want to see the report of the engineer recommending the change. I want to know if, when this contract was changed, tenders

were invited, or was the contract continued by private arrangement ?

Mr. HYMAN. There were no new tenders. $80,000 had been spent on the work, and upon the report of the engineer the contract was extended, and $50,000 added to pay the extra amount required for the substitution.

Mr. SPROULE. That was a private agreement between the contractor and engineer.

Mr. HYMAN. It was sanctioned by Order in Council.

Mr. SHERRITT. It is a pity that this work was not first started with a view of using concrete. The explanation given by the minister would indicate that there was no resident engineer there at the time, and that it was the member for the constituency that recommended the change.

Mr. HYMAN. There was no departmental resident engineer when the original contract was entered into, but there was when the change was made.

Mr. SHERRITT. I understood the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) to say that he recommended the change. Why didn't he recommend concrete when the first contract was made ? I have been a contractor myself, and I know a little about these things, and I know that after a contract is taken the changes are usually made in the interests of the contractor.

Mr. HYMAN. That is a frank admission from an old contractor.

Mr. SHERRITT. It is, and it is the case nevertheless. I understood that the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) said he recommended the change.

Mr. BUREAU. I stated that I recommended the change at the instance and request of the harbour commissioners and the chamber of commerce, through their engineers. They came to me and asked me to advocate the change, and I did so. As a matter of fact, they passed a resolution asking that the top of the dock should be concrete instead of wood.

Mr. SHERRITT. Why didn't they recommend that in the first place ?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not belong to the harbour commission.

Mr. SHERRITT. Why did not you recommend it at first ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am not a contractor or an engineer, and I did not know anything about it. I wanted the dock to be built, but I had nothing to do with the plans. The other docks were built in wood and I knew they had to make repairs every year, but I could make no suggestion for a better way, because it is not in my line of business at all.

Mr. SHERRITT. I understood you suggested that the top should be concrete.

Mr. BUREAU. No ; the harbour commissioners asked for it. There was a resolution sent to me, which I forwarded to the department, and they asked me to use my best efforts to have the change made.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) seems to have engineered the job all right.

Mr. BUREAU. I submitted it, and it was so good in itself that it went through.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the work paid for now ?

Mr. BUREAU. It is a lump sum contract.

Mr. SPROULE. The lump sum must be based on something.

Mr. HYMAN. There was an estimate made by the engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it let per cubic yard for a lump sum without any knowledge of the cubic yards in it ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not at all. It was a lump sum, and of course the number of cubic yards is taken into account by the engineer in arriving at the lump sum.

Mr. SPROULE. How much are we paying per yard ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the engineer that it is impossible to arrive at the exact calculation of how much per square yard, because the change to concrete involves some other changes. The $50,000 represents not only the concrete, but any additional work that may be required in consequence of using concrete.

Mr. SPROULE. Any engineer can estimate exactly how many cubic yards of concrete will be required. When that information is before us, and not till then, can we tell whether we are getting value for the money expended.

Mr. HYMAN. When it was decided to change this contract, an estimate of the work was made by the engineer. The whole amount is not for concrete. Part of it is for cement, and the balance is for extra piling, extra iron work, and bracing in consequence of the extra weight of the concrete.

Mr. SPROULE. Then we want to know how much is allowed for concrete, how much for the extra iron work, the extra piling, and so on. When we have that information, we shall have some idea whether this is a profligate or an economical expenditure of public money.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is entitled to any information in the possession of the department ; and if he will allow the item to pass, I shall be very glad to-morrow morning to give him the detailed estimate made by the engineer on which the recommendation was made by the department to council.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want to check these items more than is necessary, but it is not the best plan to pass the item and then to get the information. We would rather have the information first.

Mr. HYMAN. I should be very glad to have the hon. gentleman make any comments he pleases after getting the information.

Mr. CLARKE. Unless the committee are supplied with the information as to the amount of concrete required and the value of the extra iron required for bracing, how can they determine whether the contract has been a profitable one or the reverse ?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to bring down the engineer's report, which he tells me shows the details of the whole work. I will put the information in the hands of the hon. members, and it can be discussed on any item in the Ontario estimates.

Quebec—Trois Pistoles—breakwater, $3,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This amount is to complete the work. The estimated cost is $5,800. The expenditure up to the 30th of June, 1904, was $2,800.

Quebec—Verchères—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The appropriation for 1903-4 was $5,500. The estimated expenditure up to June 30, 1904, was $3,500. This vote is to complete the work.

Quebec—Yamaska river, dredging, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The appropriation for 1903-4 was $16,000. The expenditure up to the 30th June, 1904, was $6,000. This is a revote to complete the work.

Mr. CLARKE. What depth of water ?

Mr. HYMAN. Seven feet.

Mr. SPROULE. How is this dredging being done—by the government dredge or by contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. By dredge 'No. 4,' for which the department pays at the usual rate of $8 per hour, which is based on the amount of work done according to the capacity of the dredge.

Quebec-Ontario — Grand Bend breakwater, pier, &c., $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is asked to make provision for the construction of a breakwater at Grand Bend. A contract was entered into amounting to $21,388. The estimated total cost of the work is $23,400. There is an amount in the main estimates of $15,000.

Mr. SHERRITT. Has the government purchased any property there ?

Mr. HYMAN. My deputy has no recollection. There has never been any suggestion that the public has not free access to the wharf.

Mr. SHERRITT. My information is that it has none.

Mr. HYMAN. Does the hon. gentleman state that the public have no approach to the wharf ?

Mr. SHERRITT. I am asking for information.

Mr. HYMAN. We have no information to that effect. Instructions will be sent that no money shall be expended until free approach is granted.

Mr. McEWEN. There is a roadway there running down to the lake, but south of that, at the creek or river, there might not be a public approach.

Mr. SHERRITT. Is the work let by contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, to the lowest bidder.

Mr. SHERRITT. Has not some change been made in the contract since it was let?

Mr. HYMAN. The only change made was that it was reduced. It was found that the expenditure was too large, and a certain amount of work was taken off and the price proportionately reduced.

Mr. SHERRITT. Were the parties who tendered notified and given a chance to tender again ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, the lowest tenderer got the contract. It was found that the work, as originally contemplated, would cost too high, and it was decided to cut it down. But instead of going to the expense of re-advertising for tenders, the lowest tender was accepted and a proportionate amount struck off the price.

Mr. SHERRITT. What proportion of work was cut off ?

Mr. HYMAN. Four piers.

Mr. SHERRITT. What proportion of the whole amount of work is that ?

Mr. HYMAN. The cubic contents of the whole wharf were taken and a proportionate amount reduced from the contract.

Mr. SHERRITT. Had you not a tender from a syndicate at the head of which was one McTavish ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not a list of those who tendered. I have only the name of the lowest tenderer. It would not have made any difference, because a proportionate amount taken off any of the higher tenders would still leave it lower than the lowest original tender.

Mr. SHERRITT. I have been informed that the contractors consider they were not fairly used. The tender of the Mc-

Tavish Company for the whole work was $34,000. In taking off the cribs, 9, 10, 11 and 12, which are the four placed in the deepest water, you are taking off a work which is proportionately more difficult and more costly than the other, and consequently gives an advantage to the contractor. Had that been done with the McTavish tender, it would be lower than the one accepted. Is there any dredging in connection with the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. There was and that was taken into consideration.

Mr. SHERRITT. Is there any to be done in connection with the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not now.

Mr. SHERRITT. I am more than ever convinced that your contract, let as it is, for $21,000, is higher than would have been the contract if the $34,000 tender had been accepted. When you consider the four piers in deep water taken from the contract, that would certainly bring the $34,000 tender lower than the contract accepted. The cribs put down close to the shore are certainly not as expensive and difficult and would not require the same quantity of material as the cribs put in deeper water. What is the depth of water ?

Mr. HYMAN. Twelve feet.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the length of each crib and the width and depth ?

Mr. HYMAN. The original length of the wharf was 648 feet and it is now about 450 feet. Each crib is twenty feet wide.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of cribs ?

Mr. HYMAN. Ordinary cribwork built up and filled in. There is also 100 feet of a stone approach.

Mr. SHERRITT. What was the object of cutting off this ?

Mr. HYMAN. Because it was felt that the expenditure was too great. The department did not feel inclined to enter into an expenditure of this kind and it was felt that the 450 feet would practically answer the purpose, but if it is necessary hereafter to extend it from time to time the department will take into consideration the question whether the extension should be made.

Mr. SHERRITT. $34,000 was the tender.

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the verification of the amount but of course I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. SHERRITT. I am not speaking positively. For the payment of a little over $10,000 it does seem to me it would be in the public interest to continue that work to the full extent first intended. As I am better acquainted with that place than other members of the House I may say that it strikes me that the sandbar there may cause sand to drift in. Possibly the engineer was relying upon the existence of this sandbar when he came to the conclusion that it would not be necessary to run it out the 600 feet. I fear that the sand may drift in and perhaps leave the work done practically useless. I think the minister might consider the continuing of that work in accordance with the original specification.

Mr. HYMAN. I see the work has not been completed and will not be completed for a year and I have instructed the engineer to make a report on the whole matter. I will be glad to discuss the matter with the hon. gentleman, and if the engineer thinks it is in the public interest that an extension should be made, I will be glad to take the matter into the consideration of the department.

Mr. SHERRITT. Has any provision been made for the purchasing of a road to the wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think that a road would have to be purchased.

Mr. SHERRITT. The wharf is not on a public road but is at the point to which the Au Sable river was diverted by the municipality which is 30 or 40 rods from the main road, so that you would have to cross private property in order to get to the wharf.

Mr. HYMAN. The information I have from the engineer of the department is that the department has been very careful in all these works not to start any construction until such time as the property has been conveyed to the Crown.

Mr. SHERRITT. I was asking for information, I was not aware of any purchase.

Mr. HYMAN. I will have that matter looked into at the same time as the other.

Mr. McEWEN. Has the work been begun ? Have the cribs been put down ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract has only been let a short time. I do not think there has been any actual work although the contractor has, I suppose, ordered his material.

Mr. McEWEN. If they have the pier at the end of the street or road, they will not require to buy any land. I know it will be much handier at the end of the road than down at the mouth of the Au Sable.

Mr. HYMAN. A change in the location might of course require an entire alteration of the specifications.

Mr. SHERRITT. The wharf is not intended to be put at the end of the road, but at the point to which the river was diverted by dredging. It was felt that the same amount of money would go further there, notwithstanding the little difference in the cost of the purchasing the road. We have

spent as a municipality some $20,000 in dredging and the plant and specifications have been drawn up with a view to building at the outlet of the river, which is about 60 rods from the end of the road. The timber is there and although the work has not been carried on to any great extent, I saw the timber there.

Mr. McEWEN. I do not quite agree with that, unless you want to go on and dredge the river afterwards, and have deep water in behind. I think that this pier or wharf can be built as cheaply at the end of the road as at the mouth of the river, notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary. I believe it could be built as cheaply at one place as at the other, and it certainly would be much more handy at the end of the road than away down there.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the depth of the four cribs that were left out?

Mr. HYMAN. Of course this contract has not been changed without a report having been made by the engineer to the department authorized by Order in Council. While it would be impossible to bring down all the reports in connection with these different works, I shall be glad to bring down any that are needed.

Mr. SPROULE. The government does not change all contracts after they are entered into, and the minister could easily have with him those in which changes have been made. It is important to know whether the four cribs that were left out are deep or shallow, as it might make a great difference in the amount of stone that would be required for them. It appears that the original contract was for $34,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I don't say so.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that.

Mr. HYMAN. I said the contract was let for $21,388.

Mr. SPROULE. The amended contract; what was the original?

Mr. HYMAN. This was the only contract that was let. The hon. member for North Middlesex made the statement, and I presume he is aware of the fact, that there was a tender, possibly a local tender, amounting to $34,000. It was not a contract, it was a tender.

Mr. SHERRITT. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the full amount of the tender of Mr. Warwick the present contractor?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the amount here of the original tender, the lowest tender for the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, the tenders were upon plans and specifications for 648 feet of cribwork upon which the prospective contractor would tender. Did they tender upon that basis, or were tenders received? The hon. gentleman says he don't know whether any were received.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not say that, I said tenders were received, but I was not aware of the fact that tenders were received for $34,000. I said tenders were received for the work as originally contemplated, upon the plans and specifications furnished by the department for the original work; and after the tenders had been received it was not considered in the interest of the public that such a large expenditure should be made, therefore the departmental engineers figured out upon the lowest tender and made certain reductions based upon the proportionate amount, leaving the additional work for four piers, and then the contract was let to the lowest tenderer, on the basis of the cubic contents of the wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. If the reduction was made upon the basis of the number of cubic yards, it would not be so bad. But there must naturally be an allowance for the whole cost of the work that is done in water as compared with that done on the shore, and I take it there ought to be some allowance made for that. I wished to ascertain upon what basis the contract was let, if tenders were asked for the longer work and upon what basis the contract was let.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman desires full information with regard to the tender I shall be glad to bring down all the tenders and the amounts of each. I have already told him how the reduction was arrived at. It was arrived at by taking into consideration the cubic contents of the wharf. There were four piers that it was not considered in the interest of the public to complete; therefore a contract was entered into for a less amount of work, making a reduction which was a proportionate amount of the whole. The original number of piers was twelve, and four of them were not built. But in making the calculations the stone approaches have to be taken into consideration, all of which was done by the engineers of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. If a number of cubic yards in the increased length of the work is cut off, one can understand that the contractor is substantially the gainer by the change.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman's argument, though I do not dispute his right to make any statement he pleases.

Mr. SPROULE. I am giving the reasons for my statement. I say it would be more costly to put in 100 cubic yards of stone in water 9 feet deep than to put the same quantity of stone where there is little or no water at all. Which is the most costly, to do work at a distance from the shore or to do work on the land?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not pretend to arrive at an exact cost of this work, nor do I suppose the hon. gentleman would presume to either. I am informed by the engineer that the difference in the depth of water where the piers are to be built, and the depth of water where the four were left out, will not affect the cost. The engineer tells me that the difference in the depth of the water is so little that it will not affect the cost. The hon. gentleman does not know whether the water is four feet deep or five feet deep, or where the stonework starts at the end of the pier.

Mr. SHERRITT. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is a great difference in the depth of water where the pier commences and where it ends. The hundred feet of stonework is in a cut where the water is very shallow. While the minister might advance that sort of an argument, I do not think an engineer would say that it was not more expensive to handle a cubic yard of stone where there is 14 feet of water than where there is only 2 or 3 feet of water. Any schoolboy would understand that. This wharf is on a shore which is subject to severe storms, and some $10,000 had to be spent a short distance off to replace piers that were blown away. We know very well that where there is ten feet of water there must be more risk and more expense in constructing piers, in sinking the cribwork and filling it with stone, than there would be in shallower water. I think the hon. gentleman ought to apologize for advancing such an absurd argument.

Mr. HYMAN. I am simply giving the statement and estimate of the engineer, based upon careful examination of the spot. I hope the hon. gentleman would not presume to put his opinion against that of the engineer. The hon. gentleman himself probably does not know what depth of water there is where these piers start, and where they end. I am obliged to take the information furnished by the engineer, and I am informed that the cost is not out of the way, in view of the reduction of the work.

Mr. SHERRITT. I cannot take your statement.

Mr. HYMAN. Any statement I have made is made upon the advice of the chief engineer of the department; and if I have to accept advice upon a pier, I would rather have the advice of the chief engineer of the department than that of the hon. member for North Middlesex.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that a contractor would reason the other way. I have seen a few of them figuring up contracts for piers, and they make a big difference between working in water, close to the shore, where the water is calm, and working out where it is exposed and much deeper. They do not think it should be done at the same price. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he will bring down the engineer's recommendation as to the change?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to do it.

Mr. SHERRITT. And also a list of the tenders?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot give a list of the tenders now, as they are all locked up in the department, but I will bring it down in the morning.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements to, $15,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What progress has been made with the work in the River Sydenham? There seems to be no item this year, either in the main or supplementary estimates, for dredging the River Sydenham. The hon. gentleman perhaps will be able to recall that $5,800 was voted for that work last year, but I understand no dredging was done such as was contemplated. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to give the reason why it has not been done.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the chief engineer that there was some dredging done. Do you mean in the Sydenham itself?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. There was a small amount of dredging done in the vicinity of Dresden. There was some dredging done at Mitchell's Bay and some at the mouth of the Chenal Ecarté. If there is any necessity for further dredging being done, the department will have at their disposal an amount for dredging, and that money can be used for the purpose. It can be taken from the general vote.

Mr. CLANCY. There is some correspondence in regard to that. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to take that up after six o'clock? I want the hon. gentleman to bring down the correspondence.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot get the correspondence at this time, as it is all locked up in the department, but I will be very glad to bring it down.

Mr. CLANCY. When you reach the supplementary estimates?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, I will bring it down.

Mr. CLANCY. Will all the correspondence be brought down in relation to the work being done at those particular points?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman desired this correspondence, I presume the proper way would have been to have moved for it. Of course, it is a very voluminous correspondence, and I do not want to make a promise that I cannot fulfil.

Mr. CLANCY. I fancy the hon. gentleman will not ask members at this stage of the session to move for correspondence. I

am aware of the character of the correspondence that ought to be brought down, and can be brought down in ten minutes.

Mr. HYMAN. The item which is being discussed is :

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements to, $15,000.

I do not anticipate the hon. gentleman would ask me to bring down all the correspondence in reference to this item. If the hon. gentleman will specify the correspondence he wants, I will bring it down.

Mr. CLANCY. I asked a question upon this item, because there was no item in the estimates in regard to the improvement of the Sydenham river. The correspondence I want is in relation to the disposal of the $5,800, and as to the work done in the River Sydenham, at the mouth of Chenal Ecarte, and at what is known as the eastern passenger Chenal Ecarte, going into Lake St. Clair. The hon. gentleman's chief officer will know what I refer to. I do not want any further correspondence.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give an explanation of this item, and state where the money is to be expended ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a general item that is always taken by the department to provide for cases of emergency, such as injury to a wharf caused by a storm. The department have felt that they should have at their disposal a general sum with which work of that kind can be proceeded with at once.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister will remember that I brought to his attention some repairs which are required at Port Credit, and I would like to know whether any of this vote will be available for a purpose of that kind ?

Mr. HYMAN. If it were a small work it would be. If I understood the conversation we had the other day, it was in regard to some dredging we had at Port Credit. The matter has been pressed upon the attention of the department by numerous residents of the locality in addition to the hon. gentleman himself. The vote out of which that work can be done is not included in this particular item. This vote relates to repairs to wharfs, &c. The work which the hon. gentleman asked me to have done could be done out of the general vote for dredging if a dredge were available.

Mr. BLAIN. There is a vote of that character ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Ontario—Honora—wharf, $8,000.

Mr. BLAIN. We will ask the hon. gentleman to give us some explanation of that ?

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract, which was entered into on the 22nd February, 1904. The amount of the contract is $9,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What county is it in ?

Mr. HYMAN. Algoma.

At Six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Ontario—Kingsville—filling superstructure of extension of breakwater with stone ballast, $4,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer has recommended that more good could be accomplished if a certain portion of this vote were used for dredging, and I think that should be the understanding.

Mr. SPROULE. Amend your resolution by adding the word 'dredging.'

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, but if it is mentioned in 'Hansard' I think it should be sufficient.

Resolution amended by adding the words 'and dredging.'

Ontario—Lake Temiscaming wharfs, $3,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a further amount in the supplementary estimates of $3,000 which will complete the work. There has been $12,000 expended and $3,500 is asked for in these estimates.

Ontario—Little Current—improvement of northern steamboat channel in Georgian Bay, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a revote and there is a further amount in the supplementary estimates of $10,000. This is to dredge the channel to afford twenty foot navigation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it being done by contract or by the government dredge ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is done in the usual way ; the department has a dredge there for which they are paying so much an hour.

Ontario—Meaford harbour—new breakwater, pier, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. You did not use any money for this work last year. I think you have another item in the supplementaries as well as this.

Mr. HYMAN. We have $10,000 in the supplementaries. I am informed by the officers of the department that there was some delay in the preparation of the plans and specifications, but tenders have now been advertised for and received. I am not sure whether the contract has been completed or not, but the lowest tender was from Messrs. Kastner and Porter, of Wiarton for $59,500.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard they got the contract.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not sure if it has passed Council yet.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will it cost when completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total estimated cost is $65,800 ; the contract is $59,500, and then the contingencies have to be considered. This is a revote of $15,000, and with the $10,000 in the supplementaries it leaves $25,000 available during the year.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the work be gone on with right away.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the work will be completed at once.

Ontario—Midland harbour—wharf, $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the amount of the contract here ?

Mr. HYMAN. $19,492, the contractor is A. A. Macdonald of Hamilton.

Mr. BENNETT. When will it be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract calls for completion this fall.

Ontario — Midland harbour improvements, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Have any amounts been paid for private dredging done at Midland?

Mr. HYMAN. The work done in 1902-3 by the Owen Sound Dredging and Construction Company amounted to $16,700.

Mr. BENNETT. The government pays the Owen Sound Company for the work they do, but has the government been recouped by any persons for whom dredging was done which might be of a private nature ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have been informed that there has been no money paid back.

Ontario—Owen Sound harbour—dredging and pile protection work, $14,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this item for ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is to provide twenty feet of water in the channel. They are working at the usual price of $8 an hour.

Mr. SPROULE. You have something in the supplementaries for that as well.

Mr. HYMAN. That is for the continuation of the same work.

Ontario—Pembroke—wharf, $43,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This contract was let some time ago but the department only recently decided upon the location, and it is only two weeks ago the contractor was ordered to start the work, so that it may be necessary to extend the time.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the government own the property ?

Mr. HYMAN. The wharf is at the foot of a public street.

Mr. BLAIN. What would be the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total estimate is $43,000 and the contract was a shade under $42,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will that be the total cost?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, except that there is always something added for contingencies.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. HYMAN. W. J. Poupore.

Ontario—Penetanguishene, dredging and other improvements, $22,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the nature of the other improvements ?

Mr. HYMAN. Repairing the reformatory lighthouse pier, which amounts to $1,200.

Mr. BENNETT. Why does the Dominion government do repairs on property of the local government ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is done on account of the lighthouse being a Dominion institution.

Ontario—Port Perry, dredging harbour, $2,200.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote was not expended last year owing to the difficulty of obtaining a dredge.

Mr. VROOMAN. I would like to ask the minister in reference to the dam at Lindsay, which is on the same water as Port Perry. I understand that the minister sent his engineer to inspect that dam, which is a very old work and needs to be repaired. In fact, I think he will find that the report of his officer recommends a new dam. I anticipated that there would be an item in the estimates for this work, but I have not been able to discover it.

Mr. HYMAN. I think there is a report of the engineer in the department. I will have it looked up, and if I find that the survey has not been sufficient, I shall be glad to have another officer examine the work and report.

Mr. BLAIN. Is Port Perry a government-owned harbour ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no information in the department to the effect that it is not. Has the hon. gentleman any information to that effect ?

Mr. BLAIN. I have no information that would be valuable to the committee, but my understanding of it is that it belongs to two private individuals. I assumed that the minister would know.

Mr. HYMAN. I have no information here in regard to the matter. The hon. gentle-

man will understand that there is a difference between an expenditure on a harbour in the way of dredging, although it may not be a government-owned harbour, and an expenditure on a wharf which is not owned by the government. The hon. gentleman has possibly in mind some dredging in regard to another harbour on Lake Ontario. I can only say that I shall be glad to take that matter up, and the only reason why I understand the dredging has not been done there before, has been the difficulty in getting a dredge.

Ontario—Port Stanley—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The harbour of Port Stanley in the past two years has become a very important harbour, serving from 150,000 to 300,000 in the western part of Ontario. For a number of years this harbour was in possession of the railway, and the policy of the railway was not to open it but rather to keep it closed. The harbour is now being transferred to the Dominion government, and coal, which was formerly brought around by Detroit, is now brought across the lakes by ferries which run winter and summer to Port Stanley. So that it has become a very important harbour in this respect, besides being a harbour of refuge. In addition to this vote, there is a further amount of $25,000 in the supplementary estimates for Port Stanley.

Ontario—River Otonabee, dredging at Peterborough, $6,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is being proceeded with by a small dredge rented from the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. VROOMAN. Is that below the town?

Mr. HYMAN. No, directly at the town.

Ontario—Rondeau harbour—improvements to piers and dredging at entrance, $16,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The explanation which I gave in regard to Port Stanley harbour practically applies to this harbour. Port Stanley, Rondeau and Port Burwell are practically the only harbours on that part of the lake. At the present time there is no harbour of refuge in that vicinity at all. Until the last two or three years the shipping which came to Rondeau harbour was not very large; but at present the amount of coal coming there from across the lake has very greatly increased, and the improvement of the harbour results in cheapening the supply of coal all through western Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this by contract?

Mr. HYMAN. By a dredge owned by the department.

Ontario—Sarnia, dredging, $12,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is being done by contract.

Mr. SHERRITT. What is the cost per yard?

Mr. HYMAN. This dredge is hired by the hour at the rate of $12 per hour, and the price is based on the amount of work which the dredge is capable of doing in a given number of hours. It is based on a price of 13⅓ cents a yard. In order to earn the $12 per hour, this dredge has to remove 800 yards. In the case of a dredge to which we pay $8 per hour, the price is based on 600 yards.

Mr. BELL. Are they actually paid by the yard?

Mr. HYMAN. No, but the day's pay is based on the price of 13⅓ cents per yard.

Mr. BELL Suppose they do not take out the quantity, are they paid the full price?

Mr. HYMAN. The difficulty is sometimes that material may change and that is taken into consideration. There is a government inspector on each dredge. They are very closely watched, and often the full amount is not paid. We must have a certificate from the inspector that the dredge does the full amount of work.

Ontario—Sault Ste. Marie—harbour improvements, including dredging of approaches, $30,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract. The contractor is Joseph Battle of Thorold. The estimated cost of the work is $71,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What harbour improvements are you making there?

Mr. HYMAN. This includes the extension of the government wharf and dredging, so as to have twenty feet at low water.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that dredging the approaches to the harbour or the channel.

Mr. HYMAN. The channel entering the canal. This is for dredging from the head of the wharf to the channel. The actual work in the channel comes under the Department of Railways and Canals. This is for the extension of the wharf and dredging twenty feet from the wharf to the channel.

Mr. SPROULE. When that is done, will it allow the largest boats, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, to call there?

Mr. HYMAN. This will provide twenty feet of water. Any boat that can go through the canal will be able to approach the wharf, which they all cannot do now.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work? It seems to me from the outlines there, that there is a great deal of dredging to be done before boats could get with safety to the wharf.

Mr. HYMAN. This will not complete the wharf. One of the objects of extending the wharf was to lessen the amount of dredging. This amount will cover all that can be expended during the present year, and a further amount of about $39,000 will be required to complete.

Mr. BELL. What length is the wharf extension ?

Mr. HYMAN. Two hundred and fifty feet.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything in the supplementaries for this ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, the engineer of the department reports that this $30,000 will cover the expenditure until another vote is taken. This is done by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. By the yard ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a bulk sum including the dredging and the extension of the wharf.

Ontario—Southampton—improvement of harbour, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I was going to explain to the committee that the estimate for this work is quite large, and I am going to move that this item be struck out. The reason is that, in the opinion of the engineers of the department, the money can be more advantageously spent in other portions of the harbour, and in the supplementaries will be found an item of $10,000 for improvements which could not be spent under this vote.

Mr. BELL. How does it appear in the supplementaries ?

Mr. HYMAN. As Saugeen river improvements. We thought it better to take a vote for Saugeen river so that there would be no misunderstanding.

Mr. HALLIDAY. This is the fourth session that this item has appeared in the estimates. It seems to be held there as bait or something of that kind without any intention of spending the money. Three years ago we were told that this money would be spent at once.

Mr. HYMAN. Well, we are perfectly frank about it, and I am moving to strike it out on the report of the engineers.

Motion agreed to, and item struck out.

Ontario—Spanish River, dredging, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The difficulty here is that we have not so far been able to find a dredge available to do the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any assurance of being able to get a dredge this coming summer ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is almost impossible to get dredges to take small contracts of this kind, owing to the cost of towing, loss of time, &c., in going from place to place.

Mr. SPROULE. I can appreciate the difficulty of getting dredges, because I know there is a dearth of them in that district, but at the same time, I object to the principle of taking money from year to year, unless the government are satisfied they can go on with the work because otherwise it becomes a temptation and is used in favour of the government at election times. I have often heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the strongest language denounce this practice, and I think he was justified in doing it. I agreed with him and still entertain that opinion. We have these items by the dozen, money voted year after year and not spent. When they ask for money they should make an effort to spend it, and they should not ask for it unless they are in a position to go on with the work.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying there are certain amounts in the estimates, but the great difficulty is with such a large number of works to get them all going. It takes a considerable amount of time in the department to prepare the plans, but the engineers lose no time in their work. But, of course there must be delay in a case of this kind where a dredge is not available.

Mr. SHERRITT. What amount of money has been expended since last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. $5,000 the whole vote.

Mr. SHERRITT. What is the condition of the work there now ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed the work is completed.

Mr. SHERRITT. Last session the member representing that riding objected to this vote, I am not sure he moved to strike it out but he opposed the item and the Minister of Public Works promised this committee that no more money would be spent on this until he went up himself personally and investigated it. Could the acting minister inform the committee whether that promise has been carried out or not, whether the minister has himself gone up and investigated it ?

Mr. HYMAN. The department has simply employed sufficient labour to use the materials that were on the ground. It was felt that it would not be right after making an expenditure of that amount to let the material go to waste.

Mr. SHERRITT. We were well aware of that last year. But the matter has been brought before the committee last year, that the promoter of that work was not very reliable and that he had in some way misled this government. The Minister of Works agreed with this committee that under these circumstances, having been informed that the promoter was not reliable, and had made statements that were not at all likely to be correct, he himself would

go up before the material was made use of and investigate. I shall read the minister's words with reference to the promoter last year. He said, referring to Mr. Cantin :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This man is no doubt a good deal of the character the hon. gentleman (Mr. McEwen) spoke of. He seems to be able to live by his wits and to induce people to put money in schemes that have little foundation. I do not know him myself or anything about him except what I have heard in connection with this matter. He deceived a great many people into putting money into this scheme. It is stated now that a good many substantial people have taken hold of the work, and I think we might probably take a vote and spend it on the conditions as to whether they are going on to develop this place and the work will help to do so. Now that we have spent so much money we might go on.

This is the opinion given by the Minister of Public Works and after some further remarks by Mr. McEwen in opposition to the vote, the minister says :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been over $10,000 expended on the work, but I am perfectly willing, if the item passes, to have an inquiry into all the circumstances, and if this work is not in the public interest, I will not finish it. The chief engineer of the department says that there are ten or eleven feet of water there, and I cannot understand how he could have made such a report if there is none.

Mr. McEwen said on that occasion :

As far as I am personally concerned, if the hon. minister will go up there and see for himself, I am willing to let the item drop.

That is the hon. member's statement. Now we will see what the hon. minister says further :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly willing to go up there and consult the hon. members of the riding before anything further is done.

In another place he says, in answer to Mr. McEwen :

If the hon. gentleman thinks that I should go instead of the chief engineer, I am quite willing to do so.

Now, there was a straight promise to go up there and investigate. He knew the circumstances very well, there has been nothing revealed since. All the material was lying there at the time, there has been no other material furnished since that discussion took place. The minister promised that he would go there before he spent a dollar of money. Under these circumstances we allowed the matter to pass, being satisfied that if he went up there and investigated for himself he would not spend a dollar of money. Now, it is unnecessary for me to say that the people up there look with a good deal of disfavour upon the government spending public money there. If the people in that part of the country asked for that amount of money, do you think the member representing that riding would get up here on the floor of the House and oppose it, as he did oppose it in every possible way ? Do you think that I would risk my reputation amongst the people there by opposing it, as I live only a short distance away from the work ? The thing is very unpopular there. It is an extraordinary state of affairs that, notwithstanding a promise made in the House by the Minister of Public Works, this work should go on and money should be spent there. To my mind it is an awful state of affairs if we cannot believe a minister's statement.

Mr. HYMAN. Oh, I think that is rather hard.

Mr. SHERRITT. I will take that back—if we cannot rely upon the promise of the minister to go up there and see for himself.

Mr. HYMAN. Under ordinary circumstances possibly the hon. gentleman might be justified in making these rather harsh comments. But I would like him to remember that the Minister of Public Works has not been in good health for some time. The hon. gentleman knows that for the last two or three months he has been entirely unable to give serious attention to his department, and under these circumstances I think the hon. gentleman might have been a little milder in his criticism. When the minister gave that promise I am quite sure he intended to carry it out and to go there and see this work. Unfortunately for the last three or four weeks he has been obliged to be away a good deal of the time. I do not remember myself authorizing the work, but I remember the condition of affairs was brought to my attention, and I was told that this amount of material was lying there, and that the engineer had reported that it was in the interest of the country that the work should be proceeded with instead of allowing the material to go to waste. I know there has been considerable criticism of this vote, but it must be remembered that at that time a large amount of money had been spent and a considerable amount of material was on the ground.

Mr. SHERRITT. I have no doubt that the minister at the time intended to carry out his promise made in the House. But it seems to me if he could not go himself he might have sent some one. When he stated in the House that he would not spend any more money without discussing the matter with the member for the riding—of course I do not represent the riding—I thought that he might at least have given us some idea of his intention. I assure you again, Mr. Chairman, that the people in that locality look upon this expenditure as a throw-away of money. May I ask the

minister what is the condition of the harbour there now, what depth of water is there now ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed there is from ten to eleven feet at the outer end of the pier.

Mr. SPROULE. The year before last the same question was discussed in this House at length, and the then Minister of Public Works told us most positively that he would have a report made upon that harbour, and if the circumstances were found to be as alleged no money would be spent. Still he went on and spent the money. When we came back to this House that minister is out and another takes his place.

Mr. HYMAN. The minister is not out, he is ill.

Mr. SPROULE. I am correct, I say the minister who gave this promise to the House was out and another was in his place when we came back again. Now we have the same discussion over again. More money was asked for and the money which was voted the year before last was spent, notwithstanding the promise that had been made. Another sum was voted last year, and we had a similar promise made by this minister, and we come back this year to find that the money is spent again, and that the minister has not carried out his word. So we are being jollied along from year to year, promises are made which are not kept, and in the meantime the money is being squandered.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this money expended, the $5,000 that has been expended since the last session of parliament ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the months of April, May and June of this year.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, I think this is a very strange manner of conducting public business. In addition to what my hon. friend from North Middlesex (Mr. Sherritt) has read, I want to read a statement from the member for South Huron (Mr. McEwen). Last year, speaking about the promise that was given to the government when they first proposed to construct this work, the hon. gentleman said :

> They have not yet established a manufactory of any kind or any other thing that would require a wharf.

Further on he says :

> As to the wharf, there has been $10,000 spent, and I am very sorry to say that the money has been unwisely spent. I could not approve of this expenditure, because nine out of ten of my constituents believe that the money has been unwisely expended.

Now, here is a statement from the hon. gentleman who represents the county and is a supporter of the minister himself. Leaving out the fact that this gentleman was sufficiently influential with the government to get the work commenced, I will just read what the member for South Huron says about the matter :

> What surprises me is that a man of his kind should be able to mislead this government into spending money where there is no need for it at the present time or for years to come.

It is a little unfortunate that the minister and his supporters should expend money in so many places where it is not required, even according to the statements of the hon. gentleman who represents the county, and leave other places unprovided for where the money is required in the public interest. According to the testimony of the hon. gentleman on that side of the House who represents the county, it appears that the government were misled by this gentleman into an expenditure of $10,000. The hon. gentleman stood up in his place at the last session and condemned the government for undertaking this work, and as my hon. friend from East Grey has pointed out, we had a promise from the hon. Minister of Public Works two years ago, and another promise last year that no further money would be expended until an examination of the work had taken place, but in the face of the statement of the hon. gentleman representing the county that the wharf is of no value, that it is not required now, that it will not be required for years to come, and in face of the further statement in reference to the $10,000 that has been expended we are asked to put $5,000 more into the work. The hon. member who represents the county said last year :

> As to the wharf there has been $10,000 spent, and I am very sorry to say that the money has been unwisely spent. There are seven or eight cribs on the shore, and one crib in two or three feet of water, and that is the whole result of the expenditure of $10,000.

In the face of that statement, the hon. gentleman and his supporters will go into that county and spend $5,000 more of public money, having before them the bald statement of the hon. gentleman representing that county that the wharf is of no value to the people, and knowing that the promises given by the gentleman who induced the government to spend this $10,000 have not been fulfilled. Then the hon. minister appeals to the electors again by saying : We will consider it further and we will, perhaps, spend some more money.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to put words in my mouth that I did not utter.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but I thought his remarks suggested something in reference to what might take place in the fall or at some time in the near future. I think this

is a wasteful expenditure of money. There can be no justification for it whatever. In face of the statement made by the hon. gentleman who represents the county on May 19, 1903, the government send a representative up there, and they say to the department: Go on and spend the money. No matter about the $10,000; let it go. We have evidence that the wharf is not required, and we have the evidence from the county representative that the wharf is of no value to the residents there. Although this work will be of no use to the public, it will be a monument to an extravagant government which has money to spend in counties where a work is not required and which is neglecting some other counties where money wisely expended would be in the public interest. I hope the hon. minister will learn new lessons of economy since he has taken charge of the department. I hope that next year he will not venture to bring such illustrations of economic government before the people of this country as this one is.

Ontario—Thessalon—breakwater, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. Under contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. HYMAN. The building of a pier. The contract amounts to $19,000. The total probable cost will be about $21,000. There was voted in the main estimates $15,000, and in the supplementary estimates there will be $5,500 to complete.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the contract?

Mr. HYMAN. Boyle Brothers, Sault Ste. Marie.

Ontario—Thornbury, dredging, $3,550.

Mr. BELL. How is that dredging done?

Mr. HYMAN. It is done by a hired dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that you did not do this dredging last year. I suppose that was because you could not get a dredge?

Mr. HYMAN. That was the reason.

Mr. SPROULE. This happens to be in my riding, and of course I know the necessities of the case better than those who are not acquainted with the locality.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman can suggest where we can get a dredge, I shall be very glad to do the work.

Mr. SPROULE. If I could I would be very glad to do so, but I do not know where the dredges are located. I do know the necessities of the people of Thornbury.

Mr. BENNETT. I was not here when the Collingwood item was under consideration, but I would like to ask the hon. minister if he can state to the committee what is the valuation of the dry-dock at Collingwood?

Mr. BLAIN. The information was promised to me to-night.

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the information, but I will be very glad to bring down a memorandum to-morrow.

Ontario—Toronto harbour—works at eastern entrance, &c., $28,000.

Mr. OSLER. Before this item is adopted, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister to a paragraph I see in the Ottawa correspondence of the Toronto 'News,' which bears upon it. It is as follows:

> In the main estimates brought down some months ago there is an item of $28,000 for Toronto harbour works at the eastern entrance, and, according to the departmental officials, this item will cover dredging generally, repairs to the two piers at the eastern gap and repairs to the breakwater from the eastern entrance westward. No further item appears in the supplementaries. The department is advised by its own engineers and by other engineers who have studied the question, that the ultimate solution of the protection of the island must be found in the construction of a continuous breakwater from end to end of the island. For the present, however, the government does not seem disposed to invite the necessary vote. The present item, which may be reached in discussion to-day, is not thought to be large enough to permit any enlargements of the breakwater. That portion of it which will be applied to the breakwater will be for repairs done.

I would like to ask the hon. minister what amount has already been expended for repairs under that item of $28,000?

Mr. HYMAN. The expenditure from the 1st of July to the 31st December, 1903, was $13,041, and up to the 30th of June it is estimated that the expenditure will have been $10,900. That will be about $24,000, and there is $10,000 of a revote. We are asking for a further amount of $18,000.

Mr. OSLER. Toronto harbour is one of the most important harbours in Canada outside of a sea harbour. I suppose it is next to Montreal, if it is not ahead of Montreal. It is a work which is entirely under the control of the Dominion government. It has, without doubt, been neglected, and year after year damage is being done to the harbour and to the island, which, if not looked after now, will entail later on an expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars, where thousands of dollars will suffice now. The hon. minister knows that this year there has been exceptionally high water. Perhaps it is at high water mark in all our lakes. While I cannot speak from having visited the eastern end of the island this year, I can state, having visited the western end of the island, that the water is so high that the washing away of the island this year is more serious than it has been for ten years past. I think that in justice to the important harbour of Toronto the hon. minister

should see that the matter is reported upon at once, and that a necessary amount is provided in the supplementary estimates to cover any expenditure that may be absolutely necessary for this year. According to the statement in the 'News' there is only $18,000 available.

Mr. HYMAN. I will have to disclaim responsibility for the statements of the 'News,' there is $28,000 to expend.

Mr. OSLER. Toronto harbour is so important that the government should not fail to grant sufficient money to keep it in proper condition. I am sure that the neglect of the government to expend a comparatively small sum of money immediately, would entail the expenditure of ten times as much in the future.

Mr. HYMAN. I have listened attentively to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has said with regard to Toronto harbour, but I cannot agree with him that Toronto harbour has been altogether neglected. The government of Canada up to date has spent over one million and a quarter dollars upon the harbour. There is now an item of $28,000 in the estimates which is for the works at the eastern entrance. There have been very strong representations made of late, particularly during the last few days that it is imperative that a certain extension should be made to the breakwater for the protection of the island. The total amount asked for is a very large sum, but I understand there are likely to be some small additional supplementary estimates, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I shall have a report from the engineer in Toronto at once and have a sum placed in these estimates; if there are further estimates, and I am almost sure there will be. There will be an item which will extend the breakwater, possibly not to the full extent asked, but sufficient for the present.

Mr. OSLER. I thank the minister for giving this matter his attention. I would remind him that I am not asking for money to be spent on the harbour itself, but for protection works on the island. When the late Minitser of Public Works visited Toronto, and when he was asked for a large expenditure on the harbour, he stated that he would not recommend such an expenditure until the city of Toronto took charge of the sewerage in the harbour. Unlike most of the gentlemen who met the minister, I agreed with him that the city should look after the sewerage and that then the government should look after the harbour. The expenditure necessary in this case is on the island itself outside the harbour, and unless the government see to it, serious consequences will follow from neglect.

Mr. KEMP. The minister (Mr. Hyman) is under a misapprehension when he says that one and a half million dollars have been spent on Toronto harbour by the government of this country. Not one single dollar has been spent by any government on Toronto harbour. The money he refers to has been spent upon the island and upon the canal through which vessels come into the harbour. Toronto harbour not only accommodates a great deal of commerce but it is a harbour of refuge as well, and some years ago it was considered good policy to have a channel built through the eastern end of the island. Some years ago the city of Toronto paid to the government $100,000 and were discharged for all time to come from any obligation regarding that entrance. The government expenditure has been on works to prevent the washing away of the southern part of the island, and on that eastern entrance. The revenue derived from the shipping in the Toronto harbour has been devoted to improving the harbour from time to time by the harbour commissioners of Toronto, but I repeat that there never has been a dollar of public money expended upon the harbour itself. Three or four years ago the government appointed an engineer to consult with an engineer appointed by the city of Toronto in regard to the diversion of the Don, and the improvement of the harbour. The government engineer agreed with the engineer representing the city that certain works ought be carried out by the government, and the government, four years ago, put a sum of $75,000 in the estimates but no money was spent. This appropriation was put in the estimates for the purpose of diverting the Don river which flows into the eastern end of the harbour and which river carries with it during the spring freshets, immense alluvial deposits from the surrounding country north and east, which have gradually filled up the beautiful harbour of Toronto which used to have from fifteen to thirty feet of water, but which now has only five or six feet in certain places. The government have been appealed to by deputation after deputation. It was pointed out that the city of Toronto could in no sense be held responsible for the filling up the harbour by these alluvial deposits, and that the government should undertake the work of diverting the Don river to prevent this occurring. Within this last year or two the government has seen fit to drop that item from the estimates. Why, it is impossible for me to say; after their own engineer reported in favour of this work. I contend that the government is under a moral obligation to the city of Toronto to go on with that work and save the harbour. I do not want the impression to go forth that the government of Canada have spent public money on the Toronto harbour in any form, because it is not so.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) says he does not know why the government have dropped this item of $75,000 from the estimates, but he has been answered by his colleague (Mr. Osler) who said he agreed with the late Minister of Public Works that there should be no expenditure on the harbour until the city took charge of the sewerage.

Mr. OSLER. That was another item.

Mr. HYMAN. It was for the same work. I repeat what I said in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) that I shall have the extension of the breakwater looked into immediately, and will provide, if there are further supplementary estimates, a sufficient amount to undertake that work.

Mr. OSLER. I think there is more work required there. I understand that there has been considerable damage done west of the breakwater on the eastern portion of the island, and that another year of high water and storm from the east may cause further material damage.

Mr. HYMAN. I will have the report of the hon. gentleman's remarks in 'Hansard' with regard to that portion of the work, and the engineer will examine into it at the same time.

Mr. KEMP. I wish to state that about a year ago the city council passed a resolution to the effect that they would accept responsibility for the sewerage, provided the government would do the work they had proposed to do according to the estimates submitted to parliament. So far as the city is concerned, I think it has relieved itself from any responsibility by passing that resolution. I would like to have it understood that these are two distinct questions. The question now before the committee is that of the breakwater at the eastern gap, for which the government is responsible, and for which the city of Toronto, by paying $100,000 some years ago, was relieved of responsibility. The other matter is one which we have been agitating for years; and when money is being lavished on dredging, wharfs and other public works in small places all over the country, we do not understand how it is that the great city of Toronto, which has more freight to ship than any other place in this country, which ships much more freight than the city of Montreal, is so much neglected by the government. I would like the minister to tell us why the government neglects its duty in regard to the diversion of the Don in order that the deposits from that river may be diverted to Lake Ontario and not fill up the harbour in the future as it has done in the past.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that it was only last year that the city council took this ground. So that whatever blame may be attached to the government could only be from last year.

Mr. KEMP. It was previous to last session.

Mr. HYMAN. The government always took the stand that until the sewage was disposed of, it would be impossible for the government to do any work on the harbour. Personally I thoroughly appreciate the importance of the work and the importance of Toronto as a shipping point. I am only acting minister, but so far as I can, I will take pleasure in affording any expenditure possible to improve the shipping facilities at the port of Toronto; and if the city council are prepared to enter into negotiations with the government for the disposal of the sewage in accordance with the plan laid down by the former Minister of Public Works, I shall be glad to take up the matter at any time.

Mr. KEMP. Will the acting minister have any objection to reinstate in the supplementary estimates the sum which his predecessors committed themselves to for the straightening of the Don river?

Mr. HYMAN. I am not prepared to make that promise.

Mr. KEMP. Why was it taken out?

Mr. HYMAN. I think negotiations should first take place between the city and the government. It is a matter that would have to be discussed first departmentally and afterwards with my colleagues in the government.

Mr. KEMP. I admit that. At the same time, the work need not be gone on with until a proper arrangement is come to with the city. The sum might be placed in the estimates conditional on such an arrangemet being made.

Mr. HYMAN. The only fear I have in regard to a matter of that kind is this. If we should put the $75,000 into the estimates and if by the end of the year the government and the city were not able to come to any arrangement, I have no doubt that the government would be charged with having put it in for political purposes. Therefore I would not like to pledge myself, because I might get into trouble.

Mr. KEMP. The $75,000 is only a drop in the bucket when the government are trying to find means of spending the tremendous surplus which they have; and, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman's predecessors committed themselves to this policy, I think he ought to be willing to reinstate the amount in the estimates, subject to a satisfactory arrangement being arrived at with the city of Toronto. In reference to the vote having a political tinge, the members from Toronto are willing to assume

any responsibility in that respect. I do not think the government need be afraid of being criticised for an expenditure of this kind in an important harbour like Toronto, in view of the tremendous amount of money being spent in Montreal, at Three Rivers, on the deep water wharf at Sorel, and on public works at other small places. If the minister reconsiders the matter, I think he will see that there is not much in that argument.

Mr. HYMAN. I presume that the hon. gentleman knows whereof he is speaking when he says that the city of Toronto passed such a resolution. Can he tell me whether it has been communicated to the Department of Public Works ?

Mr. KEMP. Yes, and a deputation waited on the Minister of Public Works last year in reference to it. It was passed for the purpose of being communicated to the government.

Mr. HYMAN. Can the hon. gentleman remember the nature of the resolution—that the city desired to enter into negotiations with the government in regard to the matter ?

Mr. KEMP. The city assumed all responsibility in regard to the sewage and the removal of it.

Mr. HYMAN. It would seem to me that the department would require something more than that, to guard against the harbour being filled up again with sewage. I think the hon. member should be satisfied with what I say, that I shall be glad to have the matter taken up immediately. with regard to reinserting the item in the estimates, I am not prepared to say off-hand that I will do so. I think it is a matter that ought to be preceded by negotiations between the city and the department.

Mr. KEMP. I think the first item placed in the estimates was $75,000, and that in the following year $50,000 was inserted. I think it will be satisfactory if the minister will reinstate the sum of $50,000 in the supplementary estimates, subject to a satisfactory arrangement being arrived at with the city. If a satisfactory arrangement is not arrived at, then the amount drops.

Mr. CLARKE. If the minister would come up there himself, he could see the work that is required to be done. My colleague from East Toronto has stated the case correctly. Many years ago a celebrated engineer, Captain Eads, visited Toronto, and recommended the construction of a breakwater to separate Ashbridge bay from the harbour. That has not given satisfaction, for the reason stated by my hon. colleague. The freshets carry a large amount of alluvial matter down the Don river to the eastern part of the harbour. The result is that there are scores of acres where the water is not more than two or three feet deep. The appropriation of $75,000 taken some years ago was intended, I think, to be expended in diverting the channel of the Don towards the southeast, so that the alluvial deposits would go to fill up Ashbridge's bay, which would be a great improvement. Instead of that, the debris flows into Toronto harbour, constantly filling it up.

The expenditures which have been made and which are charged against the Toronto harbour were incurred in order to protect the island, and in work on the eastern gap, As has been pointed out, on account of the water being so high in the lake, especially this year, great damage has been and is being done to the southern part of the island. But with regard to the harbour itself, there cannot be two opinions as to the necessity of a large expenditure being made to protect it ; and if the minister could find time to make a personal visit, he would be able to judge of the condition of the harbour for himself. As to the work of disposing of the sewage, that work is done by the city. There is a large quantity of sewage taken out of Toronto bay to-day at the expense of the corporation, which should be taken out at the expense of the government. As my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has pointed out, the sewage deposit is increased by the silt which is carried down by the river Don. The slips are continually being cleansed by the city dredges, and the engineer's estimates of the quantities dredged out would convince the hon. gentleman that the city of Toronto is not shirking in any way the obligation devolving upon it. This work of cleansing and deepening the harbour is necessitated by the action of the Don river, which has been declared a navigable stream, and over which the city of Toronto exercises no jurisdiction. Therefore the work of removing the silt brought down by the Don, which is being performed by the city of Toronto, is not work the cost of doing which ought to be borne by that municipality. The government has expended a large sum in protecting the eastern end of the harbour, but that work will be practically of no value until steps are taken to remove from the harbour proper the accretions brought down by the river Don to the eastern end from year to year. If the minister would read the report of his officers, endorsed by the report of Mr. Jennings, he would see the reasonableness of the request made ; and no charge of political design on the city will be made against him if he will only comply with our reasonable request and put a substantial sum in the supplementaries to carry the desired work out. And if he should not be satisfied, after an examination and inspection, with the arrangement which the city of Toronto has made, then he need

not spend a dollar. That proposition is so reasonable, coupled with the cordial invitation to the minister to come and see for himself, that I do not see how he can decline to come. The harbour is being steadily destroyed. Captain Bonicastle, fifty years ago, in prophetic words declared that that would be the inevitable result if the Don were allowed to continue pouring its flood into the harbour. The city undertook to pay the sum that was considered necessary and reasonable, namely the sum of $100,000, as its share of the work of preserving Toronto island. It provided that sum and handed it over to the Dominion. Inroads are being made on the island by the waters of Lake Ontario ; and it will not be argued that the municipality of Toronto is bound to protect an island two or three miles out in the lake from the depredations caused by the heavy storms from the east and south-east. The situation is a unique one. If the government desire to perserve the harbour, they must protect the island, and that can only be done as the result of an intelligent and systematic cooperation of the government with the municipality. A personal examination of the situation will convince my hon. friend that the statements of my colleague are absolutely within the mark and that it is necessary something should be done.

Mr. HYMAN. As regards the protection of the island, I would recommend strongly on my colleagues that a sufficient sum for the extension of the breakwater be put into any further supplementary estimates. With regard to the other question, I shall be glad to take the opportunity, either as acting Minister of Public Works or member of the cabinet, to visit Toronto and become acquainted with the whole work. I should be glad to have the opportunity of personally inspecting the whole work, but I must make a decision at present, as far as I am concerned. Until negotiations are entered into with the city of Toronto and the propositions made by the city have found favour with the engineers of the department, or whatever engineer the matter may be referred to, the matter will have to remain in abeyance. A work of that character, leading to a very large expenditure, had better be proceeded with, in the first place, by negotiations between the city of Toronto and the department, and I shall be glad to study the whole question from every standpoint.

Mr. OSLER. The time is very short within which the last supplementaries may be presented.

Mr. HYMAN. I will have it done by telegraph to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE. I have a copy of the resolution of the council, also of Mr. Jennings's report, and a copy of the by-law passed authorizing the raising of $100,000 for the protection of the island ; but as the documents are voluminous I shall not undertake to read them. But I assure the hon. minister that the city of Toronto has expressed its willingness again and again to do its share of the work, and is actually doing more than its share. It is dredging all the slips into which the sewers flow, and that work has been going on continuously for twenty years. According to the statement of the Toronto city engineer, the quantity of material taken out of the harbour by the city dredges at the expense of the city is much greater than the quantity deposited by the sewers every year. The condition of the Toronto harbour, especially the eastern part, is deplorable. Scores of acres of the harbour are filled up now as the result of the deposits brought down by the Don river. The citizens and the Board of Trade have urged the government to have the necessary work done. The department issued instructions to one of its engineers to make a report, in conjunction with Mr. W. T. Jennings, late city engineer of Toronto, who is thoroughly familiar with the ground and with all the conditions in the harbour. The hon. gentleman has that report in his department now, and I think a perusal of it would enable him to possess himself of knowledge as to the requirements of the harbour. The harbour of Toronto is growing in importance, its shipping is increasing, and as the hon. gentleman knows it is the only harbour of refuge on the north shore of Lake Ontario. It is a most important harbour and the necessary expenditure should be made.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that I have asked the engineer to bring the resolution of the council to my attention. At the same time I shall look over the reports in the department and if I cannot find it I shall avail myself of the hon. gentleman's offer.

Mr. KEMP. On April 16, 1903, the matter was brought up in the House. The discussion on the question was not very long as it was thought by the deputation which came down to wait on the Minister of Public Works that he was so deeply impressed with the justice of the case that he would bring in, in the supplementary estimates, an additional sum for the purpose we are discussing. The Minister of Public Works, as reported on page 1433 of 'Hansard' said in regard to Toronto harbour and this question we are discussing now, the diversion of the Don.

This has no connection with the matter to which the Toronto deputation made reference recently.

He was referring to the matter of $14,000 in the estimates of last year for works at the eastern entrance.

This work has no connection with the matter to which the Toronto deputation made reference recently. I had a communication from

the council this week pointing out that this work is very pressing.

So that the Minister of Public Works has this resolution and this memorial from the council. The deputation waited on him in his room in this building. I was present and I am sorry there was not placed in the supplementary estimates last year a sum for this purpose, but we expected there would be this year. The deputation, I believe, has not visited the minister this year. I do not know why for one thing the mayor is away in Europe at present. I really think the proposition to put a sum in the supplementaries, contingent on a satisfactory arrangement being arrived at with the city as to sewage disposal, is a fair proposition, and I am surprised that the minister does not accede to it.

Mr. HYMAN. It is only fair to say that this matter has been brought to our attention by His Worship the Mayor of Toronto. I would ask if this communication to which reference was made in the remarks of the Minister of Public Works was before or after the passing of the resolution by the city council of Toronto assuming responsibility for the sewage.

Mr. KEMP. This resolution was passed prior to the coming of the deputation. Council passed a resolution in regard to the sewage previous to this time.

Mr. HYMAN. Did they pass the resolution to which the hon. gentleman referred in which he says, the council declared that they were prepared to take the responsibility for the sewage.

Mr. KEMP. This was passed previous to the time the deputation waited on the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HYMAN. Then it was two years ago.

Mr. KEMP. I do not know the date of the resolution. I have the full information about it, but the resolution was passed previous to the coming of the deputation.

Mr. CLARKE. The resolutions were passed a year ago. There have been deputations down here again and again, as the hon. gentleman is aware, about this matter, and I would like to emphasize the fact that the corporation of Toronto has been dredging these slips for 15 or 20 years in order to enable vessels to come in. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, knows the Yonge street slip, the main slip of the city, where the Niagara boats and the island ferries ply from. The city dredges that slip continuously, and also dredges elsewhere when it is required. The city is doing all of that work now, and there need be no apprehension of the city's desire to shirk any of its obligations, because it has never done so. The city has not only cleansed the slips of the material deposited by the sewers, but has absolutely dredged along the front the material brought down by the Don. I say that it is not fair to hold the city of Toronto responsible for the disposal of the silt brought down by the Don, and yet it is this silt which is filling the harbour and causing all the trouble. As long as the mouth of the Don is allowed to discharge as at present, into the harbour, the difficulty will continue. The Don must be diverted. There was a sum of $75,000 placed in the estimates some years ago for this work, but no expenditure was made. The estimate was provided three or four years ago, I think.

Ontario—Wiarton wharf, $13,000.

Mr. INGRAM. As this is the last item in the Ontario estimates for harbours, I would like to ask the minister what is included under a vote for harbour improvements. Does it include the extension of piers, dredging or any work done around the harbour ?

Mr. HYMAN. The broad words 'harbour improvements' include dredging, repairs to piers or an extension to piers.

Mr. INGRAM. I asked a question the other day with respect to the expenditure at Port Stanley. The hon. gentleman answered that the total expenditure had been something like $9,000. In 1893 there was an item of $12,000 for the extension of the piers. In 1894, $5,000 was voted for the improvement of the harbour, so that I cannot reconcile these facts with the statements made in reply to my questions. It may be that my question was not full enough and that for that reason I did not make myself quite understood.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman has quoted the amount voted, not the expenditure ? Which does he mean ?

Mr. INGRAM. That is what I want to arrive at. I am anxious to get the correct information. I asked the amount of the expenditure and I thought there might be some mistake in the reply. Am I to understand that of the $12,000 voted in 1893, only about $1,000 was expended in that year. I would ask the hon. gentleman to look the matter up.

Mr. HYMAN. I will have the hon. gentleman's remarks in 'Hansard' and I can look the matter up.

Mr. CLARKE. What is being done in the way of additional groining on the south side of the island at Toronto ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is nothing in the present estimates for the south side.

Mr. CLARKE. The protection given by the piers at that part of the island is limited. It extends only a certain distance west, and the damage is done to the island proper west of the point where the influence of the piers ceases.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand there was a good deal of that work done last year.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman that additional groins would be of immense service in protecting the south shore of the island.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think there have been any representations made to the department up to the present moment in regard to this particular expenditure.

Mr. OSLER. The minister might ask that to be reported upon at the same time as the other matter. He might find out if anything is really necessary in reference to that.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall include that.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the minister where that item for general dredging in the province of Ontario will be found, in the supplementaries.

Mr. HYMAN. It is on page 56—dredging, Ontario and Quebec. We have not reached it yet.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like at the same time a summary of the expenditures that I asked about.

Mr. HYMAN. I will send it over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. And will the hon. gentleman be good enough to furnish us with a summary of the expenditures in counties in the other provinces as well some time before the supplementary estimates come up for discussion ?

Mr. HYMAN. That would involve a considerable amount of work, as the items do not appear in the estimates. The hon. gentleman will understand that when these estimates are going through the engineer has to be here and cannot well attend to other matters. But I will endeavour to furnish the hon. gentleman with the Nova Scotia one, which he asked for.

Mr. BLAIN. There are perhaps some other officers of the department who can prepare a statement of this kind. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would have it ready for next week, when the supplementaries come up.

Manitoba—Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $3,000.

Mr. BOYD. Will the minister explain what that is for ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a general vote for emergency cases. If anything happens to a harbour or a public work in consequence of a storm or other accident, this amount will be available for immediate use.

Mr. BOYD. Last session I asked the minister to put something in the estimates for the Assiniboine river. There are a great many people living on that river, and I think something should be done to make it navigable. Some hundreds of miles of it can be made navigable. The minister assured me he would make some surveys and ascertain what was necessary to be done. Does the minister propose to do anything in that respect ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed that no report has been made up to the present time.

Mr. BOYD. Will the minister say whether he will have anything done in that regard ?

Mr. HYMAN. Instructions have been given, but the report has not yet been received.

Manitoba—lowering of Lake Dauphin, $2,500.

Mr. BOYD. What has been done in regard to that ?

Mr. HYMAN. $2,500 was spent last year in dredging. I do not think any decision has yet been come to as to how far the lake should be lowered. The work will be proceeded with from year to year, and we will see what the effect is.

British Columbia—Anderson and Kennedy lakes—clearing outlets, $2,500.

Mr. EARLE. Will this sum complete the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This item is to continue the work.

Mr. EARLE. Does the minister know how much more is required to complete ?

Mr. HYMAN. I could not tell at the moment.

Mr. EARLE. My object in asking is this : A considerable sum is eaten up in sending a foreman there, in overseers' expenses and small matters like that, so that unless a considerable amount is voted there will not be much left. I think that it would be advisable to grant a larger amount so as to complete the work.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I understand from the report of the British Columbia engineer that this sum will complete the work.

British Columbia—Fraser river—improvements of ship channel, protection works, &c., $25,000.

Mr. EARLE. Could the minister give us any information as to the condition of that protection work that has been going on for some years, whether the work is found to be effective, whether it will be continued from year to year, and also the amount that has been expended up to the present time ?

Mr. HYMAN. We will allow that item to stand until the engineer is back to give the information.

British Columbia—Fraser river, improvement of ship channel, protection works, &c., $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. If my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) will renew his question I will be glad to give him the information.

Mr. EARLE. I would ask the hon. minister if he would give me what information he has in regard to the protection works

being carried on in the Fraser river for many years, the amount expended up to the present time, whether the work has been effective, and whether it is work which will have to be continued from year to year indefinitely.

Mr. HYMAN. The amount that has been expended up to the 31st December, 1903, is $600,000. I am informed by the officers of the department that this vote is asked for the purpose of making provision for maintaining, renewing and strengthening the existing works constructed for the improvement of the ship channel in the winter river. I am also told that it will be necessary from year to year to have certain votes available for the continuance of this work.

Mr. EARLE. There is nothing for new work this year ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. minister a matter in reference to the dry-dock at Vancouver. I understand that the government have entered into or are about to enter into an arrangement with the Vancouver Dry-dock and Shipping Company for the building of a dry-dock at Vancouver. I would like to know if the arrangements have been completed.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that the arrangements have been completed with the Vancouver Dry-dock Company.

Mr. LENNOX. Could the hon. minister inform me whether any work has been done on the dry-dock yet ?

Mr. HYMAN. No work has been done as yet. The agreement is not completed inasmuch as the company have not signed it. The Order in Council has, I understand, been passed, but it has not reached the stage where it has been completed by the signing of the company.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the government propose to complete the arrangement with the company ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand so.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister understand that there has been a protest made by the Jackson Company, which I think is called the Vancouver Engineering Works, represented particularly by Mr. Jackson ? Has the hon. minister had occasion to look at the protest entered on behalf of that company ?

Mr. HYMAN. The matter has not been brought to my attention since I have been acting in the department.

Mr. LENNOX. I propose to discuss this matter and I would like to have a good deal of information from the hon. gentleman in reference to it as I proceed. There are one or two other members of the House who propose to have something to say on it. But, I think it would probably be more convenient if one item were allowed to stand over for that discussion. I think probably my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) also wishes to say something on it.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman will discuss this item on the supplementary estimates I will have an opportunity of looking over the papers in the meantime and I will give the hon gentleman whatever information he may require.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it might be more convenient to have the discussion at some other time, but I would not like to leave it over for the supplementary estimates because probably there will not be very much discussion on those supplementaries, but if the hon. minister will allow this matter to stand until his estimates come up again we could go on and discuss it. I will go on with the discussion now if he will give me the information I require.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not prepared to give the hon. gentleman the information. The matter has not been brought to my attention at all since I have been in the department. If the hon. gentleman will accept my suggestion I will be very glad, if he will give me a memorandum now of the particular documents he requires, to bring down the information when we are discussing the supplementary estimates.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to have an item left over if the hon. minister is not prepared to discuss the matter now.

Mr. HYMAN. This is not an item upon which the matter can be properly discussed. The item that is under discussion is the 'Fraser river, improvement of ship channel and protection works.'

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister knows there is a convenient way of discussing it rather than to bring it up on going into Committee of Supply. If the item is allowed to stand until to-morrow I am quite satisfied to leave it until then.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not wish to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman, but he can hardly expect me to be possessed of the information by to-morrow. If I am asked to go on with my estimates to-morrow I will have no opportunity of becoming possessed of the information. The hon. gentleman will have plenty of opportunities for discussing the matter. Leave it over until next week.

Mr. EARLE. Before we leave the votes for British Columbia, I wish to ask whether the city of Victoria will be able to get the use of the dredge 'King Edward' again this summer, to complete the work which was commenced last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. The 'King Edward' is on the Fraser river at the present time. Of course the hon. gentleman knows that this dredge has done a great amount of work in Victoria and the work at the mouth of the Fraser river is very important. It is almost impossible sometimes to decide as to which work a dredge will be put on, and this matter, I will have to discuss with the officers of the department before I can give a distinct answer.

Mr. EARLE. I think there was an understanding that during the season of high-water when she could not work very well on the Fraser river she might be put to work at Victoria. This is work which can be carried on by a dredge of the character of the 'King Edward,' and it certainly is work that is very badly needed.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman any definite answer. The 'King Edward' was in Victoria for a long period and did a large quantity of work there. The work on the Fraser river is said to be very important, and I would not like to send the 'King Edward' to Victoria and go to the trouble of towing her back and forth.

Mr. EARLE. I understand that if she could be spared to work at Victoria for a short time, the city would be quite willing to pay the expense of towage.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that, but there is the loss of time.

Mr. EARLE. It is only a day.

Mr. HYMAN. A day each way.

Mr. EARLE. The work at Victoria is very important.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, but so is the work on the Fraser river, and there is a protest against sending her from that work.

Mr. EARLE. There is a protest from our side too.

Mr. HYMAN. There are two protests, but I suppose possession is nine points of the law.

Mr. EARLE. She is a British Columbia dredge and she belongs to Victoria as much as to any part of the province. There is no reason why her services should be confined to the Fraser river continuously. We only want her for a month or six weeks and we could utilize her during the high water in June and July when she could not work to advantage on the Fraser river.

Lewes and Yukon Rivers, improvements, $15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This vote is placed to the credit of the Yukon commissioner and expended by him on the advice of the steamboat companies for the improvement of navigation.

Mr. SPROULE. You allow the Yukon Commissioner to make the expenditure and then draw upon the government ?

Mr. HYMAN. The vouchers are of course sent there.

Mr. SPROULE. How many dredges have you altogether and how are they distributed ?

Mr. HYMAN. The maritime provinces have seven ; Quebec, three ; Ontario, four ; Manitoba, two ; British Columbia, two.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is the snag-boat for the Red river under construction ?

Mr. HYMAN. No ; the intention is to call for tenders immediately.

New hydraulic dredge for maritime provinces, $50,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is this dredge completed yet ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is afloat, but is has not yet been despatched to its work.

Mr. WILMOT. When will the dredge be ready ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am in hopes that the dredge will be ready for work this fall and sent down to the lower provinces early in the spring.

Mr. WILMOT. I make the inquiry because there is an obstruction at the entrance to St. John harbour which requires to be dredged in order to enable a large vessel to go through. When will the dredge be ready to work ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is hoped that the dredge may be despatched early in the spring.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What work will she be put at ?

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot say at present what work will be considered the most important.

New dredge for Prince Edward Island, $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The contract has not yet been signed, but tenders have been received and have been reported to Council.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimated cost of this dredge ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the neighbourhood of $50,000.

New dredging plant, Ontario and Quebec, $75,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the estimated sum required this year for a new dredge, two new scows, new tug, light draught tug, swing engines and boiler, and four yawl boats. It is practically a renewal of a dredge owned by the department at the present time.

Mr. MORIN. Is that dredge to be used on the Ottawa river ?

Mr. HYMAN. It has not yet been decided where the dredge will be used. That will have to be considered by the department when the dredge is ready.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is the work being done on this dredge ?

Mr. HYMAN. The intention of the department is to have the hull brought to Ottawa and the work done in our own shipyard at the foot of the locks.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you building anything in the shipyard at Three Rivers ?

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman means the Sorel shipyard. That is not under control of this department.

Mr. SPROULE. Are any of these dredges being built there ?

Mr. HYMAN. The dredge 'Fielding' is being built there—the new hydraulic dredge for the maritime provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost of the 'Fielding' dredge ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the neighbourhood of $500,000.

Mr. BLAIN. When will it be ready for operation ?

Mr. HYMAN. I answered that question when the item was under discussion. It is hoped that the 'Fielding' will be completed so that she can be tested this fall and be ready for work in the spring.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the dredge 'Laurier' or the dredge 'Tarte' working at the present time ?

Mr. HYMAN. The dredge 'Tarte' is not working. She is being repaired. She is one of the dredges belonging to the ship channel and is not under the charge of this department.

Mr. SPROULE. Let us understand how these dredges are being built. Are we building dredges under the various departments? I always understood that they were built under the Public Works Department.

Mr. HYMAN. Not necessarily. When the work of the ship channel was transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as the Order in Council which was read here fully set forth, all the plant belonging to the ship channel was transferred to that department, including the dredge 'Tarte' and six other dredges.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the plant might be transferred to the Marine Department after it was built by the Public Works Department. I did not understand that the Marine Department was to build its own plant, as well as the Public Works.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know what the policy of the Marine and Fisheries may be in regard to these dredges. That will be entirely under his own control. So far as this department is concerned, I do not know that any settled policy has been adopted. When the question of building a dredge comes up, the department adopts the most economical way of building it.

Mr. SPROULE. All I can say is that that explanation is simply moonshine. The hon. gentleman has been long enough in this House to know better. I say it has been the policy in the past to have the dredges built under the Public Works Department. We have never yet to my knowledge had any intimation that the Marine and Fisheries Department was building a dredge.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot answer for the policy which my hon. colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will adopt. The Department of Public Works is responsible for the building of its own dredges, and whatever dredges are built under the control of this department will be built in the most economical way. I am unable to give information with regard to what policy may be adopted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries regarding its dredges.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some one who can speak for the government, and let us know what the policy of the government is.

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman will renew his question when the leader of the government is here, he will get the information he seeks. I am only authorized to speak as the acting Minister of Public Works, and cannot speak for my colleagues.

Mr. EARLE. In what department are the workshops at Sorel ?

Mr. HYMAN. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. EARLE. If you want anything done at these workshops, you would have to go to that department ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. The Department of Public Works would ask the Department of Marine and Fisheries for an estimate of the cost, and the work would be done by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. EARLE. I cannot understand why these workshops should not have remained in the Department of Public Works. That would not have prevented the Department of Marine and Fisheries having its dredges built there.

Mr. HYMAN. The only difference is that instead of the Department of Marine having to come to the Department of Public Works to have its dredges constructed in the Sorel workshops, the Department of Public Works will have to go to the Department of Marine. The department under whose control these workshops are will do the work.

Mr. WILSON. I would suggest then that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be sent for, so that he may give the explanation which the acting Minister of Public Works is unable to give.

Mr. HYMAN. I can give all the information regarding this particular item, but I cannot go beyond it and inform the House what policy the Department of Marine and Fisheries is going to adopt with regard to the building of its own dredges. I cannot give information as to the policy of building dredges, generally, because that is in the province of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and not of mine. But I can give all the information required regarding the building of dredges for the department of which I am now the acting minister.

Mr. WILSON. That is the difficulty we are in when these estimates come up and there is only one minister present. We ought to have present such ministers as are able to give the information we seek with regard to any item under discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. When the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was in office, he gave us all the information we required with regard to the dredging plant, and he did so because that plant was under the Public Works Department. He told us how many men were employed, how many dredges were being built, what kind of dredges, and so on. But to-day, when there is an item before us for the building of certain dredges, and we desire to know what dredges are being built and all the details concerning them, we are told by the minister that he does not know anything at all about it.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not tell the hon. gentleman that I did not know anything about it.

Mr. SPROULE. When I asked about what was being done at the Sorel workshops, the hon. gentleman said he did not know anything about it.

Mr. HYMAN. Neither do I, because that is not in my department. But I am prepared, perfectly prepared, to give all the information required with regard to this item. I cannot, however, give information with regard to the general policy of building dredges, because that matter has been transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department, and is no longer under mine.

Mr. SPROULE. I am asking with regard to the general policy of the government in carrying on the public works of this country. I first started by asking if it was the policy of the government to build dredges in the different provinces in which they were entitled to operate. That policy was adopted two years ago, when a question arose as to the advisability of building in British Columbia the dredges that were intended to operate in that province. We contended that it was better these dredges should be built there, and the government finally decided to do that, as far as that could be carried out. At that time the Sorel shipyards were under the control of the Public Works Department, and it was declared that any dredging plant which could not be built in the outlying provinces would be built in those shipyards. We are now desiring to get information as to what is being done in pursuance of that policy.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that the recent changes in the position of the various departments is not at all in the interests of economy in this country. The only advantage that I can conceive as having been accomplished has been the transfer of power from the control of the minister representing the province of Ontaro to that of a minister representing the province of Quebec, simply exploiting one department to give more patronage and more prestige to the minister of another department. Now we find that the Marine Department wants dredges, the Public Works Department wants dredges. It may be that some of the others will want dredges but we will speak of these two only. The Minister of Public Works had his shops at Sorel, he had all his staff, his engineers conversant with the work of building dredges, and was prepared to construct all the dredges necessary for the work of the country. Now what do we find ? We will have to have another set of workshops similar to those at Sorel and another full compliment of men at some other point to construct dredges, another set of engineers, a professional staff as well as a staff of ordinary workmen. The effect will be that the cost will be double, there will be no advantage to the country beyond simply gratifying the ambition of one minister who thinks he ought to control the prestige of half the country. I do say the minister has made a terrible mistake when he permitted that patronage to slip away from him. I will not say he permitted it because if we are to judge from appearances and from the fact that the minister has not appeared in this House from the time the exploitation was made, it was not done with his consent, and it would seem that he was still protesting and will still protest. I am glad he had the courage to do so, and I think the people of this country will protest against the exploitation of one department for the benefit of another. I am sure there is no gentleman in this House on either side who will not see the impropriety of what took place during this past year with regard to the division of the departments. It can result only in additional expense and no benefit whatever can accrue to the country.

New dredging plant, Manitoba, self-propelling snag boat, $10,000.

Mr. HYMAN. It is intended to build this up there if possible.

New dredging plant, British Columbia, to replace snag boat 'Samson' and dredge 'Mud Lark,' $10,000.

Mr. EARLE. Is that amount supposed to replace both of these ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a further amount in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. EARLE. How much ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is an amount of $80,000 in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. EARLE. Is that supposed to cover the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the amount that will likely be paid out on the contracts that will be made during the fiscal year until the department is able to ask a further vote of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total cost be ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total cost is estimated at $169,000.

New dredging plant, British Columbia, one tug and two hopper scows, $36,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this be the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is estimated to be the total cost.

New dredging plant generally, $60,000.

Mr. HYMAN. That is all over the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for repairs or building over or what ? It is hardly a new dredging plant ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is not so much for the building of dredges as for the building of vessels accessory to dredges, such as scows, &c. Accidents often happen, and it is from this vote that all of that is taken. Everything that is necessary as accessory to the dredges.

Dredging, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, $115,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the running expenses of the plant belonging to the government in the maritime provinces.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). Last year the Hon. Mr. Sutherland made a promise that at the first favourable opportunity when dredges could be secured some of the harbours in Halifax county would be favoured with a visit from one of those dredges. There are several public wharfs in Halifax county which require a small amount of dredging to make them effective, not a large amount but a small amount, and I would ask the minister if he would give us an engagement that at the very earliest opportunity, say next summer, he will endeavour to assist these harbours in that way. The dredging required is not extensive and a small amount would make these harbours effective.

Mr. HYMAN. I can only say that the large dredge 'The Fielding' which is now being constructed at Sorel, as soon as she is completed will greatly relieve the situation. She is very large and powerful, supposed to be the most powerful dredge in the world. When she is ready the department will have better and greater opportunities of performing works such as the hon. gentleman refers to. There has been a great deal of difficulty in the maritime provinces, the amount of dredging required is very great and in some harbours it is almost continuous, so that the Department of Public Works have considerable difficulty at all times in securing sufficient dredges. I can only promise to give every consideration possible to Halifax.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). May I ask the hon. minister when that will be ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have already answered that question.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). We have been promised that dredge in the province of Nova Scotia for the last three or four years.

Mr. KAULBACH. The promise to which the hon. member for Victoria has referred I think is one that is in his memory with relation to the county of Lunenburg. The member for that county has been applying for years and nothing has been done. The promise has always been made that the dredge would be completed, and that when she was in service Lunenburg would be recognized the first of all. The general trade of the place is being interfered with for the want of this improvement. There is no county that requires the dredge more than the county I have the honour to represent. There is more shipping there than in any other part of the province, Halifax not excepted.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I may say in connection with the observations of the minister that in Halifax county we do not require a large amount of dredging, but if we had one of the small dredges at an early period, she could do a large amount of work that would be of great benefit.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not intend to say that it was not the intention of the department to have the 'Fielding' do the work to which he refers, because I hope that she will soon be able to take the place of some of the other dredges.

Mr. WILMOT. I would like to know if any dredging is being done on the St. John river in New Brunswick.

Mr. HYMAN. There is some being done at the present time in St. John. Representations have been made to the department with regard to dredging the St. John river, and we are endeavouring to do our best to meet the wishes of the people of that river. The dredge 'New Brunswick' is now at

work there, where there are a number of wharfs that require a small amount of dredging. I cannot tell at which particular wharf she is working at the present time, but she is engaged doing work that has been asked for by the Navigation Company and by the people of the city.

Mr. KAULBACH. There are a number of dredges employed in the province of Nova Scotia doing work that is less needed than that I referred to a moment ago. A small dredge will do for some of these harbours equally as well as a larger one. I would urge that this work be looked after at the earliest possible moment, as the trade and interests of Lunenburg as a county are suffering. A number of vessels are compelled to go to Halifax and discharge there and then reship their cargoes of salt, for the want of dredging in the harbours of Lunenburg, Bridgewater and Mahone Bay.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry that I cannot make the hon. gentleman any definite promise in regard to the matter. As a matter of fact there are two dredges doing work in Nova Scotia. When we have the dredge 'Fielding' at our disposal, we hope to relieve these dredges that are now there from some of the work they are doing, and then we shall be glad to send them somewhere eise.

Mr. KAULBACH. Why should favour be shown to those counties where the work is less needed than in my county ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think the people of those counties where these dredges are working would agree with the hon. gentleman that his county needs the work more than theirs do.

Mr. KAULBACH. It can easily be ascertained that there is very little shipping in some places where the dredges have been employed for the last few years.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the experience with the new suction dredge that was built, I mean the 'Tarte ?'

Mr. HYMAN. She was only working for a short period before meeting with an accident, but the report of the engineers' department is that just previous to the accident she was doing more work than had ever been performed by any other dredge in the world. That is a large statement, but it is borne out by the reports.

Mr. SPROULE. What happened to her ?

Mr. HYMAN. Her boiler burst. But before the accident she did 38,000 yards in one day. That is entirely beyond anything that has been accomplished before.

Mr. KAULBACH. All the more reason why she should be employed in the work I have referred to.

Mr. HYMAN. I am afraid the 'Tarte' would be found an unwieldy dredge to take down to Lunenburg. It is a suction dredge.

Mr. KAULBACH. We would be well satisfied to have her there until the other can be brought into service.

Dredging, Ontario and Quebec, $95,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give us an explanation about the Port Credit harbour that I brought up.

Mr. HYMAN. I cannot give any more explanation than I endeavoured to give a short time ago. The hon. gentleman has applied for a certain work to be done in Port Credit harbour. Is the dredging to be done at the mouth of the harbour ?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. If it is dredging at the mouth of the harbour, the work is so small that it would be useless to give it out by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that likely to be done this summer or fall ? I do not wish to press the matter, I understand the hon. gentleman is doing his best. It is a long time since the promise was made, but I suppose it is almost impossible for him to meet the wishes of the people at all the harbours. With regard to its being a private harbour, it is owned by a private company. But the hon. gentleman must bear in mind that the government has expended money on that harbour in days gone by. In 1892, dredging was done there by the department that cost $1,214.75 ; in 1893 the work cost $592. Last year the minister sent an acting engineer to examine the work, and he reported what was required in the way of repairs :

The following is an estimate of work required :—

West side, 275 lineal feet of close pile work at $15 per foot..	$4,125
East side, 390 lineal feet of close pile work at $15 per foot..	5,850
Dredging, 14,000 cubic yards at 15 cents per yard..	2,100
General repairs to piers..	1,000
	$13,075

The hon. minister will notice that there was an estimate of $2,100 for dredging a small proportion of the whole amount required. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that this is an important harbour. It is a natural harbour, there is a great deal of traffic between Toronto and Hamilton and this harbour is necessary as a harbour of refuge. I would further draw his attention to the fact that there are two large manufacturing establishments at this place, one large starch work employing a great many hands and another, a pressed brick work, which is now in operation and which is likely to employ an increased number of hands. In addition I may say, that the appropriation, if properly expended, would serve very many other citizens in that locality in respect to getting in coal supplies, a commodity which is very impor-

tant in the province of Ontario at the present time. If that harbour were put in proper shape vessels could come in with coal and the farmers and citizens generally in that neighbourhood would be able to purchase their coal at a very much cheaper rate than they can now, being compelled to bring it in by rail. I do not wish to press the matter further. I have introduced it at every session during this parliament. The government, I think, have made an effort in the shape of promises and I am quite sure the promises have been honestly made but there does seem to be a difficulty in securing sufficient dredges to meet a case of this kind. May I ask the hon. minister if he has a dredge working in the harbour of Toronto or of Hamilton ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no dredge working at Toronto but there is a dredge engaged in some large work in Hamilton.

Mr. BLAIN. May we expect that possibly during this summer something will be done ? I may say that the longer the delay the greater will be the work that will be necessary. In the petition that was presented to the government from this section last year it was pointed out that :

> The entrance to the harbour is almost filled with sand, making it impossible for vessels with a draught of 4 or 5 feet to enter.

I would therefore draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that the longer the delay the greater will be the amount of work necessary, and that possibly the estimate given by the engineer last year of $2,100, if the work is left for another year, will require to be doubled. The hon. minister will see the importance of securing a dredge as soon as possible in order that the citizens of that section of the country may be served by a proper appropriation for the prosecution of this work.

Mr. HYMAN. The petition to which the hon. gentleman refers was brought to the attention of the department and there have been numerous requests made in regard to this work which the hon. gentleman has so forcibly brought to the attention of the committee. It will be the duty of the department to give its attention to the matter, but in the absence of any available dredge it is entirely impossible for me to make such a promise as he suggests. I can only hope that circumstances will intervene that will permit this dredging to be done.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that as soon as this dredge is available the hon. gentleman will give it his attention ?

Mr. HYMAN. As soon as the dredge is available I will give it my serious attention.

Dredging, British Columbia, $35,000.

Mr. EARLE. Before we leave the question of dredging in the west there is a matter that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, as I understand the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) is to leave in a few days for British Columbia. Dredging in the inner harbour of Victoria has been going on for a great many years. It is impossible to make the harbour capable of admitting the modern vessels that are coming to the port to-day, and the only port we had with sufficient water to accommodate these vessels has been taken over by the admiralty so that it has been left to a private individual to give us all the accommodation there is at the present time outside of the inner harbour for deep water vessels. That gentleman has spent half a million dollars but it has been found that the harbour which he has provided is not capable of accommodating the shipping which comes to the port. There has been a question discussed with regard to affording all the capacity that we require in the future by the building of a breakwater from the outer point or wharf to Brotchie Ledge. It is a question that ought to have been taken up some years ago as it is the only proposition within reasonable cost that would afford the extent of harbour that is required. I think there is a distance of about a thousand yards from the shore to Brotchie Ledge, which if connected by a breakwater would afford wharfage accommodation for any amount of shipping. I would ask the hon. minister to be kind enough to call the attention of his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, now that he is going to pay a visit to British Columbia, to the matter, and ask him to look into it and report as to the feasibility of that scheme. It would cost very little to get a report upon the expense of construction from the engineer there because a very late and very close hydrographic survey has been made by Mr. Gamble, who was formerly the Dominion engineer in British Columbia, and all the data required to have an estimate made of the cost is obtainable without any expense whatever. If the hon. minister will be kind enough to have the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries called to that matter before he goes and if he will ask him to look into it while he is there it will be less expensive than if it were done at any other time.

Mr. HYMAN. I shall be very glad to call the attention of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the matter and ask him to look into it when he is visiting Victoria and I shall be very glad to get from him any report that he sees fit to make on his return. I am sure that if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries enjoys his visit to Victoria as much as I did the last time I was there and if he

receives all the courtesies with which I was favoured he will come back in a happy frame of mind and will be able to recommend to the department any expenditure that may be required to have the work done.

Public Works, slides and booms, St. Maurice district—improvements of boom works to facilitate the floating and storage of logs, &c., $40,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a revote. The intention is to proceed with the work of the construction of mooring piers and fly booms, the construction of a mooring pier at Ste. Flore, the construction of 600 feet of two fly booms at Les Hêtres, the construction of a mooring pier at Pointe à Bernard and other works and in addition to these there are the usual contingencies amounting in all to $40,000.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he knows what it costs the government to meet the running expenses of these booms and slides and what the revenue from them is ?

Mr. HYMAN. The gross revenue was $29,232 and the cost of running expenses $11,501, apart from construction charged to capital.

Mr. MORIN. In this case the government gets a surplus of revenue over expenditure which in most instances is not the case. I do not see why the government should go into the business of erecting booms and slides for lumbermen. I have been in the business for thirty years and whenever there was a boom or slide or dam to be built I did it myself. The government might as well build sawmills for the lumbermen.

Mr. HYMAN. This question has received the consideration of all governments since 1851 and it has been looked upon as a national expenditure. The revenue which is derived from it at the present time is very large. For the reason that this is a general work and that one individual for lack of capital or other reasons could not undertake it, it is undertaken by the government.

Roads and bridges.—To open a pack trail from Peace River to Pelly River, $25,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is asked for by the mounted police, the intention being to open a trail so that in case of emergency, police might be sent from British Columbia to the Yukon.

Telegraph line between Deer Island, New Brunswick, and Eastport, Maine, $3,500.

Mr. GANONG. Is it the intention of the government to build that line this year ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many miles of government lines in Canada ?

Mr. HYMAN. Six thousand five hundred.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is Prince Edward Island connected with the government telegraph system ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. I have a map here of all our telegraph lines which I will send to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Thank you. Is it the intention to extend the Magdalen Island line to Cape Breton ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is now connected in an indirect way by St. Paul's island and is open for private business.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How near does the line approach Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. HYMAN. The nearest point is Port Hood, a distance of about thirty miles.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What would it cost to extend that line to Prince Edward Island?

Mr. HYMAN. From $600 to $700 a knot.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be about $20,000. What rates do you charge ?

Mr. HYMAN. They are based upon commercial rates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On a recent visit to Prince Edward Island, I found there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the existing telegraph service. The rates paid by the people are double the ordinary rates and from eight o'clock at night till eight o'clock in the morning telegraph communication with the rest of the world is cut off. Has the government under consideration the amelioration of the telegraphic conditions in Prince Edward Island, which apparently could be effected by a small expenditure in connecting the island with the government system at Port Hood ? That may be a suggestion which is impracticable. I am asking entirely for information.

Mr. HYMAN. The matter has been brought to the attention of the department, and there is an item in the supplementary estimates of $5,000, in addition to the $2,000, which was the amount in the estimates last year. I intend to ask the House to place that $5,000 at the disposal of the department, so that it may enter into negotiations with the companies with a view to obtaining an improved service for Prince Edward Island. That is the idea with which the amount is placed in the estimates. Whether it would prove a profitable undertaking for the government to construct the cable line, which the hon. gentleman suggests, is a matter that would have to be considered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No disposition was made of the sum voted last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a sum voted annually, arising out of the terms of union, which require that we shall keep up telegraphic communication with Prince Edward

Island; and the $2,000 a year is an old subsidy which the Dominion government was to pay. It is now proposed to increase the vote from $2,000 to $7,000, in the hope that we may come to a better arrangement with the companies. With regard to a cable between Port Hood and the island, that would hardly improve the communication in the way the island people most desire. What they are anxious to have is communication with the mainland and also with all parts of the upper provinces; and the hope is that some arrangement may be made with the present companies whereby, in consideration of some increased subsidy, they will reduce the rates and give the accommodation which the people require in regard to later hours.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you connect the island with Port Hood, would you not connect it with the telegraph system of Nova Scotia, and therefore with that of the continent?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; but there is not much commercial business coming from the upper provinces by that way. I think all the commercial business would come by the Western Union or the Canadian Pacific Railway lines. However, all these matters are worthy of consideration. We all recognize the desirability of giving the island better accommodation, and if the House votes the minister the $5,000 which he is asking for, we hope that some arrangement can be made with the companies. If not, the question of the advisability of the government laying a cable will arise. That could best be done between the capes, and perhaps some working arrangement could be made with the companies.

Mr. R. L .BORDEN. Communication between the island and Port Hood would connect with the Western Union system. I do not know whether the Canadian Pacific Railway lines extend there or not.

Mr. FIELDING. They are not in that part of Cape Breton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I recollect that there is some difference between the view of the contract with this cable company held by the people of the island and the view of those interested in the company. I do not remember the exact nature of the dispute. Possibly the Minister of Finance will recall it.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The original contract with the company, which was first known as the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company, which has since been absorbed or controlled by the Anglo-American, which is associated with the Western Union Company, provided that no other company should have the right to land a cable on Prince Edward Island. But from the point of view of the island people, and the point of view of the Canadian government, that is understood to apply entirely to the landing of a cable from Europe, and would not shut out the landing of a cable from Canada. The company takes a different view; but the parliament of Canada has rejected that view in the last year or two by granting a charter to another cable company, giving it the right to do business with Prince Edward Island, as well as with other parts of Canada. The question may possibly have to be decided in the courts; but the idea of the monopoly has never been acknowledged by the government of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am glad that the matter has received the attention of the government. There will be an opportunity of discussing it again. May I ask the Minister of Public Works whether the extension of the government system of telegraphs is in pursuance of any definite plan, or whether it is made from time to time as immediate circumstances may seem to require?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think there is any definite plan. Each case is considered as it comes up.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the statement made a couple of years ago. We were told that there was a definite plan, and that the government telegraph system was being extended from time to time along the coast.

Mr. FIELDING. The general rule with regard to the government telegraph lines is that they shall be extended to portions of the coast which are isolated—in other words, to portions of Canada which ordinary commercial enterprise would hardly reach. That is the idea with which they were started, and we still cling to that idea. In pursuance of it, we are opening up the Yukon and the Labrador coast by telegraph. In a sparsely settled country there may be reasons, in the saving of life and property, for erecting telegraph lines.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For example, between Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood there is a land line indicated. Is there a private line between these two points?

Mr. HYMAN. There is, I understand, a private line between those two points—the main line of the Western Union.

Telegraph lines—Quebec—Bersimis to Godbout telegraph line, P. Q., $6,000.

Mr. MORIN. What is the distance from Bersimis to Godbout?

Mr. HYMAN. About 90 miles.

Mr. MORIN. Is there a drive road or sleigh road between these points?

Mr. HYMAN. This is being built along the shore.

Telegraph lines—Quebec—to repair and improve roadway and increase operating facilities generally to eastward of Godbout, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE: Is not that a provincial work ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is for the roadway on either side of the line for the purpose of the maintenance of the line and is not a highway.

Telegraph lines—Quebec—Anticosti island—renewal of line wire between Fox Bay and Becscie River, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the Marconi system, to which we are giving $80,000 per year, working ?

Mr. HYMAN. Very satisfactorily, but this is a matter which comes under the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Miscellaneous—Public Works, arbitrations and awards, including payments authorized, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it because you are expecting to employ civil servants as arbitrators and pay them something in addition to their salaries that you put in this item ?

Mr. HYMAN. The expenditure last year on this vote was only $226.12. The vote is only taken in case any expenditure should be necessary.

Public Works—miscellaneous—surveys and inspections, $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. You spent $50,000 last year. What was that for ?

Mr. HYMAN. It was spent on purchasing instruments and supplies necessary for surveys. The season was too late last year to start the survey, but the supplies were purchased and the parties are out in the field now.

Mr. SPROULE. How many is the party to consist of ?

Mr. HYMAN. Each party consists of ten or twelve—the ordinary survey party.

National Art Gallery, Ottawa, including the purchase of painting on the advice of a committee of artists, $7,500.

Mr. HYMAN. With the consent of the House $750 of this will be spent in having a painting of the late Chief Justice Armour.

Public Works Department—Chief Architect's office—salaries of architects, draughtsmen and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $32,200.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you put these words in 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ?'

Mr. HYMAN. Because these are technical men, not put on the permanent list, and you could not get the services of such men if they had to come in for the small sum of $400.

Public Works Department—miscellaneous—to provide for one half of the salary of the departmental photographer, $800.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with this vote I would ask why it is that after the adoption of the amendment of last year providing for the placing of these temporary clerks upon the permanent list we still provide the same vote for the same number of employees.

Mr. FIELDING. The amendment of last year did not require that all these persons should not be put on the permanent list. It was an enabling Act which enabled the government to take a number of these temporary people and put them on the permanent list. It was not intended that they all should be put on but in many cases it was done. It was done in many cases but not universally.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that all who had been employed for a certain number of years were placed on the permanent list ?

Mr. FIELDING. The intention was to take a number of the temporaries who were especially qualified and worthy and put them on the permanent list. I think in this case they were not put on.

Public Works Department—Miscellaneous—to provide for expenditure in connection with a transportation commission, $25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no report from the Transportation Commission yet. They are visiting different parts of the country and I would suggest that they should make an annual report as they are conducting themselves as if their commission was a permanent commission.

Mr. HYMAN. I think the hon. gentleman's suggestion is a good one. There has been no final report yet and I shall communicate with the committee asking them for an interim report or a report which can be distributed with the report of the Public Works Department.

Land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service, also maintenance of Marconi wireless telegraphy at Belle Isle, $80,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought this was in the Marine Department.

Mr. HYMAN. No. I am informed that this part of the system is working very well and very satisfactory. It is only twenty-two miles.

Mr. SPROULE. This was the sum which we gave them.

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend was mistaken. It happens to be an equal sum but the $80,000 which we gave to the Marconi Company for a station at Glace Bay is what my hon. friend is referring to. That $80,000 was a special vote that appeared only in one year. It was paid and the transaction was closed so far as our expenditure is concerned. The matter has not made

all the progress we could desire, but the Marconi people tell us that the experiments are going on satisfactorily. They have been telling us that for many months, and we are not in a position to give much additional information on the subject. This, however, is a different matter, and is for maintenance of other telegraph service.

Quebec harbour improvements, $100,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This is under contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When will it be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a large work, and the engineer informs me it will take 18 months anyway to complete it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there a time fixed by the contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. A time is fixed by the contract, but the engineer is not prepared to say that it will be completed within the time. A great many difficulties have been met with in regard to dredging, &c., one way and another. I had the pleasure of seeing the work the other day, and I think the contractor has done very good work indeed.

Manitoba—St. Andrew's rapids improvements, Red river, $80,000.

Mr. PUTTEE. What position is that work in now ?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer's department is looking into the whole question, but I have not yet had any report. They were up there about a month ago.

Mr. PUTTEE. Are you going to call for new tenders, or another contract ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not yet got a report from the engineer ; when I do, I will take the matter into consideration.

Transportation facilities—lower division of Montreal harbour—improvements below St. Mary's current, $75,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When will this work be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. Probably it will be completed this fall, this vote is to complete.

Ontario—Port Colborne—harbour improvements, $85,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This work is under contract, which was let on the 8th of June, 1904, and calls for completion on the 30th of November, 1905.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give us some explanation of the manner in which the money has been spent at Port Colborne?

Mr. HYMAN. All by contract. The main breakwater has been completed. This contract is for a further eastern breakwater.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business do you propose to take up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand an hon. gentleman opposite desires to move an amendment to supply ; therefore a motion to go into supply will be made in the morning. When that motion is disposed of, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will have some estimates, then the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 29, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 162) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Alien Labour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, although the Bill is entitled 'an Act to amend, consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Alien Labour,' it will be necessary to amend that title inasmuch as it is not a consolidation. The provisions of the present Bill are as follows :

One section of the Bill amends section 1 of the Alien Labour Act, 1897. That original section provides that it is an offence to import alien labour under contract. It was found that this provision could be easily evaded by the contract not being made abroad, and therefore it is proposed to strengthen the clause by making it an offence to import under a promise or offer of employment.

Another section containing a number of subsections provides machinery whereby employers may obtain judicial permission to import labour that cannot be procured in Canada. At present the spirit of the Act, so far as it is enforcible, is stringent, and it is represented that in many cases labour not procurable in Canada could not be lawfully imported. It is expedient that under these circumstances a measure should be adopted to meet such a situation so that there would be no inducement to persons in need of labour of a particular class to import illegally that class of labour. The machinery provided by this Bill contemplates an application to a judge for permission. That application will require to be published in the press and a hearing of the application can be conducted in the open court as in civil causes. All parties interested have a right to appear and if the judge is

of opinion that the application should be granted, he may do so, setting forth the extent to which he grants the leave and to the extent to which he grants the leave the order is an authority to the employer to import the persons authorized by the order.

Another section amends section 3 of the Act of 1897, which was further amended by the statutes of 1901. That section as it stands to-day requires the consent of a certain functionary to the bringing of an action for a violation of the provisions of the Alien Labour Act. The proposed section dispenses with any such preliminary sanction.

Under the law as it is to-day it is declared illegal to induce people to come into Canada in contravention of the Act by promise of employment by advertisements. It has been held by a judge of the Supreme Court in the province of British Columbia that an advertisement, for example, such as 'wanted,' naming a large number of men, and other inducements which might be or might not be correct, was not an offence against the law inasmuch as the advertisement could not be held to be a promise. It is proposed therefore to add to this section after the word 'employment,'

—or by representations justifying reasonable expectation of employment.

There are some other verbal changes.

Another section deals with the case of inducing people to come to Canada by false representations. This spring there was an illustration of the injury done by men inducing people to come to Canada by false representations. It appears that a very large number of Italians, going up to the thousands, reached Montreal this spring in search for employment under circumstances that amounted to a serious fraud upon these people, and a demoralization of the labour market of Montreal and perhaps of other portions of Canada. A commission was issued to inquire into the circumstances attending the bringing in of those men. The commissioner has not yet reported, but his investigation was conducted in open court, and the press reported somewhat fully the evidence given. I do not purpose at this moment to state in any detail the nature of the evidence, but I think that any one who has perused so much of it as appeared in the press cannot but reach the conclusion that the methods adopted to induce these unfortunate people to come to Canada were criminal and cruel in the extreme. They were brought into Canada by the most grossly false representations originating in Montreal, by a scheme of fraud for the enrichment of men in Montreal to bring men here thousands of miles from their own homes, and, when they reached Montreal, to induce them to contribute money to the persons promoting this agency, in the deluded belief that they would thereby immediately secure profitable employment. The scheme seemed to be conceived and carried out in fraud. It is proposed by this section to make such false representations as to the state of the labour market a criminal offence.

Another section proposes to incorporate into law the spirit of the clauses introduced into the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Contract, requiring the work on lines constructed by a railway subsidized or aided by the government either by gift or loan of money or guarantee or other valuable consideration to be carried on in accordance with the spirit of the clauses made applicable to that contract. Hon. gentleman are familiar with the provisions of that contract. They are to the effect that, wherever possible, the labour shall be British or Canadian labour, and that in case contracts are made with companies for the work of construction, the companies shall be incorprated in Canada under Dominion or provincial legislation, the majority of the directors shall be citizens of this empire and the majority of the capital shall be owned by citizens of the empire.

Another section provides that persons infringing the Act by importing the classes of labour in question, that is in violation of the law, shall be liable for the expense of their deportation to the country from which they came, and obligations are also cast upon the ships bringing out persons of this class knowing, or having reasonable ground for believing, that they have been brought here in contravention of the law. Then some other provisions of the Bill deal with undesirable classes of people, not being brought here in connection with labour at all, and it is proposed to prohibit from landing or remaining in Canada any of the following classes :

Idiots, insane persons, paupers, or persons likely to become a public charge, professional beggars, persons afflicted with loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, polygamists, anarchists or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of all forms of law, the constituted authority of the country or the assassination of public officials, prostitutes, and persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women for the purpose of prostitution ; persons who have been within one year deported or ordered to be deported from Canada for having entered Canada in violation of any of the provisions of the said Act of 1897 as amended, or of this Act, and of persons convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude; provided that this shall not be held to exclude from Canada persons convicted of offences purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

Another section deals with the liability of the owners of and persons interested in the vessel that aids in any violation of this Act. Another section provides for the arrest of any alien brought in in contravention of the law, and for his detention while waiting to be transferred to the vessel to be sent back to his own country. Another section gives the Minister of Labour, instead of as

at present Attorney General, the authority for ordering deportation. Another section authorizes the Governor in Council to appoint special officers for the enforcement of the law and to pass necessary regulations for its more effective working. Another section provides that in case His Majesty should be obliged to defray any expenses in the first place connected with the deportation of persons illegally brought into the country there shall be a clause of action over by the Crown against the persons primarily the cause of such prohibited labour or persons having entered Canada. There are some provisions that I have not alluded to, but they will more fully appear when the Bill is printed and placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I would ask the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) if there is any provision in the Bill to oblige them to inspect immigrants before they are allowed to leave the port from which the ship sails, because, unless that is a part of the law, I think it would be very deficient. We saw a case of that kind when the steamer 'Lake Simcoe' landed a number of Syrians the other day. It appeared to me that had there been an efficient inspection at Havre, France, the ship would not have taken any of them on board. The owners of the ship have had to become responsible for twenty-nine that were allowed to come over without any visible means of support. More than thirty of them have had to be deported and there are a large number of others who are subject to treatment. That is an important provision and should be enacted in the Bill.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). There is much in the remark of my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson), but perhaps when he has looked at the Bill he will find that clause 14, or at all events one of the clauses near the end of the Bill, authorizes the Governor in Council to appoint special officers in order to accomplish the object of the Bill. If the object of the Bill, for instance, is to exclude from landing in Canada any undesirable classes of persons, my hon. friend's proposal would be in harmony with the clause that the Governor in Council should appoint such officers as are necessary in order to give effect to that prohibitory clause. It would strike me as a very wise thing that these proscribed classes should be intercepted at the earliest moment. If the government is of the opinion that it would be wise to have such examination made before the vessel sails I think my hon. friend will find that the measure proposes to give the government full authority to make any such arrangement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I, of course, do not propose to discuss the Bill at this stage. May I ask whether or not the Bill has been printed or is it introduced with the intention of having it printed? Has the printing been expedited in any way?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not sufficiently printed to enable me to hand my hon. friend a copy, but it was printed in galley form and has been revised.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I desire to suggest is that the printing may be expedited as much as possible. It is, we hope, a very late hour in the session and we would like to see it as soon as possible.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will try to have it in galley form in the hands of my hon. friends to-morrow morning. I will send a number of copies so that other hon. gentlemen may be able to see it.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Is it the intention to have the evidence which is being taken by Judge Winchester respecting employment of aliens on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and respecting the influx of Italian labour into the city of Montreal printed and distributed for the use of members of the House?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is intended to have it printed at the earliest possible moment, but it will not be possible to have it printed before prorogation if it takes place at an early date. As soon as the inquiry is completed I will have it printed and distributed. The inquiry has not yet been completed, but I was informed by Judge Winchester, who passed through Ottawa on his way from Montreal a few days ago, that there only remained the examination of Mr. Lumsden and perhaps the cross-examination of Sir Sandford Fleming as he has not been able yet to conclude the evidence of these two gentlemen.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LATE MR. PROULX, M.P.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called it is my sad duty to have to inform the House that we have lost another of our colleagues in the person of Mr. Isidore Proulx, member for the electoral district of Prescott. As is well known by most members of the House Mr. Proulx had been in poor health for many months past. He had undergone last autumn an operation which he bore with great fortitude, and it was hoped that it had checked the disease, but unfortunately the vital forces were gone and he was carried away at a comparatively early period. He left us last week with the intention of coming back but we are not to see him any more in this House. Mr. Proulx was a quiet, unobtrusive member of this House, but very much respected by all of those who came in contact with him. and I can bear testimony that he was as

faithful a friend as ever lived. I am sure that hon. members on both sides of the House will join in sympathizing with the bereaved family in the sad mourning through which they are now passing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to join in the expression to which the Prime Minister has given utterance with regard to Mr. Proulx. While it is true that I did not enjoy an intimate acquaintance with him, nevertheless I learned to know him sufficiently to respect and appreciate him. I am sure that all of us on this side of the House will join in the sympathy and condolence which the Prime Minister on this occasion has so fittingly expressed.

CANADIAN MILITARY GAZETTE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before you proceed with government orders, there is a matter to which I wish to draw attention. I sent for the Minister of Militia——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend is going to make a personal explanation, I might state that the House will be moved into supply in a few minutes, and he will have a better opportunity then of disclosing his grievance.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have no personal explanation to make. It is a matter in connection with an article in the paper this morning, and I think this is the proper time to bring it up ; is it not ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think not. It would be more opportune to do so when the House is moved into supply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It will not take more than a moment. In the 'Citizen' this morning, under the heading

Attempt to Dragoon—Methods of the Martinet to Stifle Criticism—Minister of Militia Takes Revenge Upon the Canadian Military Gazette for Daring to Disapprove of His Course in Dundonald Exposures.

I find an article referring to a letter signed by L. J. Pinault, Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, addressed to the proprietors of the 'Canadian Military Gazette.' The letter is dated 28th of June, and reads :

Department of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, June 28, 1904.

Sir,—I am directed by the Honourable the Minister of Militia and Defence to inform you that the agreement entered into with the Canadian Military Gazette, by my letter of the 29th August, 1903, will terminate on the 30th September next, from which date this department will not hold itself responsible for the publication and payment thereof of the Royal Military College advertisement and the Militia General Orders.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) L. J. PINAULT,
Colonel,
Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

The proprietors of the Canadian Military Gazette.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The paper says :

It seems superfluous to comment on this letter. It tells the publishers of the 'Gazette' very plainly that the minister does not approve of its recent policy in the Dundonald exposures and gives it until September 30 to make amends. If it does not do so a considerable part of its revenue will be cut off.

This is the third time this payment has been withdrawn in an effort to influence the 'Gazette.' The threat will have no more influence now than on the two former occasions. The 'Gazette' will continue to pursue the policy that all honest men believe to be in the best interests of the country—for the militia and country are one.

In an editorial comment the 'Citizen' very properly points out :

The idea that men who volunteer their services to the country in most instances for nothing or at a sacrifice of both time and money, should also be expected to surrender their liberty as citizens not only when on duty but when in civilian life is too ridiculous for consideration, unless the object is to ruin the militia force of this country entirely. The members of the militia make enough sacrifices as it is out of patriotism to keep up a force that should be kept up by the country in such a manner as to at least make the sacrifice part of it unnecessary.

Then follows an illustration of the power of the minister, or of a general, or of any officer to control any officer or man under him, when he is not on duty or in uniform, and it illustrates the case of Sir Mackenzie Bowell when years ago he was major in the militia, and when the general officer commanding sought to influence him and dragoon him for certain expressions to which he had given utterance. In view of the great importance of this question to civil liberty, and in view of the erroneous impression that the officers of the force all over the country have, I think it is proper that some attention should be paid to the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not take my suggestion. He is out of order altogether, and the only way he can put himself in order is to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, I can move the adjournment of the House. Section 72 of the proposed Militia Act reads :

72. The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's Regulations, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of Canada for the government of the militia, and every officer this Act or the regulations made thereunder, to from the time of being called out for active service, and also during the period of annual drill or training under the provisions of this Act, and also at any other time while upon military duty or in the uniform of his corps upon or within any rifle range or any armoury, or other place where arms, guns, ammunition or other military stores are kept, or any drill

shed or other building or place used for militia purposes, or during any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present in the ranks, when going to or from the place of drill or parade, and also whether in uniform or not at any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present as a spectator.

Subsection 2 :

2. Officers and men of the permanent force and members of the permanent staff of the militia shall at all times be subject to military law.

It is clear this last section applies only to the permanent force, which, of course, is subject to the military law throughout the year, but the militia force is not subject to military law except they are on duty or in the uniform of their corps. In order to encourage the officers and men of the permanent force to be free men, and to take an interest in military matters and let the public have the benefit of their views from time to time, I have given the minister notice that I intend to move the following amendment to section 79 of the Militia Bill :

Nothing in this Act shall at any time prevent any officer or man of the militia, except when on parade or on duty, from temperately expressing his views on questions affecting the welfare of the militia force and communicating suggestions, criticisms and statements thereon to the public of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is going to discuss the Militia Bill, that is clearly out of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am discussing civil liberty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Humbug.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I find in the Toronto 'News' of yesterday interviews from three prominent military men, which show that the military officers of the country do not understand that the men under them are absolutely free. I regret that a couple of these officers think they have power over their men when not on duty. For example, suppose a private in Col. Pellatt's regiment should assault him on the public street when not on duty or not in uniform, according to the generally expressed notion the colonel would have control of that soldier under the military law. That is not so. All the redress he could possibly have against him would be under the common law, under which he could be fined. I ask any one of these gentlemen, from the minister down, to point out where directly or indirectly the King's regulations or the Army Act authorizes the bringing of that man under the military law. We want to resist these attempts at dragooning ; we want to resist these attempts at establishing militarism in Canada. We have seen instances of Straffords, Lauds and Jeffreys and Robespierres, and democrats up to the hilt, becoming aristocrats, but there is only one way to preserve civil and religious liberty, and that is to check militarism and tyranny whether it is found in the Prime Minister or in his subordinate the Minister of Militia.

We want no dragooning in this country ; we want no muzzling of the public press or of private individuals in the Dominion of Canada. I move the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). As to the letter which has been read, which appears to have been sent by the deputy minister of my department to the printing or publishing office, I can only say that I never saw the letter. I presume it is a business letter written to give notice at the beginning of the financial year, so that if it is thought desirable to terminate the contract, for which it is necessary to give three months' notice, that contract can be terminated. As to the military law, I cannot understand the hon. gentleman bringing the matter up now, seeing that, as he says himself, he has given notice that when the Bill comes up for third reading he is going to propose an amendment. I shall be prepared, when that time arrives, to discuss it. I cannot understand why he attempts to precipitate a discussion upon it at this moment.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well if some of our militia colonels went on a pilgrimage with the Doukhobors, or engaged in a struggle with the spirit wrestlers, and gave the sane people of this country a little time to attend to the ordinary affairs of life.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to draw attention to the exact wording of the letter : 'I am directed by the Minister of Militia and Defence to inform you.'

An hon. MEMBER. What is the date of the letter ?

Mr. SPROULE. The date is June 28, 1904. Surely these words are specific enough.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Every letter sent out from my department is couched in similar phraseology. I am responsible, of course.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Might I ask the minister at what period the fiscal year ends—the 30th of September or when ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The 30th of June.

Mr. CLARKE. The advertisement, I understand, runs to the 30th of September.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Three months' notice is required to have a contract for any advertisement terminated.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the minister recollect if similar notices were sent to other journals publishing this notice of the military school?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no other journal publishing that advertisement.

In all other journals the advertisement is inserted for one issue in the year only.

Mr. CLARKE. Has it been the practice to send a letter like this to this journal at the close of each previous fiscal year ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware, but I think so. I cannot speak positively.

Motion (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLY—TRANSPORTATION OF PERISHABLE PRODUCTS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I have a resolution to propose, and I wish to make a few remarks with regard to it. The resolution, I may say at the outset, is one censuring the government for not taking that care with regard to the transportation of perishable products from the point of origin to the markets of the world that I think they ought to have taken, and that the opportunities which have presented themselves from time to time enabled them to do. The perishable products of the country are among the most valuable of our exports, not only in the aggregate, but intrinsically. Our total exports of agricultural products for the year ending the 30th of June, 1903, amounted to $114,441,863, of which nearly one-half, or $52,880,153 were perishable products, which require special care in their transportation to the markets of the world to enable the producers to get full value for them. It therefore seems to me particularly incumbent upon the government of the day to look carefully after this matter. These products are the most valuable of our exports. On account of the skill required to produce them, they generally yield more profit than those articles in which there is a great deal of competition. Consequently the production of these perishable articles ought to be encouraged in this country. The chief item among these exports is cheese, of which we export close upon $25,000,000. Another is bacon and hams, of which we export close upon $16,000,000. These two articles require, not cold storage, but simply a thoroughly ventilated storage for their transportation, not only on land in the cars, but in ships on the sea. They simply require the temperature of the outside air, which can be obtained by thorough ventilation. The next item on the list is butter, of which we exported in the year ending the 30th of June, 1903, close on $7,000,000. This requires cold storage at a certain temperature, over which the government should have control. The next item is fruit, of which we exported in the same year $3,751,000. Some of it requires cold storage, but the greater portion requires only ventilated storage on shipboard ; and this can be got without any extra cost of freight and without any appreciable extra expense to the steamship owners. It only requires the government to exercise that supervision and control that will enable the shipper to know positively that his products will have the temperature of the ocean air in crossing the ocean, in which case they will be landed in the old country markets in a sound condition to receive the highest prevailing prices. Any loss from lack of proper transportation facilities ultimately comes out of the pockets of the producer. To the extent to which the service is imperfect, to that extent the value of the product is depreciated. The depreciation from this cause in the value of the products shipped from Montreal amounts to many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It may be said that our cold storage facilities are better than they once were. That is very true. We are certainly progressing. It would be strange if a government, in an enterprising country like Canada, were not able to improve our facilities from year to year. It would indeed be strange if the transportation companies themselves did not greatly improve their facilities without any suggestion from the government at all. For many years before we initiated cold storage we had the example of other British colonies which transported their perishable products across the tropics from the farthest corners of the world safely in cold storage, while we, who live only two weeks' journey from the British market, even yet, with all that experience of twenty years behind us, are unable to ship these perishable products in a cold storage that is anything near perfection.

Last year the government had thermograph records taken of 155 cold storage chambers carrying these perishable products. In his report of 1902, the hon. Minister of Agriculture said that butter should be carried at a temperature of 20 degrees, and he stated afterwards that to bring about the best results you should have the chamber at 10 degrees. But in these 155 records taken last year there is not one chamber that carried butter at a temperature of 10 degrees, and there are only 40 that touched a temperature of 20 degrees, and that was not the average across the ocean. Only 40 out of the 155 touched 20 degrees, and there was a very large number that carried the goods even above the freezing point. I would just enumerate a few of those. The 'Iona,' of the Thompson line, which sailed July 25, 1903, carried butter, and the butter was put in at a temperature less than 40 degrees. The Minister of Agriculture seems to be always hunting for some excuse to explain why the steamers do not carry goods at the proper temperature, and he sometimes has for excuse the plea that the butter is put in hot. But in only two of these records does it appear that the butter was put in hot. In

this case the butter was put in at a temperature below 40, or 10 degrees lower than the temperature of the car in transit usually. Yet it never ran a point lower than 32, and that only when it arrives on the other side. On the 'Monteagle,' which sailed May 29, 1903, butter went in at a temperature of 40 degrees and never reached a point lower than 34, and that only on its arrival on the other side. On the 'Montford,' which sailed August 22nd, the butter was put in at a temperature a little higher, 45 degrees, and the temperature rapidly went down to 40, showing that the butter was not hot, but it never reached a temperature lower than 32 degrees at any point, and when it reached the other side it was 33 degrees. On the 'Montcalm' the butter was put in at Montreal at 36 degrees, an exceedingly low temperature for butter to be put in the chamber, but it never got lower than 34, and several days of the journey it was 36 or 37, or warmer than when put in. On the 'Montford,' which sailed September 27th, butter was put in at 38 degrees and never got lower than 36 at any time during the journey and a large portion of it was at 39. On the 'Corinthian,' which sailed October 8th, the butter was put in at 38, a very low temperature for butter to come out of the car, and never reached a point lower than 32, and that only after the expiration of ten days. On the 'Hungarian' the butter was put in at the low temperature of 34 and never got below 31, and that in the early portion of the voyage. It gradually rose and came out at the other side at a temperature of 34.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman mean that by the time of arrival, the time of arrival in the ship or at the shop where the butter is sold ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am reading from the thermograph records, and of course these were taken while the goods were still on the ship.

On the 'Kildona' the butter went in at a temperature of 42 and 43, and it reached 30 on its arrival on the other side, but only very gradually, so that the average would not be lower than 34.

On the 'Iona' the butter went in at a temperature of 40. It immediately rose, however, to 43, then gradually went down, but at no point was lower than 32.

On the 'Devona,' June 28th, the butter went in at 37 and remained at 37 and 38 during the whole voyage.

On the 'Hurona' it went in at 50, or about the temperature of the refrigerator car in which it arrived in Montreal. It gradually went down, but at no time did it get to a point lower than 40, except for three or four hours before being unloaded on the docks it went down to 38. That was a ridiculously high temperature, and the butter could not be expected to land in good condition. When we find our exports of butter decreasing over $2,000,000 in value, no doubt that is largely due to the hard experience which the shippers of the previous year had, the records of which I am reading. On the 'Hibernian' butter went in at a temperature nearly 70, but the refrigerator chambers of that steamer were never able to get that butter down to a temperature lower than 42. That was about half way across, and instead of holding the butter at 42 and getting it even as low as 32, it gradually rose and came out at a temperature of 54. I would not be surprised if the butter on that steamer was entirely lost.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the month ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. That steamer sailed August 22nd. On the 'Iona,' which sailed 5th of September from Montreal, the butter went in at a temperature of 66, but never got to a point at any time during the journey lower than 44. In other words, it took the whole of the journey across the ocean in cold storage chambers to bring the temperature down to 44, whereas a good cold storage chamber would bring down the temperature in forty-eight or, at most, 72 hours, no matter how hot were the goods when put in, to a temperature as low as required. Then on the steamer 'Ionian,' which sailed from Montreal June 20th, the butter went in at 40 and never got below 38 during the whole journey. On the 'Kensington,' which sailed the 20th of June, the butter went in at 45, and only at the time of its arrival on the other side reached 30, or an average of about 36. On the 'Tunisian' the butter went in at 37 and never got below 35 during the whole journey. On the 'Pretorian,' sailing July 11, the butter went in at 40 and never got below 35. On the 'Bavarian' the butter went in at 34 and rose gradually to 35, and came out on the other side at 36. In other words, it was in better condition when it went on board than at any time during the journey, in so far as temperature was concerned. On the 'Pretorian,' which sailed 15th of August, the butter went in at 60, and the lowest point reached during the journey was 37. The temperature fluctuated from time to time 4 or 5 degrees every day, showing that the storage apparatus was not in proper order.

Then, the 'Canada,' sailing on 22nd August ; the butter went in at 54, and the lowest point touched during the voyage was 37, coming out, apparently, at the other side at 70. Whether that is a mistake or not, I do not know. I cannot imagine that such a thing would occur except by an accident. The butter in that case must have been very badly damaged. The lowest point reached was 37, or twenty-seven degrees higher than the minister himself and the experts say should be constantly maintained. The 'Pretorian,' sailing on September 19th, took in the butter at 55 ; lowest point reached 38, coming out on the other side at 40. The 'Lakonia,' sailing September 3rd : the butter went in at 50, and at no time in the voyage did the temperature go lower than 43. That

butter must have been almost ruined. It might as well have gone across in the ordinary storage, thus saving fifteen shillings a ton. Going in the ordinary ventilated storage it would have received just about as good treatment, so far as temperature is concerned, as in these cold storage chambers. In another chamber of the 'Lakonia' the butter went in at 40, the lowest point reached was 37½, coming out on the other side at 38. The 'Marina'; butter went in at 50, and the lowest point reached was 36, then rose to 40 and remained at about 40, coming out at that temperature at the other side. In another chamber of the 'Lakonia,' the butter went in at 50, reached 32 at the other side, the average temperature for the voyage being about 40. On the 'Kastalia,' the butter went in at 42, but rose immediately to 46, The temperature gradually went down and reached 34, or 24 degrees higher for the lowest point of the journey than the temperature which ought to be maintained according to the minister himself. On the 'Montcalm' the butter went in at 44 and reached the other side at 32.

Now, I have taken up the time of the House in reading a large number of records in order to show that, out of 155 records taken there were something like 35 or 40 where the temperature never reached a point lower than the feezing, whereas, according to the minister himself a temperature of not more than 20 is necessary, and he and the experts now unite in saying that for good results the butter should be carried at not higher than 10. I am sure everybody must agree with me that this is not a satisfactory condition of affairs. After an experience of carrying butter in cold storage by the different British colonies of twenty years and after an experience of this government of about nine years we still find that we are unable to carry a single shipment at the temperature which the experts tell us is required. Only about forty shipments ever reach that temperature during the whole journey, while about one-quarter of all the shipments were carried at a temperature above freezing point and many of them reached such a temperature that the butter must have been ruined in the voyage.

Now, who is to blame? I contend that the government are entirely to blame. This parliament voted willingly the large sum of money it thought necessary in order to secure this cold storage service. Something like $150,000 was spent by this parliament in order to secure a good cold storage system. Half of the expense of putting in the cold storage chambers has been borne by the country. As against this, I wish to point out, the ships going to the ports of the United States pay for their own cold storage chambers; the government of the United States does not go down into the pockets of the people to provide this outfit for the steamships. We have taken the people's money to pay for these improvements, in the hope that we would get a good service, and not only that, but in the hope of being able to control it. And, not only have we not got the service but we have absolutely no control. Not only have we spent the people's money to pay half the expense of providing this accommodation on the steamships, but we have given some of these lines at least enormous subsidies. The subsidy to the Allan Line was ostensibly to carry the mails; in reality it was to induce them to come to the ports of Montreal, Halifax and St. John regularly. Incidentally, in the last contract with the Allans, it was mentioned that they must provide cold storage chambers, We pay them a subsidy, besides paying half the expense of the cold storage chambers, and yet we have not an atom of control. They may carry the goods at any temperature they like. No government officer can step aboard and say: You must carry these goods at such and such a temperature. When the officers of the government go aboard these vessels they must go by the grace and favour of the company, and not by authority of this parliament or by any authority delegated to the officers by this parliament.

Now, what ought the government to have done? There are many courses they might have pursued. The simplest and most obvious thing for the government to have done, was in agreeing to pay half the cost of these cold storage facilities, to make it a condition that they should have control, that they should have power to dictate to the steamship companies at what temperature the goods should be carried. That was not done, and yet this is the most natural thing any ordinary business man would have done in his private business in a similar case. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) himself admits that he has no control. He has neglected every opportunity to put himself in a controlling position. But he and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) have had many opportunities since. First of all in making these contracts with the Allan Line and other lines to carry these goods across the ocean, they might have provided in the contract, when the large subsidy of $260,000 was given to the Allans and other large subsidies to other lines, that the government should retain control of the temperature and provide that the payment of the subsidy should be conditional upon the steamship carrying the goods at the temperature the government desired. But, nothing of the kind was done, or, apparently even thought of. The Minister of Agriculture blandly tells us that he has absolutely no control. But why did he not go to the Minister of Trade and

Commerce, when the contract was being made with the Allans, and say: We find ourselves in this position, that we have no control over the temperatures of these vessels and now is our opportunity. We must have control of the temperature. In the contract it is specified that the vessels should have cold storage facilities subject to the approval of the government. What does that mean? It means only that they must put in a refrigerator plant sufficient to produce the degree of cold required. It is as though the city of Ottawa or any other town making a lighting contract with an electric company, were to provide that there should be a power-house of a certain capacity, so many poles, so many lamps placed in certain positions, and so on—but no provision whatever as to the amount of light to be given. That is exactly our position in this case. We make it a condition that cold storage facilities shall be provided, that the chambers shall be built, the refrigerating plant put in and all that, but not a word as to the maintenance of a certain temperature during the voyage.

An hon. MEMBER. And no power to inspect.

Mr. E. D. SMITH No power to inspect, and absolutely no control over the temperature, which is the one essential thing. But, even failing this the government had still another recourse. We have on our statute-books a law providing that no steamship shall sail from our ports carrying cattle until the government inspector has been aboard to see that proper provision is made for carrying the cattle—that certain space is allowed to each beast, that there is a certain width of alley-way, certain provisions for feeding, and so on. Why could not the government have a similar statute passed with regard to the cold storage and ventilated storage on vessels sailing from our ports and thus provide in a practical way for the carrying of these products of this vast industry representing not less than $52,000,000 a year? But they neglected this third opportunity as they neglected every other. So, I am sure that anybody who studies the question will agree with me that the government are to blame that the shippers of this country have not proper cold storage facilities.

Now, the main portion of these perishable products, cheese, apples and meats, are carried in the ordinary stowage, not in cold storage. This is the most important matter of all. It is very important that we should have the six or seven millions worth of butter which we export, carried in cold storage and some of the fruit; but we still have thirty-five millions worth of goods ter which we export, carried in cold storage, simply the pure air of the ocean which costs practically nothing. It has been pointed out time and time again that all that was necessary was to provide that exhaust fans should be put on the steamers, which could be done at a trifling cost, and the ocean air sent through the holds of these vessels. If that were done all these exports could be landed on the other side in perfect condition and we could get full value instead of having a depreciation of millions of dollars every year on our apple crop. Prof. Robertson said before a committee of this House, that we would lose three millions dollars on the cheese export, which was verified the next year. All this enormous loss takes place simply because the ocean vessels and the cars in which the goods are taken from the point of origin to the sea-board are not ventilated. It has been pointed out that this can be done easily and cheaply, but all that the minister has ever done has been to send circular letters to the steamship companies, asking them to do it, asking them, out of the goodness of their hearts, to provide this facility. He has taken no power to control them that would enable the government to compel the companies to install this ventilation which would enable these products to be carried in good condition. He took no power to do this, but in his wisdom he thought he would provide something better, so he came to this House and asked for large sums of money to provide for what he calls a cool air service. This parliament voted willingly something over $100,000 to provide a cool air service, which is a sort of hybrid between cold storage and ventilated storage. What is the result? Last year of a total export of 229,000,000 pounds of cheese, 3,000,000 pounds were carried in the cool air and 226,000,000 pounds in ordinary stowage. Out of 2,000,000 barrels of apples, only 8,000 barrels were carried in the refrigerated air. Why? Not because it is not a good thing, for the cool air is all right and it would be a good thing to carry these products all in cool air storage or better still in cold storage, but there is a charge of ten shillings a ton on butter and cheese and 1s. 6d. a barrel on every barrel of apples placed in the cool air, although the minister stated that there would be no extra charge for the cool air carriage. See 'Hansard', page 5168—1901. Shippers have found that by the courtesy of the steamship companies, a large number of vessels have been fitted with a more or less thorough system of ventilation and on these steamers the goods are generally carried all right. It is also true that many vessels are not properly fitted, but yet shippers take their chance because they would rather trust to the ventilated or unventilated steamers than pay the extra charge for this cool air. In the session of 1902 he stated that these ventilated chambers would be provided and that the cool air would be provided without any extra cost, and yet we find this charge

of 1s. 6d. per barrel on apples and 10 shillings a ton on butter and cheese. It would undoubtedly be a great convenience to the shippers of this country if they could receive the benefit of this cool air for the carrying of their products with no increase of cost, but when they have to pay extra cost for it, they find it better to ship in the ordinary stowage. Let us see what the minister has done with regard to ventilated stowage. Time and time again the fact has been brought to his attention, that if these vessels were properly ventilated the goods would be carried over in proper condition. He himself, has admitted that the officers of the government on the other side on examining the apples as they came out of the vessels that were ventilated, found them in very much better condition than those on unventilated vessels. 'Hansard,' page 70, 1901. He admits that it is of very great value to the shippers of this country and yet he has taken no effective steps to ensure its being brought about. During the past three sessions it has been repeatedly pointed out to the minister that goods could be carried in perfect condition and at no extra cost to the shipper, and the minister has said that he was aware of the great benefit that would be derived from having holds ventilated, yet he has taken no steps in the meantime to provide for it. He said that he would put thermographs in each of the chambers in which these perishable products were carried, and in this way he could ascertain the temperature of each chamber on the arrival of the steamer on the other side. then if there was a thermograph on deck which would record the termperature of the ocean air, by comparing the records on the other side he would know whether the exhaust fans on the steamer had been in operation or not. He promised last session that a thermograph would be put in each chamber carrying perishable products from this country. At page 7623 of 'Hansard' he said:

> The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I ordered a large number of extra thermographs and have given most positive and reiterated instructions to the officers in charge that no chamber shall be allowed to go without a thermograph in it. If it is there it will show the temperature, and we shall be able to know whether the fans are used or not. My instructions are plain and positive and I believe they will be carried out.

He made the statement plainly and explicitly and we believed that this would be done. What were the facts? I presume that several hundred trips were made from Montreal last season and on each of these steamers there were several chambers. To make a rough guess there were probably 500 or more chambers carrying perishable products out of Montreal last year in ordinary storage as distinct from 'cold storage,' in 'cool air storage' and the minister promised he would put a themograph in each one to ascertain the temperature. There are his words, plain and explicit. Now, how many were taken? Just twelve records of these temperatures were taken. These twelve records only prove what the temperatures were in these chambers. They do not prove whether the system in operation on these steamers, or supposed to be in operation, was in order or not. This could only be done by having a thermograph also placed where the actual temperature of the ocean air would be registered, which the minister steadfastly refuses to do. A comparison between the thermograph record of temperature in the chamber and on deck would prove this absolutely. Every one of these steamers ought to have an exhaust fan for each chamber. All shippers and all experts agree that the only practicable way in which you can get ocean air through the holds of these vessels is by an exhaust fan or forced draft. I find on looking over the records that there was only a limited number of steamers that were provided with exhaust fans, that there was a great number that had no ventilation whatever and that many of them only had the trunk ventilation. That is simply an opening that will allow steam to get out but which is of no use whatever for the purpose of ventilation. Others had what is known as the cowl ventilation. That system is very good if the wind is not blowing in the same direction as that in which the steamer is going, because then the air is carried down to the bottom of the cargo, passes up through it and out, but if the wind is blowing in the same direction as the steamer is going the cowl system is no good at all. The cowl system, however, is a great deal better than having no ventilation at all provided the air is driven to the bottom of the cargo and there is an opening at the top of the chamber that will enable the air to get out. It is forced out by the impact of the air against the cowl ventilator. The air is taken to the bottom of the cargo, it is then forced up and comes out at the top of the chamber. A considerable number of vessels are fitted with these cowl ventilators, but all should be fitted with exhaust fans. If the vessels that were fitted with these fans had them in operation all the time and if they had them in every chamber, that would be what we want, but I am aware that a great many of the chambers are not fitted with these fans at all. The report simply states that there are exhaust fans on certain steamers, but I find on some of these steamers that whereas there is an exhaust fan in one chamber there is no ventilation in another chamber, so that we do not know what the system of ventilation is upon any steamer. As a matter of fact there are a number of these steamers that have not even the cowl system of ventilation. For instance, the 'Lake Champlain' has only intakes, the 'Ontarian' has only fans in one

compartment apparently, the 'Kensington' has only what are called ventilators, the 'Pretorian' has the same, the 'Canada' has the same and there are a number of other steamers such as the 'Southwark,' 'Montcalm,' which have only ventilators apparently—which means that there is no efficient ventilation at all—simply a hole in the roof which is practically no use whatever, while a number of steamers such as the 'Ionian,' 'Parisian,' 'Tunisian,' 'Peruvian,' 'Bavarian,' 'Lake Erie,' 'Dominion' and 'Mount Temple' are only very imperfectly ventilated with cowl ventilators.

This is the condition of affairs to-day in regard to the ventilation of these steamers. Notwithstanding that it is an important matter in view of the fact that we have $45,000,000 worth of products to be carried in these steamers there is no control whatever of the ventilation in the holds. The government are entirely responsible for this condition of affairs. It has been pointed out time and time again but still nothing has been done. The right hon. minister has admitted that the ventilation of the holds of vessels carrying perishable cargo is of enormous benefit, but instead of taking advantage of the opportunities, instead of seeing that remedies are provided, the government have done nothing effective in regard to it. This is something that would cost the government nothing. If the right hon. minister finds that there is something to be done which requires a large expenditure of money he has no hesitation in coming before the House and asking for it because he knows that the House will vote it willingly if it is in the interest of the country. But, he does not appear to be willing to come before the House and propose any measure unless there is a large money vote connected with it. Here is an opportunity. He does not even need to come before the House for anything unless it would be to ask the House to pass a Bill something similar to the cattle inspection Bill so as to give him control of the temperature on these vessels. In making these contracts such as were made with the Allans, the Manchester liners, the direct steamship line to France and the steamship line to Mexico, the minister had an opportunity to provide that there should be absolute control of the ventilation in these vessels. But advantage was not taken of that opportunity. I know it was not taken of the opportunity in the case of the Allans. I have not had an opportunity to examine the contracts made with the line of steamers going to France or Mexico but if I am wrong in my statement in that regard the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will be able to correct me. If a clause were inserted in these contracts providing that the government shall have control of the ventilation in the ship and that the ship shall be ventilated by forced draft ventilation or exhaust fans, the remedy will be found. Here is what the hon. Minister of Agriculture said in regard to the benefits of ventilation in 1901, as reported in 'Hansard,' at page 5166, 1901:

> During the last year or two our cheese has suffered in reputation in consequence of heating in the holds of the vessels, and it is well known that our fruits have been cooked a good deal in the tightly battened down holds.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture said that when he was coming before the House and asking for a large sum of money to put cool air plants into vessels which were not absolutely necessary. At the time that vote was asked for it was pointed out to the hon. minister that it might be very good, but that in all probability there would be an extra charge for it, and although the hon. minister said that there would be no extra charge we find that they are charging ten shillings a ton on butter and cheese, and one shilling six pence per barrel on apples.

I want to show by a few of the thermograph records that the temperature in the holds of these vessels where there are supposed to be fans is not what it ought to be. These twelve returns brought down, although there is no opportunity of comparing them with the records of a thermograph placed on deck giving the proper temperature of the ocean air, show that even though there are fans on the vessels they are not operated as they are supposed to be and that there is really no ventilation. On the 22nd of August the 'Canada' sailed out of the port of Montreal. The temperature commenced at 60 degrees, it goes down to 55, for a large portion of the journey it remains at 55, and on the other side it goes up to 67, at no time reaching higher than 67. There is ample evidence that this steamer was ventilated at any rate during a large portion of the voyage. The temperature recorded is about the temperature of the ocean air. It is also about the temperature of the cool air chambers provided by the government at an expense of $100,000. For instance, take the 'Cervona' fitted with cool air chambers for the use of which a large additional charge is made. The goods went in at a temperature of 68 degrees and at no time did the temperature reach a lower point than 54 degrees. That is almost identical with the temperature in ordinary ventilated stowage, where the exhaust fans are in operation, or where by some system the cool air of the ocean is introduced and forced through the cargo. For a large portion of the journey the temperature was 55 degrees in ordinary ventilated storage, just one degree higher than in the 'cool air' chambers. This simply bears out what I have contended time and again, and it is that the temperature of the ocean, if we can get it through the cargo, is practically all we need for such products as cheese and win-

ter apples. Or we might cite the 'Kildona,' June 7th, from Montreal, cheese and meat in 'cool air;' temperature 55½ to 58 throughout the voyage—almost exactly the average temperature of the ocean air, which we should and can secure without paying 10 shillings a ton extra for it. On the 22nd of August there sailed out of Montreal another steamer, the 'Bavarian,' and the temperature, as recorded by the thermograph during the voyage, ranged around 60 degrees. During a large portion of the time it was 65 and sometimes as high as 67 degrees. It went down occasionally and intermittently to 55 degrees and 50 degrees, but it immediately rose again, an average difference in temperature of from 5 to 10 per cent between this boat and the 'Canada' sailing the same day. Then take the 'Mount Temple' which sailed on the 7th of August; we find that the temperature was at no point lower than 63 degres, ranging most of the time around 65 degrees and 70 degrees and coming out on the other side at 72 degrees.

The next day another boat, the 'Parisian,' sailed the temperature on which at no time was above 65 and ranged from 62 to 65 on all the voyage across. On the 8th of August another boat, the 'Devona,' sailed, and for a portion of the journey the temperature was as low as 48, and at no time did it reach above 60. Here we have three steamers crossing the ocean at the same time, and the thermograph records show a very wide difference in the temperature, the only possible way to account for which is that at least two of them were not properly ventilated. Again, the 'Livonian' sailed on the 5th of June, and on the journey the temperature was as low as 45. At no time did it reach above 60, and that was as she was going down the St. Lawrence. On the same day the 'Tritonia' sailed, and her temperature was 60 at the time of sailing, but it rose to 68 and 69 and when it got across the other side it had reached 74, being 15 degrees higher on an average than the other boat,which shows that one was ventilated and the other was not. I could quote you numerous other examples of the same kind. Last year the Minister of Agriculture promised that he would provide thermographs in every chamber carrying perishable cargo from Montreal, but if he had done so that would not be sufficient unless there was also a thermograph on the deck. Why has the Minister of Agriculture neglected to have these steamers properly ventilated, when through his neglect the producers of this country lose an enormous sum of money annually by not having their goods landed on the other side in perfect condition. The government have been entirely negligent in this matter, and it is a shame that the people of this country should go on year after year suffering in this way when the government have it in their power so very easily to control the situation. We have time and again pointed out that something should be done, but for the last seven or eight years the government have been neglectful, and the people have been suffering all that time. Then, as to the question of ocean freight rates. Why should we not be able to get as good a rate on our goods out of Montreal, as if they were shipped from Boston or New York? Why should the farmers of Canada be compelled to pay last year $800,000 extra freight on their produce, because they sent it from Montreal rather than from Boston or New York? It is true that just now the rate for cheese out of Montreal is just as cheap as out of New York, but even now when freight is so scarce, the rate of butter out of Montreal is 43 cents per 100 pounds, while out of New York it is 33·75 cents per 100 pounds, which on our exports of butter last year would have amounted to a loss of $31,450. It is the same thing with regard to apples. The rate out of New York for Liverpool to-day is 50·40 cents per barrel and out of Montreal 60 cents, a difference of 9 4-10 cents per barrel in favour of New York on our shipment of apples. It is always the case that in the fall when they ought to carry the goods cheaper because there are large cargoes offering, up goes the freight rates to the farmers of Canada, and they are taxed away and above what they would have to pay if they would ship from Boston or New York. In making this contract with the Allans and the other steamship lines the other day, the government had an opportunity to control these freight rates to a very great extent, but they neglected to do so. They might have specified, as in the case of railway rates, that the steamship rates should not be above a certain maximum, and in this way the producers of this country could be protected, but the government neglected to do that and the steamship companies can tax the farmers of Canada just as they please. Then again, our railway cars are badly ventilated or not ventilated at all. Perishable products are gathered in box cars throughout the country, in which the temperature is ten or fifteen degrees higher than it is on a warm day in the shade, and with proper ventilation the temperature in the car could be easily made the same as the temperature in the shade. The Minister of Agriculture paid $62 apiece for certain cars on the Grand Trunk to experiment on, but since that time nothing has been done, and an official of the Grand Trunk came before the Railway Commission at Toronto the other day and stated that the system was insufficient and did not seem to produce any good results, and he did not know that it was to be continued. The matter is now before the Railway Commission, and whether they take action or not remains to be seen. If we had the cars properly ventilated, and the ships properly ventilated, we would be able to lay down in the old country, the most valuable of the products of Canada, in a

perfect condition and get for them their full value which we are entitled to. It is a shame that this enterprising country should have delayed for so long to recognize the value of the St. Lawrence route ; a route which properly utilized and safeguarded would enable us to get the trade not only of the Canadian Northwest but of the American Northwest. Owing to the facility of transporation over our waterways, goods from the west can be laid down in Montreal at a cheaper rate than in New York or Boston. Our wheat is laid down in Montreal at one and a half cents a bushel less than in New York, and other goods from the lake ports are laid down at a proportionately favourable rate, but in the transit of our goods across the Atlantic we lose all that advantage. That may be to some extent due to the fact that up to the present time steamers have not been able to navigate the channel day and night, and that there are other defects in the navigation of the St. Lawrence : lack of sufficient aids to navigation, a bad pilotage system, Montreal harbour dues, old-fashioned and expensive methods of loading and unloading vessels, &c. The Minister of Marine stated the other day that for a large portion of the journey steamers could now navigate the St. Lawrence day and night, but I make bold to say that they cannot do so along the entire route.

Steps should be taken to insure to the people of this country as low rates from the port of Montreal as can be obtained from the ports of Boston, Portland and New York ; and when that is done, we shall be able, from the natural advantages of our position, to capture all that trade. This parliament has never refused any vote that is asked for, to improve those routes. This government should at the earliest possible moment take steps to insure greater return cargoes for our ships by adopting a fiscal policy which will result in our purchasing in England a very much larger share of the things we import than we do at the present time, by differentiating to a much greater extent than we do to-day the duties on imports from the United States and those on imports from the mother country. Why should we not adopt a fiscal policy which will turn the enormous imports which we to-day receive from the United States, a large portion of which could be produced in this country, and another large portion of which we could purchase in England, giving our steamships larger cargoes, and thus enabling them to carry our outgoing products at much lower rates than they do at the present time ?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as it is the desire of some members to get away to-day, I do not propose to talk longer on this subject, though much more might be said. I think I have shown that the present condition of affairs is not a natural, but an unnatural condition ; and if only a reasonable amount of intelligence and energy, or only a small portion of the business ability which this government have boasted so much about, had been applied to this problem, it might have been solved long ago. Every loss resulting from depreciation in the value of goods by the lack of proper transportation facilities comes out of the pockets of the producers, the farmers of this country. I say that if a proper degree of business ability had been displayed by this government, this state of affairs would not exist at this late date in this country, where the people are intelligent and enterprising. I move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :

That according to the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the export of agricultural products from Canada, for the year ending 30th of June, 1903, was $114,441,863 ; of this $52,880,153, were perishable products, the value of which can be and is depreciated in value by inferior transportation facilities, which depreciation ultimately comes out of the pockets of the farmers of this country.

The government has signally failed to take advantage of the opportunities that they have had during the past seven years to secure for the farmers of Canada a safe and speedy transport for the perishable products of the farm and at competitive low rates of freight, thus causing a direct loss of many millions of dollars to them.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). Mr. Speaker, I should like very much for my part to know whether the hon. gentleman who has just sat down speaks for himself or speaks for the whole opposition in expressing a desire for a much larger reduction in the rates of duty levied on British goods. I have not observed any overwhelming desire of that kind on the part of any of his friends ; but if he is authorized, in moving this motion, to speak on behalf of the opposition, for my part I welcome it as a sign of grace, and I hope we shall find them ready to support him in the desire he expresses.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am sure that nothing I said would indicate that. I said there should be a larger differentiation in the rates of duty. I did not say there should be a lower rate on goods coming from England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see how you are going to get any great increase of British imports unless you reduce the duties on British goods.

Mr. COCHRANE. Put higher duties against the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Higher duties against the United States will not bring more British goods here. They might exclude a certain kind of American goods.

but they would not bring more British goods, and the return cargoes to which the hon. gentleman attaches so much value are not likely to be increased by any such measure. With reference to the motion itself, almost the whole of my hon. friend's remarks were directed to the Department of Agriculture. Of course, he is perfectly aware that the Minister of Agriculture is not in the city at this moment, and he and his colleagues had ample opportunity during the four months and a half that we have been sitting here to have brought this matter up when that hon. gentleman was in his place. A good many of the points my hon. friend has mentioned I cannot pretend to deal with, with the knowledge which my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture possesses. With respect to the subject at large, I admit at once the great importance and desirability of attaining the ends which the hon. gentleman has in view; and had this motion been brought up at an earlier period, it might have been of much greater use than I fear it can be at this moment. The facts which have been placed in my hands by the Department of Agriculture, however, do not appear to confirm the statements made by my hon. friend. For instance, if I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman stated that there were only a very small number of thermographs made use of at the instance of the Department of Agriculture. According to a statement placed in my hands by the officers of that department, there were no less than 199 thermographs placed in different parts of the steamships sailing to Great Britain. These were placed at follows: In cold storage chambers, butter and fruit, 155; cold air chambers, cheese and fruit, 32; ordinary storage, cheese and fruit, 12;—in all 199. That does not appear to correspond entirely with the statements my hon. friend has just been making.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I think it does.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear him admit that there were 199 thermographs placed in different chambers. On the contrary, I understood him to complain that the department had grievously neglected its duty in that respect.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Had the right hon. gentleman heard what I said, he would have known that I quoted exactly those figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear him make any such statement.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I said that just twelve records were taken of goods going out in ordinary storage out of several hundred chambers of perishable goods.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman led the House to understand that there had been great negligence in the matter of placing thermographs. As to the question of temperature, the figures given me do not appear to correspond entirely with those given by the hon. gentleman. In respect of the Canadian Pacific Railway lines, the highest average on any voyage is given at thirty-eight. His average in some cases were very much higher. In the case of the Domininon Line the highest average was thirty; the Donaldson Line, thirty-nine; the Allans, thirty-five; the Dominion, thirty-six, sailing to Liverpool; the Allans, sailing to Liverpool, the highest forty, lowest fifteen; the Thompson Line sailing from London, highest forty-three, lowest nineteen; the Allan Line sailing to London highest thirty-five, lowest twenty-four; the Manchester liners, highest thirty-three, lowest twenty-two. As regards what the Department of Agriculture has done, the department has furnished me with this memo. They state that the department maintains a staff of inspectors at Montreal to observe and report concerning the condition of Canadian food products when loaded in the steamers, including the shipments carried in cold storage. The refrigerator chambers are examined before loading commences, and a note is made as to their condition. The storage of the packages is carefully observed and thermometers are placed in each chamber in which food products are stowed. The inspectors at the British ports also report on the condition of the Canadian food products when discharged from the steamers. That appears to show that the department exercises control, as far as possible, over the shipment of these various products. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was any considerable depreciation in the great article of cheese, but that in one or two cases there had been some depreciation. His complaints were very largely directed to the condition of the shipments of butter, which he alleged were carried forward under conditions not favourable to their delivery in England in a proper condition, and I think he also specified apples as having been forwarded in a rather imperfect state. As to the matter of fruit and butter, I am not in a position to say whether the statements made by the hon. gentleman are correct or not. Undoubtedly the matter is one of very great importance. Undoubtedly it is extremely desirable that these goods should be carried in good condition, and undoubtedly the Department of Agriculture has been at pains to endeavour to see that this was done. I may also state that I believe the various steamship companies are, as would naturally be expected, themselves very desirous of seeing that those goods are properly cared for and arrive in proper condition. That is very much in their interest. They desire to encourage trade and are extremely anxious that these products should be delivered in good condition and all damage and loss in transit be avoided. But I notice, particularly in connection with the shipments of

apples, that the authorities on the other side are of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary for our fruit dealers to alter their method of packing in order to insure the apples being delivered in proper condition. That is a question of importance and quite apart from the question of ventilation and storage. Both the Department of Agriculture and mine have been advised at various times that great injury to the Canadian trade had resulted from improper packing in various ways, from the use of packages not suitable to the English trade, from very inferior fruit being packed, particularly in the centre of the barrels and sometimes fruit that was damaged at the time. I have a report from the 'Commercial Intelligencer', London, which it is worth while reading, although I hate to detain the House, because it throws a good deal of light on the complaints that have been made concerning the shipments of apples :

The shipments of apples from Canada in the season just closed were on a very large scale, but although we were short owing to the almost complete failure of home orchards, Canadians have not reaped the golden harvest they should have done out of our necessities. Many thousands of barrels of fruit have been sold here at a figure that would not cover freight and charges, without reckoning prime cost, and it is doubtless the fact that shippers have in many cases netted a loss on their consignments.

The Federation of Grocers' Associations of England have passed a resolution calling on exporters to change the present style of packing, and if the advice is followed Canadians may see a little more money in the export business than they have in recent years. They say that the barrel which is now used, save in a few instances, is a most unsuitable package. The fruit arrives in a damaged condition, and frequently apples of a fine quality, which were in prime order when put up, are unsaleable or only disposable at a low figure. This is borne out by our own experience, as we have seen fine fruit turned out of the barrels bruised and unsightly, which were probably a picture to look upon before they began their long journey.

Another objection to the barrel is its size. Grocers have only of late years taken up the sale of imported apples on any scale, and the reason is that they have not always the convenience of stowage required by the barrel, besides which a package containing three bushels of fruit is not a convenient one to handle. The unanimous expression of opinion by this important federation, which represents grocers throughout the entire country, should be taken heed of by shippers in Canada, who, if they can get grocers here to take up the sale of their apples all over the country, need not fear for the disposal of their surplus apples.

The package that would meet the ideas of the grocers here, according to what we have been able to make out from inquiries we have made, is a case of two compartments that would hold about one-half barrel, something after the style of the boxes now arriving from Tasmania and New Zealand. The apples should be laid in tiers, and paper shavings, where these are easily available, would help to prevent bruising and to preserve the flavour of the fruit, which is mostly gone by the time it gets on our tables.

The barrel is absolutely condemned, and it is to the interests of Canadians to devise some package which shall take its place.

Mr. CLANCY. Where does the right hon. gentleman find any justification in that for the neglect of the Department of Agriculture to see that its instructions are properly carried out ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not say that the department has shown any neglect, but I am pointing out that there are two or three sides to the question. If Canadian shippers had put their goods in proper packages, an immense number of the complaints that have been advanced would have disappeared. The sending forward of very large quantities in barrels is likely to cause the crushing of the fruit in many cases, particularly if the fruit be of tender character, which must naturally depreciate the products of our orchards when for sale in England. The government are as desirous as hon. gentlemen opposite can be, and have shown every anxiety to advance the interests of the community and of the farmers. So far as there is any justification for the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I am quite sure that my hon. colleague will do his very best to meet any reasonable demand that may be made by the shipping interests in the way of securing better shipments of our products.

These statements from his department as to the steps taken, which I have read, appear to me to show that the department has not been negligent of its duty. It appears to me that the department is doing what it can to provide that these matters shall be carefully attended to. I do not see, Sir, that there is any very great use, in my hon. friend's (Mr. Fisher's) absence, in prolonging this discussion very much. I will call his attention, when he returns, to the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith), and to the facts that he has stated—if they be facts ; all I can say is that they do not seem to me to correspond entirely with the statements supplied to me from the Department of Agriculture. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith) that the question is of importance ; I agree with him that the attention of the House and the government cannot be called to any subject of more importance than that of seeing to it that all our food products are landed in England in the best possible condition—all that is correct and true. The government, and particularly the Department of Agriculture, have been bending their energies in that direction. If, in any respect, they have fallen short or failed, all I can say is that, for one, I propose to do my uttermost to remedy these defects. And any one who knows what my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has done in the past in that direction will agree with me that the hon. gen-

tleman may be relied upon to do all that he can, and the government, too, may be relied upon to do all that they can, to meet the needs and wants of the people in this regard.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. One o'clock.

Mr. INGRAM. I desire to say only one word. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) cast reflection upon the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) for not bringing this matter up earlier in this session. I wish to point out that on the 9th of June last the hon. member did bring this matter up, and I will quote one sentence that will be found at page 4568 of 'Hansard,' and which was spoken in the course of a long, able and important speech :

> I find, however, that there are only 199 thermograph records taken, 155 in cold storage chambers, 32 in cooled chambers, and 12 in ordinary storage.

In that speech the hon. gentleman dealt fully with the question. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was in his place during a portion of the discussion, although he was not here when the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith) began his address. So it is not correct to say that my hon. friend from Wentworth left this important matter until late in the session. But, on the other hand, I wish to point out that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not deigned to reply to my hon. friend's speech from that day to this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. One o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are in the judgment of our friends on the other side. If the debate is closed, if nobody else wishes to speak, I think we had better divide upon the question.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPROULE. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that by this kind of interruption they are going to restrain any member on this side from expressing his views, they might as well understand first as last that their efforts will have no such result.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at one o'clock we were dealing with the question of cold storage, and were discussing the answer made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who I regret is now not in his place. The minister was excusing the Minister of Agriculture and saying that he was unable to do justice to the subject owing to the absence of his colleague. We regard the Minister of Trade and Commerce as quite as much responsible for any defects in the situation as the Minister of Agriculture, and he should have answered for himself rather than for the Minister of Agriculture. Why ? Because the Minister of Trade and Commerce submits and has this House vote subsidies for steamships carrying mails. It has always been, we are told, the policy of the government in making these contracts to provide suitable accommodation, cold storage, cool air chambers and ventilated spaces for carrying the products of the country. When we were giving these subsidies, when parliament was giving consideration for the services of a steamship line, then would have been the best time to impose such conditions to the subsidy as we desired to have attached to it, and it is not and ought not to be the sole aim of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to have this House vote large subsidies to steamships for the purpose of carrying a portion of the mails of this country. He told us that the large bulk of our mails went by New York and would continue to go by New York on account of the more rapid transportation from that port, and because boats leave New York every day, whereas boats leave Montreal and Halifax practically only about once a week. Then if it was only partially for the purpose of carrying mails that the money is given, what was the other purpose ? The other purpose we are told repeatedly by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce as well, was to induce the vessel owners to provide suitable cold storage or ventilated chambers for carrying the perishable products of Canada in order to place them on the markets of Europe in the best possible condition. That being the case, whose duty was it above all others to see that this was done, if not that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce ? It was he who got the House to vote the subsidies for these vessels, and who made the contracts with the steamship companies. He was constantly in communication with the steamship companies, and if they failed to make such provisions as would ensure to the people of Canada suitable ventilated chambers and cold storage on these vessels, then they failed to do their duty, and I claim that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was more responsible than the Minister of Agriculture. When we were discussing these subsidies to vessels, his attention was drawn to this state of affairs, and we had the contracts produced: What was the bare provision of the contract? That the companies would provide suitable cold storage with no specifications as to just what provisions should be made and with no authority for the government to supervise or control the system.

This question of ventilation was discussed last year. The Minister of Agriculture was

asked on May 14 about this matter and he answered :

Under this arrangement goods will be put into ordinary holds and they will not be charged any extra but just the ordinary freight rates on the same kind of goods.

He was speaking of the air shafts that were to supply cool air to the hold of the vessel. When the question was asked again across the floor of the House by the hon. member for Wentworth, what charges were made, he answered :

8,796 barrels apples were in cold air chambers and the extra charge was 1s. 6d. per barrel.

Now that does not agree with his answer to us when we were voting the money ; then there was to be no extra charge ; but he says there that it is 1s. 6d. per barrel extra, if you take advantage of these cold air chambers. Is that correct ? He assures us in one case that there is no extra charge, and takes credit to himself because they have made that provision in the interests of the farmers of the country, and when the question is put direct to him in another form he says that there is an extra charge for the use of these chambers. The importance of the extra charge of 10 shillings per ton on butter and cheese will be appreciated when I remind the House that the ordinary freight charge is 20 shillings a ton, so that the increase amounts to 50 per cent of the freight charges, for those who take advantage of this arrangement. Whatever benefit might result from the installation of this ventilation was denied to the agriculturists of this country owing to the increased cost.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said : Oh, the Minister of Agriculture is not here. Why did you not bring this up earlier in the session when the Minister of Agriculture was present ? We have been endeavouring during the whole session up to the last few days to elicit the information we required to enable us to deal with this subject and it was because we could not get this information that we did not bring it up earlier. We had to resort to every expedient in parliamentary practice to obtain that information. We brought it up at the very earliest moment we could so as to enable us to deal with it intelligently and it is not our fault that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not here. We have had this serious ground of complaint against the government for a long time that generally when these important questions are discussed they are discussed when only one or two or three of the ministers are in the House and when the members of the government charged with the department whose acts are under consideration are nearly always absent. Is it our duty to keep them in the House ? Is it not rather their place to be in the House ? Last night when we were discussing the Public Works estimates and when we desired information what did the hon. acting minister (Mr. Hyman) tell us ?—it is not in my department ; it is in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Then we asked ; Why is not the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) here ? This money is being voted ; we want the information to enable us to do our duty to the country properly, to know whether this is a wise vote and if that information can only be got from the Department of Marine and Fisheries why is not the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries here ? I noticed the fact last night that while these important discussions were going on there were only two ministers outside of the ho. minister without portfolio who were in the House, that for a part of the time only one minister was here, and that none of the ministers representing the spending departments of the government that we desired to get information from were here.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How many members of the opposition were present last night ?

Mr. SPROULE. There were enough members to put all the questions that we desired to put in order to bring out the information. If the ministers had been here as they ought to have been we could have shortened the time very much and the progress with the estimates would have been much more rapid. I say that we have just ground for complaint and that we have had to complain of the absence of ministers over and over again during the present session. The ministers seem to think that the discharge of their duties in the House is a secondary consideration. We want information but we are told that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is out. Then, we ask about the Department of Public Works and we are told that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) is away, that he is unwell. Then we ask about the Department of Militia and Defence and we are told that the hon. Minister of Militia is not here, next we are told that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not here and we go round from one to the other until we are put to our wits end to know what to do to perform our duty in this House. We cannot get information. For half of the session we have been trying to get information from the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) but we find that that hon. gentleman is rarely here when we are discussing a question in which his department is involved. Where are these men to-day ? Is it our place to compel them to stay here ? Is it rather not their duty to be here to answer questions put by members of the opposition regarding the conduct of their various departments ? I draw attention to this matter

here so that the country may know how difficult it is to perform our duty in this House on account of the absence of ministers who ought to be in their places attending to their duties as ministers of the Crown.

Now, it strikes me in connection with this question which has been brought before the House that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has made no defence whatever for the Department of Agriculture or for his own department either. He simply says: Well, we desire to do our duty and if we have not done it we wish to do it. They get credit for good intentions but it is said that a certain road to a certain place is paved with good intentions that have never been carried out. They may talk of their good intentions but when it comes down to a question of actual business management there is a notable absence of it. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that there were so many thermographs placed upon the vessels. We drew attention to one thing that we believed was very desirable and it is this: You are providing a shaft for the purpose of drawing cool air down into the holds of the vessels where the bulk of the produce is carried and you say you have thermographs down there but how do we know whether the temperature in the holds is the ordinary temperature of the Atlantic ocean or whether it is due to an abnormal or artificial condition produced by the appliances you have for the purpose of cooling the chambers? Attention was drawn to the fact by my hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) that if you do this intelligently you must have a thermograph as well above deck on the vessel so that you can ascertain what is from day to day the ordinary temperature of the ocean and then compare that temperature with the temperature that is registered by the thermograph which has been placed in the cool air chamber. It is not enough to have it in only one place. You say that you have a register of the temperature but you do not know whether the appliance that you have provided is accountable for the temperature that is in the chamber or whether it is due to the temperature of the ocean. To do this work intelligently we claim that it is necessary for you to have a thermograph as well above the deck so that you may be able to compare the temperature above and below deck and ascertain whether the appliance for cooling the air is doing its work or not. Then, there is no authority to go on the vessel to regulate the temperature and ascertain if everything is as it should be before these shipments are made. When the act regulating the shipment of cattle was introduced two years ago I remember very well the objections that were raised. I happened to be one of those who took an interest in helping to secure some amendments to the shipping regulations to compel the vessel owners to provide better accommodation for those in charge of the cattle, a better supply of hay for feed for the cattle, fresh water and to make better provision for the cattle as to space, stalls and other things. This Bill also provided that the government should have the right to inspect the vessels. I remember that when these regulations were proposed to be made we were obliged to fight the vessel owners at every step of our progress. But, we secured these advantages for the shippers of the country, not by the agreeable consent of the vessel owners but because the vessel owners were obliged to consent to these amendments. Inasmuch as some such provision has not been made in connection with the shipment of perishable products we claim that the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, have not displayed business ability, prudence or foresight in the arrangements they have made with these vessel owners who have been given these large subsidies. I say it is because of these failures, failures which to-day leave us in such a position that we cannot determine what is the cause of the change of temperature in the holds, that we have no control over these vessels such as we should have, and that we cannot go upon the vessel and see before the cargo is put on or after it has been put on whether there has been suitable provision made to secure the cargo being carried across the ocean so as to be landed upon the market in proper condition. That is the reason why we complain. We have just grounds for complaint and we move this vote of censure on the government, including the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, because of their culpable negligence, their want of business ability and indifference to the wants of the agriculturists, dairymen and fruit-growers. It is because of their indifference to the interests of these great classes that we are endeavouring to bring it to the attention of the House and to accentuate it by this vote. Then, I say it shows an indifference to the interests of the great producing class of the country—the farmers. We are told how much hon. gentlemen opposite do for the farmers, but these essential things that they could do they have not done. They have refrained from doing them. Yet, the hon. Minister of Agriculture will go on the platform, spread himself and talk about his splendid cold storage. What did he tell us the other day? First he went on to tell how the dairy products had increased in quantity and quality on account of the splendid provision that he had made for the shipment of them. He told us this industry had developed by millions of pounds because he had provided this cold storage, but a few days afterwards he had to tell us that

there was only one cheese out of every fifty-eight, shipped in cold storage——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not a speaking trumpet, and I would like to get an opportunity to say what I have to say—what observation did the Postmaster General make ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not make any observation ; I was only thinking.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no objection to your thinking if you and your government would think out how better to discharge your duties. I was proceeding to show that the development of the industry was not due to anything the government had done by providing cold storage, and as proof I drew attention to the fact that only one cheese in fifty-eight was sent in cold storage. The Minister of Agriculture has no right to take to himself the credit for the development of the industry under such circumstances. It is because of these derelictions on the part of the government and because of their lack of intelligence and business foresight that we believe we are justly entitled to move this amendment and to, if possible, censure the government because of the manner in which they have neglected to discharge their duties.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BRODER. You gentlemen had better keep quiet over there, because you are in cold storage, and you will find it difficult to get out. There is no use of your sweating ; that is the trouble with the butter and cheese which we send in cold storage ; it sweats. I want to bring the attention of the House and the country to a few things that ought to be understood more fully by the people of Canada. I find in the report of the Minister of Agriculture proof of the most guilty neglect of duty in reference to the condition of our products when they get to the old country. He tells us in his report that in one instance butter shipped to Glasgow in cold storage lay eleven days on the Glasgow dock. What is the use of shipping anything in cold storage when you allow it to be exposed to the weather for eleven days ? There ought to be some business system connected with this cold storage transportation. Previous to the election in 1900, every large rock and boulder through the country was placarded : 'Vote for Laurier and eleven cent cheese.' We are on the rocks now. Then, any poor fellow that got up on a political platform and could not talk very well, only had to point to the inscription on the rocks. To-day the rocks cry out against the government : Vote for Laurier and seven cent cheese. Where is the wonderful accomplishment of the Minister of Agriculture who himself has to admit that only one box of cheese out of fifty goes in cold storage. It is a strange process of reasoning that will force us to the conclusion that one box of cheese in cold storage will raise the price of the other forty-nine. I call the attention of the country to the further fact that the Canadian farmer to-day is confined to less articles out of which he can make money than ever before in the history of the country. That being so, his butter, his cheese and his cattle must be shipped under proper conditions or he will loose his foothold in the British market. The government are neglecting their duty, and Siberia, New Zealand and Denmark are displacing Canada in the English market. Russia, including Siberia, is taking a larger place in the butter trade of England than Canada is. Talk about what the government has done in the interests of the farmers of Canada. It is the energy of the farmers backed up by the energetic business men of Canada that has pushed the government along. These influences push the cart up the hill and when they get to the top the government shout : 'Look at the load we have drawn.' The Hon. Mr. Fisher is not in his place to-day, but he ought to be ; a farmer should not be away from home in the harvest time. I venture to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that the work won't suffer if he is away, judging of our experience of the man. Until there is a continuity of proper transportation in reference to these perishable products, and provision made on the other shore for their care, our trade will suffer. I am quite willing to admit that it would not be a wise thing for business men, or for the government either to over-ride the business conditions now in control of business men in England. But it is possible to use the men in business over there to the interest of this country, and the government have not done that. If the consignee of an article of a Canadian produce of a perishable nature, allows it to remain in Glasgow for eleven days lying on the dock there is a wrong condition of business. I will read what is said in the report of the Agricultural Department for 1903 :

> A good deal has been done in recent years to improve the transportation facilities for our export butter trade, so that to-day Canadian butter is carried in cold storage from the time it leaves the creamery until it reaches the British docks. To reap the full advantage of our chain of cold storage transportation it is apparent that the butter should go into cold storage as soon as it is landed in Great Britain.

Why is not that the case ?

> Instead of this, however, it is often allowed to remain on the quays at Liverpool and Glasgow several days, greatly to the detriment.

The idea of taking credit for sending butter and cheese over to England in cold storage, and allowing it to lie on the docks there for several days. It makes no difference under what condition you send the article over, if you allow it to stand on the dock until it has deteriorated in value. Can there be any stronger indictment of the government, and particularly the Minister of Agriculture in reference to the cold storage, than this very statement contained in his own report. After all the boasting of hon. gentlemen opposite; taking the last seven years of the Conservative regime and the first seven years of the Liberal regime, the average increase in the price of cheese has only been three-tenths of one cent per pound.

If you take the seven years inclusive of this year, that three-tenths of a cent will be gone; the average will be less than the average of the seven years previous to the Conservative party going out of power. Then why take such credit to the government? The song they sing all over the country is: See what we have done for your butter and your cheese; vote for Laurier and seven-cent cheese. This, as I have said, is on all the rocks. They will not sing the same song this year if they are honest; they will have to dance to a different kind of music. I want to say this before I sit down. In the interest of these large products of this country, the condition of the market as affected by the efforts of other people is not duly considered by hon. gentlemen opposite. We are meeting a different condition of things in the English market from what we ever met before, and until this new condition is studied and met, the business of this country of that nature cannot be successfully handled. We are too much at the mercy of the efforts of other people in the English market, unless we hold the first place there. In order to meet this new condition, it is necessary first to find your market; and, with all their boasting, hon. gentlemen opposite have not found a new market for this country since they came into power. After having found your market, it is necessary to keep it, and, in order to keep it, it is necessary to suit your market. Unless hon. gentlemen opposite change their system of attending to this business, they will fail to keep their market because they will fail to suit it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. E. D. Smith.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Hughes (Victoria),
Armstrong,	Ingram,
Barker,	Lancaster,
Bell,	LaRivière,
Birkett,	Lefurgey,
Blain,	Lennox,
Borden (Halifax),	Léonard,
Boyd,	McGowan,
Brock,	Morin,
Broder,	Northrup,
Clancy,	Richardson,
Clarke,	Robinson (Elgin),
Culbert,	Rosamond,
Earle,	Smith (Wentworth),
Fowler,	Sproule,
Gilmour,	Tisdale,
Gourley,	Vrooman,
Hackett,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson—38.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Beith,	Lewis,
Blanchet,	Logan,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Loy,
Bourbonnais,	Macdonald,
Brodeur,	Mackie,
Bruneau,	Macpherson,
Bureau,	McCool,
Campbell,	McGugan,
Carbonneau,	McIsaac,
Champagne,	McLennan,
Christie,	Marcil (Bagot),
Costigan,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Matheson,
Desjardins,	Mignault,
Emmerson,	Morrison,
Erb,	Oliver,
Ethier,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Fitzpatrick,	Riley,
Fortier,	Rivet,
Geoffrion,	Roche (Halifax),
Gervais,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gibson,	Ross (Yukon),
Harwood,	Russell,
Heyd,	Scott,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Smith (Vancouver),
	Stewart,
Johnston (Lambton),	Sutherland (Essex),
Lapointe,	Turgeon,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wallace,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wright—62.
LeBlanc,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Haszard,	Daniel,
Wade,	Kaulbach,
Law,	Casgrain,
Talbot,	Cochrane,
Malouin,	Monk,
Parmalee,	Pope,
Ross (Ontario S.),	Clare,
Sinclair,	Donnelly,
Tucker,	Tolton,
Dugas,	Tarte,
Galliher,	Seagram,
Grant,	Lavell,
Holmes,	Maclean,
Kendall,	Halliday,
MacKinnon,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Calvert,	Taylor,
Hyman,	Bruce,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Cartwright (Sir R.)	Tupper,
Lovell,	Kendry,
Thompson (Haldimand),	Roche (Marquette),
Tobin,	Ball,

Lang,	Bennett,
Mulock,	Porter,
Meigs,	Ganong,
Reid (Restigouche),	Kidd,
Sifton,	Osler,
Tolmie,	MacLaren (Perth),
Bickerdike,	Roddick,
Gallery,	Calvin,
Gould,	Hale,
Guthrie,	Avery,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Robinson (Northumberland),
Lavergne (Drum. & Artha.),	Thompson (Grey),
MacLaren (Huntingdon),	Kemp.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and myself have not voted. The reason I did not vote is that I am paired with the chief whip of the government. I notice also that several gentlemen whose names are recorded are not now present. Their names ought certainly to be struck off the list.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am paired with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Had I not been paired, I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Department of Justice—salaries, including John Chisholm at $1,650, and allowance to private secretary of the Solicitor General, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $39,090.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that old phrase, not withstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. I would like to know what it means in this instance.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). This item has reference to John Chisholm. Mr. Chisholm is a member of the bar of Nova Scotia, he has been in the department for a long time, and the intention is to give him an increase this year of $150 as a first-class clerk. He is a competent man and is worthy of the increase.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know that Mr. Chisholm is a very good officer, and he has been a long time in the service of the department.

Department of Justice—contingencies, $12,300.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is it necessary to make some provision with regard to the private secretary of the Solicitor General?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At the time he was not qualified but he has since passed his examination, and it is not really necessary now.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me it would be better for ministers to take men outside the service as their private secretaries. The private secretary to a minister must be mixed up in politics, and I don't think it is well that members of the civil service should take any part in political matters, although of course they should be perfectly free to exercise their franchise.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is something to be said in favour of what my hon. friend urges. But a private secretary, who is acquainted with the details of the department is more useful to the minister than could be an outsider. When Solicitor General, I took the private secretary of my predecessor and found him exceedingly useful. I never had any cause to suspect his loyalty, and when I became Minister of Justice, I took the private secretary of the gentleman whom I succeeded.

Mr. FOWLER. That is all very well, but at the same time a private secretary is bound to mix himself up in politics sometimes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course, he cannot help being mixed up in politics. You have to use him for your private or political affairs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the cause of the increase in the amount to be paid junior second-class clerks?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Miss Armstrong gets an increase of $50 from 1st of July, 1904. Mr. H. A. McGillivray gets an increase of $50 from 1st of October, 1904. There is an increase of $180 to Mr. Gilbert Smith who has been in the department many years and who formerly was connected with the penitentiary branch. He is really no addition to the force, but simply transferred from the position of temporary clerk, which he occupied since 1895 in the penitentiary branch.

Administration of Justice — miscellaneous expenditure, including Northwest Territories, $45,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The increase is due to the expanding business of the Northwest Territories. The expenditure has been increasing gradually until it has reached a very large amount. The amount expended in 1902-3 was $42,185. The services which show the largest increases are the maintenance of prisoners and the jury and witness fees, and we are obliged to ask for a supplementary vote of $20,000, making in all the expenditure connected with the administration of Justice in the Northwest Territories some $65,000. The maintenance of prisoners at the police posts costs $26,000. The prisoners who do not go to jail or penitentiary are held over, pending their trial in the mounted police posts, and the mounted police charge the department 60 cents per day for their maintenance. That cost us this year $26,000. Then there is the transport of prisoners from one place to another in the Territories. This is done by the police. We have to pay for the moving expenses and that item amounts to $6,000. Then there are the Crown prosecutors', juries' and witness fees and the coroners and sheriffs' fees.

Administration of Justice—to supplement the salary of the judge of the county court for district No. 7, Nova Scotia, $600.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is Judge Dodd at Sydney.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That, I suppose, is in consequence of the immense amount of work thrown upon Judge Dodd by reason of that great commercial development there?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. We made special cases of Halifax, St. John and Sydney.

Mr. WILSON. What is his salary now?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is $3,000—$2,400 was the usual salary.

Administration of Justice—allowance to 'ad hoc' judges, $200.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is a vote which is seldon drawn upon. It is to provide that judges of adjoining districts may be sent in, where, through illness or other causes, the judges are not in their places.

Administration of Justice—Supreme Court—one usher, $700.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that an additional official?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is the usher of the court, in succession to Curran. I understand that Curran was paid as a messenger and acted as usher. We have now appointed a man as usher of the court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see that in the next item the messengers, there is a reduction of $540. I suppose that means that there is not an additional official.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The accountant explains to me that the increase of $520 in the item of contingencies and disbursements, extra messengers, &c., means that an extra messenger has been appointed in the Supreme Court.

Administration of Justice—Exchequer Court of Canada—one chief clerk, $1,900.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is Mr. Morse, who is a barrister and has been sixteen years on the staff of the court. Since 1890 he has been engaged in the preparation of the court reports, and he acts as a sort of legal secretary to the judge. He is a very competent man. I have decided, this year, to make him a chief clerk, which entails an increase of $150 in this vote.

Exchequer Court of Canada—two junior 2nd class clerks, one at $1,075, one, Duncan Clark at $1,000, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,075.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. These are James Macdonald, and Duncan Clark, officials who are well known and who are very competent men. Mr. Clark has been in the service for nine years and is reported to be, by the registrar, as one of the most efficient men in the service.

Exchequer Court of Canada—contingencies—judge's and registrar's travelling expenses, salaries of sheriffs, &c., printing and stationery, &c., and of $50 for judge's books, $4,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was not present when item 26 was under discussion, but I will take advantage of this opportunity to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a matter of importance. We have had an admission in this House from an hon. member that he sat here with the expectation of taking a place on the bench in the province of Nova Scotia. Telegrams have been sent by that hon. gentleman to his friends, petitions have been circulated by his friends with his knowledge among his friends to the senior minister from that province and to the Prime Minister, urging that the hon. gentleman should be given this position on the bench. It was a rule laid down by the late Sir John Macdonald never to give a place upon the bench to any one who asked for it, because any one who asked for this position proved himself thereby utterly unworthy of it. The hon. gentleman to whom I refer is not in his place now. I am sorry he is not. I will ask the attention of the minister in the meantime, and I will bring it forward again when the hon. gentleman is in his place. I am calling attention to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) who has been driven out of every part of Nova Scotia in which he has held any position. I would ask the Minister of Justice what are the facts in connection with the application of this hon. gentleman for a place on the bench.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No application has been made to me for this position. All I can add to that is that, if I were asked to make a selection for the appointment to the court in the province of Nova Scotia, I do not think that, because of his standing and eminent ability and his position generally, I could make a better selection than the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the hon. minister in this connection, why it is that there has been such very great delay in filling the position of chief justice of the province of Nova Scotia? This has been the subject of a good deal of comment in that province, and the rumour is not by any means unknown that questions of political expediency have had something to do with it;—that is to say, a certain county in the province is a fairly close county in most elections, and that we have had the most unusual condition of a vacancy in the position of head of the highest court of that province continuing now for smething like six months because of that reason, and that reason alone. It is not desirable, in the interest of the administration of justice, that a rumour of that kind should be so common and apparently so well founded as this has been. If I remember rightly the matter was referred to by a question early in the session, and the Minister of Justice said at the time that the delay in filling the vacancy was due to the fact that the late chief justice still retained the position of judge of the Admiralty Court.

It would not appear to me that that affords any reason whatever for delay in the appointment. In the province of New Brunswick, and elsewhere the gentleman who fills the position of local judge of the Exchequer Court is not the chief justice. That position is not associated in any way with the position of chief justice of Nova Scotia. That position is absolutely distinct from that of the local judge of the Exchequer Court. I know no reason why the Supreme court of Nova Scotia should have been deprived of its head for so many months and cannot conceive of any reason for it, unless we are to assume that the rumours which have undoubtedly been current in the province are worthy of credence. I think it is due to the House as well as to the people of Nova Scotia and especially to the bench and bar of Nova Scotia that my hon. friend should make some statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that the chief justice of Nova Scotia sent in his resignation at the end of January or the beginning of February last. Of course, I speak from recollection only. And at the time he resigned his position as chief justice while retaining his position as judge in admiralty. I quite understand there is no connection between the chief justiceship and the admiralty because the duties of the office of chief justice do not entail the duties of a judge in admiralty. At the same time my hon. friend will realize that it would be advisable in view of the salaries paid—I have to admit, speaking now absolutely for myself, that the salaries are very small,—to offer the position to some one who would enjoy the advantage of being a judge in admiralty and able to add the emoluments derived from that office to these derived from the chief justiceship. The matter has received some consideration and so far no one from Nova Scotia has made complaint that any inconvenience has resulted from the vacancy. Speaking for myself I would be prepared to urge the appointment of a chief justice. Of course the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is aware that the position of chief justice is not under the patronage of the Minister of Justice. The chief justiceships as well as appointments to the Supreme Court are not under the patronage of the Minister of Justice. However, I will see to it, so far as I am concerned, that immediately after the session we will consider the matter carefully and something will be done towards making the appointment so far as I can arrange.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know the etiquette as to the patronage in regard to these positions, but I believe that the appointment rests with the Prime Minister.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That has been the practice since 1885, since Sir John Thompson's time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me the Prime Minister should be here to answer the question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not seek to shirk responsibility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Possibly you might leave an item.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You can bring it up at any time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will have supplementaries in which that will be touched upon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must ask the Minister of Justice to be prepared on some further item to answer this question a little more satisfactorily than he has done to-day. There is no argument at all in what he has said. If the chief justice of Nova Scotia should retain the position of judge in admiralty for the next three years the government of this country would be justified in keeping that position vacant for three years if the argument of the Minister of Justice is a valid one. That is not a valid reason, and it was not believed by the people of Nova Scotia that any such reason has influenced the government. I accept everything the Minister of Justice has said exactly in the sense in which he intended me to understand it. He realizes that perfectly ; I understand it exactly as he intends, but I want him to understand this distinctly that the people of Nova Scotia believe, and I think there is good reason for believing, that the position of chief justice of that province has been kept open for reasons of political expediency and not for the reasons suggested by the Minister of Justice to-day. It is not right that there should be any dealing with important judicial positions from that standpoint or for reasons of that kind. There are men on the bench and at the bar of Nova Scotia who are not only able but willing to fill that position to-day for the somewhat meagre salary attached to it, and there would have been not the slightest difficulty in filling that position satisfactorily to the people and to the bar of Nova Scotia, without delay of more than one or two weeks after the vacancy occurred. Under these conditions I think it is due to the House that the Minister of Justice should either now or later give some better explanation or that the Prime Minister, if the responsibility devolves on him, should give some better explanation than we have had to-day. The whole matter of judicial appointments may require to be discussed a little either now or later on ; in fact I propose to discuss it. I will not say any more at this time but I would like the Minister of Justice to see that the premier is here when some supplementary estimate of his own is brought before the House in order that this question may be discussed in a more satisfactory way.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this connection I was a little surprised to hear a gentleman of the standing of the Minister of Justice state that he would have been satisfied to see the member for Hants appointed to a position upon the bench. After the exhibition which was furnished this House and the country yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in defending a gentleman bordering on the condition of a criminal, and his appointment to a high position in the service of this country, I suppose we should be prepared for anything, but I did not think the Minister of Justice would so far forget himself as to endorse the appointment of the hon. gentleman for Hants to a position on the bench. The hon. member for Hants has distinguished himself in this House. He has practically admitted that he is an applicant for the position of chief justice of the province of Nova Scotia. Whether he admits it or not, it is well known that he is an applicant for the position. It is well known that he telegraphed the Prime Minister and urged his friends to telegraph the Prime Minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is out of order. We cannot discuss the hon. member for Hants and his relations to the government under this item.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We are discussing contingencies and appointments to the chief justiceship of Nova Scotia.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He is discussing simply the character and reputation of the member for Hants. You cannot discuss that under this heading.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The item is in reference to judges.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Hants is not a judge.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He may be, we are discussing judicial appointments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling is this and I am sure the hon. gentleman will see the reasonableness of it, that you cannot discuss the relations of the member for Hants with the government. The hon. member's statement is simply a conjecture and we cannot discuss that here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am discussing the purity of the bench and we have the policy of these gentlemen——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I rule that it is out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member should sit down. My decision is that we cannot take up the question whether the member for Hants is expecting an appointment or not in dealing with a question of this kind.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am asked to wait until the hon. member for Hants is here. He was in his place five minutes before this discussion began and he skipped out. If the Minister of Justice will give us an item or name a day when this matter will be discussed, I will be satisfied. If he will not I shall make a motion to adjourn, because I certainly am not going to allow, as far as I am concerned, any such appointments as this to be made, of members who occupy places in the parliament of Canada with appointments in their pockets, misrepresenting the people of the country without——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has given notice that he intends to bring this up at a future date and perhaps we might as well discuss it then.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What item is there ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We will make an item ; we can take it up at any time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will this pass ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, we will not pass it while I am on my feet making an arrangement with the Minister of Justice. Under no circumstances will we do that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman need not get angry. I was looking at the Minister of Justice and did not see the leader of the opposition was on his feet. The hon. gentleman should be a little more courteous to the chair.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The chair should not be discourteous.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have never uttered an uncourteous word in this House in the last four years. Why the hon. member should speak as he has done I do not understand. I must protect myself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no desire to be discourteous but I do not wish to have an item passed when I am on my feet. Would the minister give us the item.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are two items in the supplementaries for the present year and for the past year. The additional amount required for judges travelling allowances will be found at page 2 of the further supplementary estimates and at page 1 of the supplementaries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I understand that on any of these items this matter may be discussed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. On any item, or if it would be more advantageous to have the question widened, we might fix a day on going into supply to take up the matter and discuss it. I will arrange to have the right hon. Prime Minister here and it would probably be better to take it up on going into supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Probably it would be better to have it in committee as there might be some question to be asked and it would be less embarrassing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it the intention of the government or the hon. Minister of Justice to appoint another judge in the Exchequer Court ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That question has been discussed and I must confess I thought it necessary at times to make such an appointment but there is no intention of doing it at the present time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then there is no member sitting in this House with the appointment in his pocket ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He may have the appointment but it has not come from me.

Administration of Justice—Yukon Territory, travelling allowance for judges, $1,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What allowance for travelling expenses do they require ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The two places at which they sit that I know of are Dawson and Whitehorse. I may say that while we have voted this sum for three years none of it has ever been used.

Living allowance of sheriff, deputy sheriff, clerk of court, assistant clerks, police magistrate and stenographers of territorial court at $1,800 each, $14,400.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister if Mr. Eilbeck is yet in the Yukon Territory ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you are giving him a living allowance in addition to his salary ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. His salary is $4,000 a year and his living allowance $1,800. That is the same living allowance as is paid to all the officials in the Yukon with the exception of the judges who receive $5,000 and the librarian and caretaker who receive each $1,200.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would it not be better to give them a salary and allow them to live on their salary ? I do not believe in that way of paying officials at all. There is no inducement for them to be economical or to show any respect for the amount of money that you give them. I believe in giving them a proper salary and allowing them to live on their salary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think this whole question of living allowance to officials in the Yukon will require to be reconsidered at a very early date but it would be very hard for the Department of Justice to discriminate as against our officials when the officials of other departments are paid living allowances. It is rather a curious anomaly that the officials of other departments who go to Manitoba, the Northwest, the Yukon and British Columbia, are allowed in addition to their salaries certain amounts over and above for living allowances, but the unfortunate judges who happen to be assigned to the courts there are paid actually less salary than they are paid in the eastern provinces.

Mr. FOWLER. It is unfortunate but a great many men are very willing to take these positions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The best are not chasing after them.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that the cost of living in the Yukon is not so very much greater than it is in British Columbia. It does seem to me that $5,000 in addition to the salary of a judge is an exceedingly large amount. Not only that, but we make a living allowance of $1,800 a year to the sheriff, deputy sheriff, clerk of court, assistant clerks, police magistrate and stenographers of the territorial court who in addition receive salaries equal to if not greater than those which they would receive if they were occupying the same positions in the eastern provinces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. FOWLER. At least equal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The sheriff probably gets more than he would receive east but not the rest.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that it is about time that kind of thing was stopped.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the best men are not looking for these positions ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not say that but I did say that they were not made very attractive just now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. minister explain if the judges or officials of his department are on the territorial council and if so, what are their functions ? Are the ordinances of the council laid before this parliament ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think so. I know we receive them. Judge Dugas is on the council but I cannot tell about the others. I think there are six nominative and six elective, or five nominative and five elective members but I do not just remember at the present moment.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That territory is governed and all the record we have of it practically is the voting of the salaries for these officials. There may be records but they have not attracted my attention. Have we any record of the internal rules, regulations and laws that are enforced in the Yukon to-day ? These should be prepared and submitted to parliament at the very earliest date.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will have to look at the Yukon Territory Act which we passed a couple of years ago before I can answer that question. The Act provides for the way in which these ordinances shall be disposed of. I know they come to the department but what is done with them after that I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. The stenographers are paid salaries greatly in excess of what similar officers in the east receive.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They get $2,000 a year.

Mr. FOWLER. The court stenographers in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia do not get any such salaries, and I doubt if they do in Ontario. In addition to the $2,000 you give the Yukon stenographers $1,800 living allowance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In Quebec the stenographers are paid by fees, and these fees are such as to enable them to earn very much more than $2,000 a year. The work of a stenographer is very hard work indeed. A man who is obliged to attend in court all day and do this work earns every dollar he gets, and I can quite appreciate that $2,000 for a really good stenographer—there are two of them up there—is not too much.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is not too much if they are good men.

Mr. FOWLER. That all depends upon the amount of labour they perform, and the frequency of the court sittings. It may be that the work of these stenographers is very light indeed, and it need not follow that they must be of the expert class.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know Mr. Craig, but I do know Mr. Valiquette ; he is an Irishman with a French name which reverses the usual order and he is expert in both English and French.

Mr. CLARKE. He ought to be paid double then.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The police court stenographer only receives $1,200.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not objecting to the $2,000, but I do object to the living allowance of $1,800 which brings the salary up to $3,800 a year. We have official reporters in this House who perform duties very much more onerous than the gentlemen in the courts in the Yukon, and our reporters get just the same salary of $2,000, and as I understand they have to pay their own living allowance.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Justice the propriety of having both the stenographers and the sheriff paid by fees.

At these salaries, these men are probably getting from $50 to $75 a day for every day they work. The stenographers cannot be working in court all the time, and I think it would be better to compensate them by fees which of course considering the conditions in the Yukon might be higher than they are in the east ; I do not think we should pay them $3,800 a year, for perhaps not working a quarter of the year. I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that the Yukon judges are getting in living allowance and salary, twice what the judges get in Ontario. The Yukon judges get $5,000 salary and $5,000 living allowance. Living is pretty expensive now in Ontario, as the government points out when they propose to increase the salaries of civil servants. The judges of the High Court in Ontario get $5,000 salary and they have to live on that. I would assume that the Ontario judges are at least equally as competent jurists as the judges in the Yukon. It would be better in my opinion to give the Yukon judges a salary and let them live economically, or extravagantly as they think fit. It would be a more businesslike way of dealing with the matter. I would not be penurious ; I would give them a good salary, but I do not believe in giving half of the stipend in the name of salary and the other half as living allowance : It would indicate that he is supposed to save his salary and live on the allowance. In Ontario a stenographer gets $5 a day when he sits in court and so much per folio for the evidence transcribed, and they manage to make a pretty good income out of it, but they earn all they get and they are busy most of the time. It would be more satisfactory, I think, if the stenographers were paid by fees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If this question of living allowance is to be reconsidered I would like to have it reconsidered in a general way in regard to all the departments, and not to have my department singled out especially. I had an idea at the time the Yukon judges were appointed, that it was not proper to give them this living allowance, but the difficulty arose that if we paid a judge in the Yukon a higher salary than his brother judge elsewhere, and if we wanted to transfer him to another part of the country, he would be sitting side by side with another judge who had far less salary, but who would be performing the same duty. The same difficulty would arise on the retirement of a Yukon judge. I certainly am not of opinion that exorbitant salaries should be paid ; the salaries are large enough already ; they are quite generous. Remember that I am now speaking of the Yukon and not of other parts of the country, because so far as other parts of Canada are concerned I wish to make it quite clear, speaking for myself, that in my opinion the whole question of judicial salaries requires consideration at the earliest possible moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the salary attach to the office and not to the man ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is attached to the man. We pass a statute providing for the appointment of a judge, and in the same statute we provided for the salary, so that he that takes the position takes the salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Even if he were sent somewhere else ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, that is the difficulty.

Mr. FOWLER. Do any of these officials get fees in addition to their salaries ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, the Crown prosecutor is paid by fees.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the sheriff ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The sheriff gets his salary, I am opposed to the system of fees to sheriffs and clerks of the court. I believe, generally speaking, that the fees should go into the public exchequer, and that the man should get his salary. Otherwise, especially when they are far away from control, you could not tell what might happen.

Mr. FOWLER. I agree with that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope the Minister of Justice will give instructions that the sheriff of the Yukon will confine his electioneering to the Yukon territory in the coming elections, and that he won't send him down to Ontario.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I never did. I do not approve of it in any manner, shape or form.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then we will take for granted that he will stay at home this time.

Yukon Territory—law books, &c., and freight thereon, for the use of the bench and bar, and stationery, and freight thereon, for use of courts, $2,500.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. So far as I am concerned, this is the last year provision will be made for the library up there. It must be far enough advanced now for them to maintain their own library.

Yukon Territory—miscellaneous expenditure, including fees and expenses of Crown prosecutor, salary and living allowance of stenographer of police court and other officials or employees connected with the administration of justice, coroners' inquests, &c., &c., $25,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We spent last year $19,480.64.

Mr. FOWLER. Why are you taking the whole vote this year ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They make very good use of the money.

Dominion police, $32,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Have these men been given any increase in their salaries ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There have been two increases since 1896 ; but there has been no increase, I think, since 1901.

Mr. CLARKE. Was any requisition sent to the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The question of increase was considered, and it was thought proper to lay the matter over for the present, so that the government might have an opportunity of considering the advisability of increasing the pay of the Northwest Mounted Police and that of the Dominion Police at the same time.

Mr. CLARKE. What pay does a constable in the Dominion Police receive now ? They are a very fine body of men.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think they get from $1.50 to $1.90. I think $2.10 is paid to inspectors.

Mr. CLARKE. That is a pretty small wage considering the cost of living in the capital. I think the minister might reasonably give some small increase to these men. The constables in most of the towns of Ontario get more than that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think after three years they get $1.90. I can say, as the official head of the department, that these men are admirably well qualified, and they deserve every possible consideration. They are certainly as fine a body of men as we can possibly have. I may say that no department of the government is administered with less friction and gives the minister less trouble than the Dominion Police.

Mr. CLARKE. The best expression of the appreciation of the minister would be a slight increase in the salaries of these men.

Kingston Penitentiary, $177,600.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year the Minister of Justice stated, in reference to the chaplain of Kingston penitentiary, that he purposed making an arrangement by which each denomination should take week or month about to fill the position, which was then vacant. Has that been carried out ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was said when the Bill for the amendment of the Penitentiaries Act was up last year. My hon. friend will remember that the Bill was dropped. That appeared to be the unanimous desire of the House, so far as I could gather at the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. What action was taken ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Bill was dropped and nothing was done. The old order of things was allowed to continue.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a letter from a clergyman in Kingston, which reads as follows :

Permit me to report to you as a member of parliament what quite a few in these parts regard as a high-handed way of making government appointments. In a few brief words permit me to state the case. The Rev. Cartwright, brother of Sir Richard, and an Episcopalian, has been chaplain in the penitentiary for twenty-five years. Lately he decided to resign. His resignation was accepted and Rev. Cooke, an Episcopalian, was installed as chaplain without any person knowing anything about the change. One of the executive told me to-day that as an executive they knew nothing about the change until they saw it published in the city papers. Now, what many of us object to is this stealthy way of filling important government positions of this character without giving other denominations any opportunity of having a represen-

tative apply for the position. I will be glad if you can do anything which will open the whole case so that the appointment can be made in the light of day and not inside prison walls.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would my hon. friend pardon me if I ask him to explain the word 'executive' in that letter? I do not understand what that means.

Mr. TAYLOR. Neither do I.

Mr. CLARKE. That would be the local executive of the Liberal party.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I allow politics to run a great many things, but I do not allow it to run religious matters.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has not carried out the arrangement he spoke of last year, but, on the recommendation of the executive committee of the Liberal party in Kingston, this gentleman was appointed at once.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think my hon. friend is quite wrong. The statement in the letter he read was to the effect that the executive had not been consulted in regard to the appointment.

Mr. CLARKE. Was any recommendation received as to the minister appointed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The only person I would consult as to the appointment of a chaplain belonging to the Episcopal Church would be the bishop.

Mr. CLARKE. Was any recommendation received from anybody else?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not remember.

Mr. CLARKE. Who recommended the appointment? Was the recommendation received from the executive of the Liberal party?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly not, I would not consult them in such a matter.

Mr. CLARKE. Was he appointed on the recommendation of the bishop?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say, but if I consulted anybody, he would be the only one.

Mr. CLARKE. Then there was no one consulted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not that I can recollect.

Mr. CLARKE. There were some recommendations, however, received by the department?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have no recollection of any.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be possible to ascertain from the files of the department from whom the recommendations came?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will see.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. CLARKE. And we will have an opportunity of discussing the matter later?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If this were a question of the appointment of a Roman Catholic chaplain, I should not like to discuss the question of recommendations. I would rely absolutely and exclusively on the question of fitness. I do not like, so far as the appointment of a chaplain is concerned, to discuss the question of recommendations.

Mr. CLARKE. That is just the reason why I ask the minister to bring down all the communications with his department with respect to the appointment of this gentleman to the position of chaplain.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will consider that.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the hon. gentleman to agree to do that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will consider it. I would not like to establish the precedent.

Mr. CLARKE. If the position which the minister takes is a sound one, if he would not consider any recommendations made, there can be no objection to his bringing these down, so that we may see what recommendations were made and who made them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The particular point I made, and it is quite apparent to anybody, is that the executive of the Liberal party was not consulted. So far as I am concerned, I would not consult it in a matter of that description.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the rule in the case of Protestant chaplains? Are they confined to any particular denomination?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. At New Westminster the chaplain is a Presbyterian. In Manitoba he is a Methodist and at Kingston, St. Vincent de Paul and Dorchester, the Protestant chaplains are Anglican.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What about the Salvation Army?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You can leave them to me. They do the work outside the gates and do it very effectively. I have an item in the estimates for them.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the minister to say that this appointment was not made on the recommendations of the Lord Bishop of Kingston.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If I were appointing a Roman Catholic chaplain. I would make the appointment on the recommendation of the Archbishop. In the case of the Reverend Mr. Cook, I cannot recollect whether or not he was appointed on the recommendation of his bishop, but I have grave doubts about it. The only man I would consult in the case of that kind, and the only one I think, would be entitled to be consult-

ed would be the ecclesiastical superior of the chaplain.

Mr. CLARKE. Was he consulted ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be better if the Minister of Justice would carry out the statement he made last year with reference to the Protestant chaplains. He said that all denominations should have a representative. At Kingston there is a Roman Catholic and there is also a Presbyterian. I have no objection to that, but the other denominations should be represented.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps they are not represented in the penitentiaries.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister said last year that he would let a Presbyterian take one month, a Methodist another, an Anglican another, and so on.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Are you sure I made that statement ? Of course I will take my hon. friend's word for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sure that was the statement made. If the hon. minister will look up 'Hansard' he will find it there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The law provides for one Catholic and one Protestant chaplain.

Dorchester penitentiary, $59,700.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the cause of the increase in the Dorchester Penitentiary?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is due to lands, building and equipment. We had nothing but an ordinary board fence around the institution, and we bought some land and are putting the whole establishment on a par with the other penitentiaries.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this the penitentiary of which that gentleman is warden who took part in the Guysborough elections ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He denied that. As soon as I learned of the report, I wrote to the inspector and the charge was denied.

Mr. FOWLER. Did he deny that he was in Guysborough ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The report as to Warden Craig is that he was in Guysborough, but denied that he had anything to do with the election beyond voting. We will take up the second item in the supplementary estimates for the year ending June 30, 1905, I will give my explanations on the items in that vote, and we can then keep it open for the express purpose of discussing the question of the judges' salaries.

Civil government—Department of Justice—to provide for an additional 2nd class clerkship, $1,200.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Two years ago, I allowed one 2nd class clerkship to drop. It had been held by Mr. Blackadar. I wish to recreate that clerkship intending to appoint Miss Armstrong, who has been for many years in the department and who is a very competent person.

To increase the salary of R. R. Creighton, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $200.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Creighton was accountant of the Kingston penitentiary. A few years ago I transferred the book-keeping of the penitentiary to this department here and brought Mr. Creighton to Ottawa. He has proved such an efficient man that I wish to increase his salary $200.

To increase the salary of T. J. Morris, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Morris is a lawyer's clerk whom we have in the department. He is engaged in connection with the filing of records. He is getting $600, which is a very small salary, and I want to increase it to $700. These three items make up the second vote in the supplementary estimates, and we will allow it to remain with these explanations, in case the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) wishes to bring up the question of the judges' salaries.

Administration of justice—penitentiaries generally—to pay expenses in connection with supervision of paroled and discharged convicts, $2,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is a new departure for which I ask the approval of the House. In connection with the paroled convicts we find that a great number fall away to their old habits because they cannot get employment or assistance. This is an item put in at the suggestion of Superintendent Archibald, of the Salvation Army, who has done an immense amount of good in connection with the prison-gate work of the Salvation Army. The Army has a certain number of people who attend at the prison gate—they know when men are to be released, being kept informed when they inquire by the Department of Justice—and they take hold of these men, find them employment, help them along and encourage them. If a man, for instance, is a mechanic, and needs tools, or something of that kind, the intention is that Superintendent Archibald may be able to take out of this fund such an amount as is necessary to help the chap along. I find that it is absolutely necessary to give a man a chance, if he has happened to fall into trouble and the best way when he gets out of gaol, is for society not to turn its back upon him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON. I thoroughly endorse what the minister has said and am very glad that he has this vote in the estimates. There are none more worthy of assistance and none

that are doing better work for the poorer classes than the Salvation Army. I think the minister will remember that last session we had a little talk about it. I think that all parties in this House and out of it will endorse the passing of this vote.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Inspector draws my attention to the fact that, perhaps, under the item as it appears in the estimates we may not be able to do all we want. He suggests, therefore, that it should be amended so that we may be able to buy a kit for a discharged convict or anything of that kind. I would move that it be amended to read, 'travelling expenses and aid to discharged convicts.' That will make it absolutely clear.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Why not say that this is for the Salvation Army ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I always mean what I say, and I think that here I have said what I mean. This vote is put in at the request of Mr. Archibald, I want, if I can—I am not sure I shall be able to do it—to appoint an officer who will receive a salary to do this work. I tried to get Superintendent Archibald, but the Salvation Army would not let him go.

Mr. WILSON. Will the new officer be a Salvation Army man ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is my inclination.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister keeps a register of those who are on parole and how they turn out afterwards ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. It may be of interest to the committee to know that there are eight men who are discharged convicts from the penitentiary—I will not say where they are, but the facts are given me by Superintendent Archibald—who have been placed by him in important positions of trust. One of them has held his position for five years. The employer knows that he is a discharged convict, but no one else knows it. Not one of these men has fallen away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. minister give us the returns of those who have been paroled and who have broken their parole ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman will find that in my report. I will look it up in a moment.

Mr. WILSON. Did the minister agree on this amount with the Salvation Army ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. LOGAN. I am glad to see this item in the estimates. The only reason I wish to speak about it is that I wish to say a word about Superintendent Archibald. If the minister can secure his services, he will have the best man in all Canada for this work. I have had the advantage and privilege of knowing Superintendent Archibald from boyhood. He is a splendid specimen of manhood and, as I say, the best man the minister could have for carrying on this work.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood that the minister was looking up the percentage of lapses among paroled prisoners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The inspector tells me the percentage is about five. I might give the particulars of these because there is an erroneous impression as to the number. The number liberated for instance from the time the Act was put in force was as follows :

Year.	Number.
1899-00	71
1900-1	122
1901-2	157
1902-3	113

Nine per cent of the total prison population were paroled, and of these about five per cent returned. I find the parole system operates admirably, and if I were connected with this work for any great number of years I would adopt the Swiss system in reference to the sentence, the indeterminate sentence so that a man in jail would feel that on his own good conduct would depend the time of his release.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to hear this is turning out so well. I know that the hon. gentleman's predecessor Mr. Mills was much in favour of it and I thought he was right, but I have seen some adverse criticisms of the system since that, indicating that if the system was not being abused, it was at any rate not turning out as great a success as was anticipated. I think myself the system is a good one.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister speaks of the inspectors. How many inspectors of penitentiaries are there at present ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are two.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In what position is Mr. Stewart ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He remains an inspector. He is the senior inspector but remains in the department constantly at my disposal. The other is Mr. Dawson. I may say that the appointment of an additional inspector was absolutely necessary. Previous to the appointment of Mr. Dawson the penitentiary of British Columbia had not been inspected for three years.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You have a good man there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, a good man, perfectly reliable in every way. I think the result of the administration shows—of course I cannot claim any credit for it—

that the inspectors are competent men and are doing the work well.

Administration of Justice, miscellaneous (further supplementaries), $26,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I gave some explanation of this on the item in the main estimates for miscellaneous expenditure, $45,000.

This is an increase of $3,000 over the main estimates for the year 1903-4. The still expanding business of the Northwest Territories necessitates an increased expenditure. The amount expended in 1902-3 was $42,018.58 but a number of accounts had to be carried on to the next year because the appropriation was insufficient. The expenditure in 1901-2 was $42,909.42. The services which show the largest increase of late years are the cost of maintenance of prisoners and the amount of jury and witness fees in criminal trials. We are asking a supplementary vote of $20,000 making $65,000 altogether.

For 1904-5 this vote is estimated to be spent about as follows :

IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.	
Maintenance of prisoners at police posts at 60 cents per diem for each prisoner	$26,000
Transport of prisoners	6,000
Crown prosecutors, legal services and expenses	8,000
Jury and witness fees	15,000
Coroner's inquests	2,500
Sheriff's fees	1,500
Clerks of court, fees	1,500
ELSEWHERE.	
Extradition expenses	2,000
Copies and translation of evidence	500
Sundries	2,500
	$60,000
Penitentiaries—	
Manitoba penitentiary, additional amount required	$6,000
Dorchester penitentiary, additional amount required	1,000
Regina jail, additional amount required	500

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The explanation is:

Manitoba—to pay cost of transfer of 32 prisoners to St. Vincent de Paul, $1,500 ; cost of brick-making plant and necessary buildings, $2,500 ; maintenance of convict population above that estimated $1,000. The population was estimated at 130, but notwithstanding the transfer of 32 prisoners, it is 155 now. This abnormal increase has necessitated additional accommodation, and the brick plant has been installed to facilitate construction. The mason instructor was compelled to retire on account of ill-health, and necessitated payment of a gratuity of $1,300.

Dorchester—the appropriation for 1902-3 was short and one-half the staff pay-list for June, 1903, was paid from the appropriation for the current year. This vote is to provide for that charge.

Regina—the population has been about 20 per cent in excess of the normal. A new water service has been installed that will result in greater economy hereafter, but in the meantime the capital cost has incurred additional expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. Is this brick plant in Manitoba bought to manufacture the brick you want for your own use ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. There are two things to be borne in mind in a prison expenditure of this kind. First, you have to provide employment for the inmates, and second, to utilize the product after manufacture. We have to add a wing to the building and the brick will be utilized in that way. We have also to build a fence or wall around it and we find that it will be cheaper to buy and install a plant at the cost of $2,500. You must remember that as it is very much cheaper to manufacture your bricks in Manitoba than to buy them in the market. I am told that in Manitoba brick costs $12 a thousand delivered at the penitentiary. It can be manufactured for very much less than that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would ask the hon minister to be good enough to direct his inspector's attention to the fact that the new process of brick making largely utilizes cement, and that there is a very excellent cement works in Manitoba. I think he will find it of advantage when employing this machine to utilize cement in making brick.

Consolidation of Dominion statutes which may be paid, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act or in the Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to ask the hon. minister when the consolidation of the statutes will be completed, what it will cost, and why there has been so great a delay ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There has not been any very great delay in the statute revision. The appointment of the commissioners were made only a little over a year ago, and the result is that the statute revision is now practically completed, with the exception of the following public Acts : Criminal Code. Interpretation, Dominion Notes, Militia (which we are now considering), Northwest Mounted Police, Provincial Subsidies, Statistics, Reformatories, Dominion Police, Bills of Exchange, Banks and Banking, Insurance, Evidence, Extradition and Fugitive Offenders' Acts. All the rest are done. There is no reason why we should not be able to get through with the revision of the statutes within a reasonable time, probably within the next three or four months. The commissioners are : Sir Henry Strong, chairman ; Mr. E. L. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice ; Mr. Aug. Power, chief clerk, Department of Justice ; Mr. E. R. Cameron, Registrar of the Supreme Court ; Mr. Henry Robertson, of Collingwood ; Mr. Thomas L. Metcalfe, Winnipeg ; Mr. W. E. Roscoe, Kentville ; and Mr. L. P. Sirois, Quebec.

The expenditure up to the present time for printing, stationery, salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks is $33,146.

Mr. WILSON. What will the total cost be ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The total cost ought to be, although this does not provide for the final printing, in the neighbourhood of $40,000. The last revision in 1886 cost $46,049. I imagine we ought to remain within that figure.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you include the printing in the $46,000 ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. The salaries in 1886 amounted to $46,049.

Mr. WILSON. Do the gentlemen in the department get special pay for this ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They get some pay.

Mr. WILSON. Do they not get as much as the others ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. WILSON. Explain why, and what they do.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will explain, in the first instance, the reason why we are employing these permanent officials. The Deputy Minister of Justice is constantly advising in respect to the construction of these statutes, he is an expert draughtsman, he is absolutely expert in the art of drafting, and he has enormous experience in so far as the statutes in respect to the different departments are concerned. I have handed over all these statutes to him.

Mr. GOURLEY. What kind of a man is Mr. Power ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Power has been in the department since 1871. He is one of the oldest officials in the department. He is a gentleman who is connected with the consideration of appeals in respect to criminal matters. They are dealt with by him. He is also a very competent draughtsman, is a member of the bar of Quebec, has a very good knowledge of French, and is of very great assistance in the revision of the statutes.

Mr. WILSON. A pretty old man.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Men, like wine, improve with age. Mr. Newcombe gets $1,500 and Mr. Power gets $1,000, the intention being that they should give their own time after office hours to this work.

Mr. FOWLER. How much do commissioners like Mr. Robertson, for instance, get ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The salaries of these gentlemen have not been fixed, because my intention was to make some sort of a distribution, so far as they were concerned, in proportion to the amount of work done, and I will make my intention clear when I explain how they proceed. Each man takes home with him a certain number of statutes, does the work, after which the commissioners meet. There have been three meetings up to the present time in Ottawa. At these meetings each man's work is revised by some other members of the commission, and then there is a sub-committee composed of Mr. Newcombe, Mr. Roscoe and Mr. Sirois, who take the work of the general commission and give a finishing touch to it, and I accept the work of this sub-committee as the final revision. I am one of those who believe that there is not always wisdom in numbers in so far as the drafting of statutes is concerned, and I think that by leaving the matter in the hands of a sub-committee we will probably have the matter disposed of more satisfactorily, and in the end we shall have better work. A clear understanding was arrived at with the commissioners that none of them is to receive over $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How much does Sir Henry Strong get ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He gets $3,500. I will give the amounts that have been paid to each: Mr. Newcombe, $2,000; Mr. Power, $1,700 ; Mr. Cameron, $1,700 ; Mr. Robertson, $1,600 ; Mr. Metcalfe, $1,600 ; Mr. Roscoe, $3,200 ; Mr. Sirois, $2,100.

Mr. FOWLER. They are to receive the sum of $4,000 as the total amount ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, as the total amount.

Mr. SPROULE. After the last revision I think one or two copies of the statutes were supplied to each member of the House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Each member ought to be entitled to three copies.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not understand the functions of the Printing Bureau.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, do not ask me to explain them. I am never able to get anything done there.

Mr. GOURLEY. Are these statutes printed in the Printing Bureau ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes ; they have to be done there.

Expenses of litigated matters which may be paid for services in connection with the litigation conducted within the Department of Justice, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $15,000.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Somewhere in the vicinity of $12,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it counsel fees principally ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. As a result of the change that has taken place since the

deputy minister has undertaken to look after litigated matters, I may mention that while for instance in 1897 the cost amounted to $101,000, last year we decreased them to $72,000. In the amount paid to lawyers in the city of Ottawa it is now down to $5,000 from $16,000 to $19,000 previously. I say this to the credit of the officers of the Justice Department, and not for any other purpose.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where was the rest of it spent ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All over the Dominion. When a lawyer is employed in my department as a rule the department pays, but at times there are payments for opinions taken by the Department of Justice itself and they come out of the $15,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What rule guides you as to the payment of counsel fees ? Is it the rule of thumb ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Gisborne is the taxing officer of the department. He has been there for a great number of years. and he is almost like the man who sleeps with a gun between his arms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Like Alexander Mackenzie.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And he got no thanks for it either.

Mr. SPROULE. As far as the smallness of the fees go it is dog eat dog.

Mr. GOURLEY. I had a lot of experience with Mr. Gisborne and he allows about half what an ordinary taxing master in the province would. It is very seldom that I have a grievance, but I have a grievance now, and it is the grievance of some Liberals in my county more than my own. I and some Liberal lawyers filed six or eight petitions of right in connection with the Belmont accident on the Intercolonial Railway. We desired not to raise the question of negligence. I agreed with my learned friend, Mr Mackenzie and other Liberal lawyers well known to the Prime Minister who were engaged in this suit, to have petitions of right filed. There were cases of great hardship in this Belmont accident. My learned friend Mr. Mackenzie, a very eminent Liberal in the constituency and a very good man, filed a petition in one case of great hardship. I may mention that Mr. Mackenzie frequently praises Sir Wilfrid Laurier all through the constituency, and his praises of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the greatest difficulty I met with in getting certain electors to vote for me. This good Liberal, Mr. Mackenzie, joined with me in saying that these Belmont claims should be settled in some way by the government without litigation. The claimants are mostly widows with large families, whose husbands were killed in the accident. These petitions of right were filed with the Minister of Justice some months ago, and they were referred to the Railway Department, but since then we have heard nothing of them. I had a letter from Mr. Mackenzie asking me to get Mr. Sinclair and other Liberal members to call upon the minister, and ask him if he would not agree to give those people a reasonable indemnity without sending them to the Exchequer Court. That indemnity could be included in the estimates of this year and the claimants paid. Several of these cases are of particular hardship. I told Mr. Mackenzie that he should write to Mr. Laurier about the case in which he is interested——

An hon. MEMBER. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. GOURLEY. I beg pardon ; it makes no difference with a democrat up to the hilt.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. In the case in which Mr. Mackenzie is interested a man named Wall who had a family of six children, was killed, and the whole of his family are now depending on their friends. I would ask Mr. Emmerson, the Minister of Justice to treat these people generously, and to place some reasonable compensation for them in the estimates. They are poor people ; too poor to take their cases to court unless the government dispenses some measure of generosity, it means an absolute denial of justice to the sufferers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When these applications are made to the Department of Justice we have absolutely no power to dispose of them until such time as the department interested is heard from. I act merely as the legal adviser of each department, and therefore it is for the Railway Department to consider as to whether or not they would test the suit or settle. If my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) will be good enough to call around to see me to-morrow morning we might take the matter up and after we have had a discussion together, I may be able to make representations in the proper quarter, and try to come to a settlement.

Mr. GOURLEY. I shall be glad to. I thank the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FOWLER. Sometimes great injustice is done in the Railway Department in connection with these accidents on the Intercolonial Railway. At Norton an old lady and her daughter coming from early church, were driving in a closed buggy across the track, and as trains do not usually run in our province on Sunday, they were not expecting a train to come along and they were instantly killed. The Railway Department reported there was no liability and they did not seem to think there was even any moral claim. These people were too poor to go to law, and the result is that justice is denied them.

To pay claims for losses of property destroyed by fire rendered necessary to secure the recapture without loss of life, of escaped convict, Ernest Cashel :—Wm. Pitman, jr., $675 ; G. H. Pitman, $100 ; Thos. Emery, $50 ; A. B. Choate, $25—$850.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The explanation of this appropriation is as follows : There was a convict of the name of Ernest Cashel under sentence of death in the guard room at Calgary. On the 10th of December he escaped. Somebody had furnished him with revolvers, and he overpowered the guard. He was immediately followed by the police, but he was not captured until the 24th of January. During that period so close was the pursuit that he did not get more than twelve or fifteen miles from Calgary. After a chase of more than thirty days, he was located at a certain point. On a Sunday morning he was found by the police hiding in a hillock. When he saw the police, he took refuge in the cellar of a log cabin belonging to one Pitman, and commenced firing on the police. In order to save life, the police got the permission of Pitman to set fire to the building and smoke him out, which they did, and he had to come out and surrender. This vote is to compensate Pitman and those who were with him for the losses they sustained—Pitman himself as the owner of the property, and his relatives, one named Emery and one named Choate. Pitman lost his house and the others their clothing and other property. They asked for compensation to the amount of $1,450. The claim was referred to the mounted police and the Crown prosecutor at Calgary, and this settlement was agreed upon.

Mr. FOWLER. Are the constables who were overpowered by this man still in the force ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. There were three men, who, I am sorry to say, were guilty of something very unusual. They allowed themselves to be bulldozed by this man and covered, who covered them with his revolver. They have all been dismissed from the service, and two of them are in jail for some technical offence.

Mr. FOWLER. Were they suspected of a desire to assist Cashel to escape ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I think not. I think the escape was the result of loose discipline on the part of one of the officers, who has been reprimanded for it. He is a very good officer, and I would not like to mention his name. But the best of men will sometimes make a mistake, and he did not pay sufficient attention to a warning which had been given to him that Cashel had communication with people outside. Instead of taking the precaution to have a sufficient guard put over him, he disregarded the warning.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why, then, punish the three constables who never heard of this warning ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because the constables were guilty of cowardice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is all very fine, when perhaps the constables were standing in the corridor unarmed. It seems that the officer was warned, and yet did not warn his men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. The superintendent was warned by two of the inspectors that they had reason to suspect that there were communications with Cashel from the outside ; and there were, because he had two revolvers in his possession. But when Cashel chose his moment, there were three officers in the guard-room. It was their duty to be on guard, and, even if unarmed, not to surrender, but to risk their lives. They were guilty of such conduct as I think, for the honour of the force, which is above reproach, should not be tolerated.

To pay amount of reward offered for the recapture of escaped convict, Ernest Cashel, $1,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This explains itself. We offered a reward of $1,000 for such information as would lead to the recapture of Cashel.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who gets the reward?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has not been decided yet. There are several claimants.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The newspaper reports showed that there were a number of ranchers in the locality who rendered very valuable services to the police force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So there were.

To compensate members of the Northwest mounted police for injuries sustained while in the performance of duty, $1,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This requires some explanation. To the men who suffer from accidents in the service such as loss of limbs or wounds, if they are disabled in any way, we give pensions varying from sixteen cents to sixty cents a day. At the present time we have nineteen beneficiaries, and the amount we paid last year in that connection was $1,923.55. Sometimes it happens that a man is disabled in early life, and instead of receiving the pension he makes application for a lump sum. For instance, there is a man thirty-three years of age who receives a pension of thirty cents a day, having received an injury to his foot. He has asked to have his pension commuted to a cash sum of $800. The controller of the mounted police submitted a case based on this man's age to the super-

intendent of insurance, who replied that, upon the British mortality tables and at 3½ per cent interest, the commuted value of the pension would be $1,540. The man is willing to take a lump sum of $800. It is to deal with such cases that we take this appropriation.

Mr. FOWLER. If the man is entitled to $1,500, I do not think you should cut him off with $800.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The man has asked for $800, and we are willing to give him that, provided it is within the commutation tables.

Mr. FOWLER. The present value of the pension, reduced to capital, is $1,500. We have sometimes to legislate to protect men against themselves, and if this man has suffered such an injury as to entitle him to $1,500, he should be paid that much even though he is willing to take less. You should not take advantage of him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are not taking advantage of the man. He is able to look after his own business, and he offers to take a cash sum of $800. Therefore we think we should give him that, and no more.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would again draw the First Minister's attention to the fact that the mounted police who did duty in the Northwest in 1885, have never received any recognition in the way of land scrip, as other officers and men did. It is not too late yet, and I am satisfied that the right hon. the First Minister will only do himself and the splendid force of which he has the honour to be the head simple justice in giving these men the same recognition as was given all the others in the Northwest, namely, 160 acres of land.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This takes us back to 1885. After the rebellion the government of the late Sir John Macdonald, which was then in office, considered the case of the volunteers and the mounted police, and decided to give scrip to the volunteers and not to the mounted police. The reason they made this discrimination was that the volunteers were men who left their civil vocations to serve their country, and the government of that day thought it only proper that they should have a special reward, whereas the mounted police were professional soldiers, whose engagement it was to serve their country whenever called upon, and who, consequently, were only carrying out their ordinary avocation when they went to the front. Whether or not it would be advisable now to reverse the judgment passed twenty-five years ago is something which would require some consideration, and until further advised I do not think it would be wise to undo what was then done.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad that the right hon. gentleman has advanced the argument he has, because it proves the title to consideration of a corps whose claim I have always advocated, the Wood Mountain Scouts. These men were not professional soldiers, but were engaged for the emergency. They went out as scouts, and were in as dangerous a position as either the militia or the police force. I pleaded on their behalf many years ago, but could never succeed in obtaining for them the consideration to which I think they are entitled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THOMPSON RIVER IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. W. GALLIHER moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Thompson River Improvement Company be concurred in.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. I notice that the amendments to this Bill are very extensive, several clauses have been wholly cut out and others considerably changed. We have not had opportunity to examine these amendments and, if they are to be gone on with, some one should explain their nature and effect.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Bill stands in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), but it is really a Bill introduced by myself. The Bill was modelled on an Act of last session relating to the Columbia River Improvement Company. In going through the Private Bills Committee of this House one section of the Bill with regard to the schedules was left out. Practically, the rest of the Bill was left the same as the other. It then went to the Senate, where some objections were raised to it by parties in the neighbourhood of the Thompson river around Kamloops. They were represented before the Private Bills Committee of the Senate by a lawyer from Kamloops. Finally, certain amendments were agreed to by both parties, and so the Bill was made satisfactory to those who were objecting as well as the promoters. After that, the Senate made some further amendments, and the Bill comes before us with all these changes in it. I do not know whether there is any objection to the amendments made by the Senate. But I know that the session is far advanced, and it seems to me the Bill ought to be considered to-night and assented to. It is a Bill, I believe, that is in the interest of the whole lumber industry along the North Thompson river. Parties are putting a great deal of money into that industry. Naturally, Bills of this kind arouse the opposition of some

parties, probably for personal reasons. These may be very good reasons; but, since the two parties interested in the question came before the Senate and agreed, it seems to me that no objection should be made here, unless it can be shown that some of the clauses are objectionable.

Mr. SPROULE. The amendments are so extensive that I contend no one on the spur of the moment can go over them carefully and learn what is the effect of them. I do not think that the argument that the session is far advanced and that therefore we ought to pass the Bill right or wrong should carry much weight. Nor do I think that the argument is conclusive that two parties who claim to be interested have agreed upon this Bill. All that part of the country may be interested and we here are the persons who are supposed to be looking after their rights. Because the conflicting interests of two lumbering concerns have been accommodated, it does not follow that the House should accept the division of interest that they have made. This is not to say that I have noticed anything in the Bill specially objectionable. But the amendments are extensive and I think that some little time should be given to consider them; we should have time to look over them and see whether they should be made.

Mr. GALLIHER. We have an hour to consider this Bill, and I do not see anything in the nature of the amendments that would make it necessary to spend longer time upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman might leave it until the next sitting of the House.

Sor WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) can have it brought up on Monday.

Mr. GALLIHER. There are some parties here who are waiting to see the Bill through. For my part I do not see why the Bill cannot be taken up and the amendments read and considered now. We have an hour to do it, so why should it be postponed? I do not usually press these matters, and if there were other private Bills to occupy the hour to be devoted to that order of business, I probably would not press it now. But, why cannot we consider it within the time?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman surely does not want to keep the House held up while we are going through these amendments.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the House were never held up in a worse cause than in considering whether this Bill is right or wrong, no one would have cause to grumble.

Mr. HENDERSON. These amendments came suddenly upon us and we have had no time to give them such examination as would have been given in the Committee on Private Bills. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) should allow this Bill to stand over until Monday and, in the meantime, let some department of the government examine these amendments carefully and state to the House whether this Bill should be passed or not. If the government take the responsibility, it will go a long way towards removing any objection that might otherwise be made. I do not wish to detain the House for an hour to go into the Bill, for there is other business that might better occupy our attention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who says 'carried' will look at the copy of the Bill, he will find four clauses cut out and one clause with eight or nine subsections put in. And this Bill so changed is put into our hands, and in less than ten minutes it is to be carried. We are not going into Committee of the Whole to consider it. Is it not rather going it blind to agree so quickly to such extensive amendments?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not suggested that. My hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) is within his rights if he proposes to proceed with the Bill. The only way, if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is not satisfied is to have each amendment read and let the House decide whether it shall be refused or agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE. The powers given to the company, as I understand it, have been restricted by the Senate?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes. If there is so much objection to it that any one wants it to go over until Monday, I am agreeable; but I would have preferred to have it go through to-night, because private parties who are very much interested want to start for home.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Since my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) agrees, I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

For the purchase, equipment and maintenance of vessels to be employed in patrolling the waters in the northern portion of Canada; also for establishing and maintaining police and customs posts at such points on the mainland or islands as may be deemed necessary from time to time, $200,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, the committee, I am sure, has not forgotten that last year we sent an expedition to explore, patrol and assert the authority of the government of Canada in Hudson's Bay and

the northern waters. The object of this expedition was fully explained to the House last year and met with general favour. The view was to assert beyond any possibility of doubt, so as to prevent any future possible conflict, the undoubted authority of the Dominion of Canada in the waters of Hudson's Bay and beyond. The steamer 'Neptune' was chartered last year and sailed from Halifax. It had on board a representative of the Geological Department, a representative of the Marine and Fisheries Department, Inspector Moodie and five men of the mounted police. The expedition for the time being was under the chief control of Mr. Lowe. He was to explore, as far as he could during the season, the northern waters and to establish a post somewhere in Hudson's Bay. No definite instructions were given to the expedition as to the location of the post. Then, as soon as the break of the ice in the spring would permit, the expedition was to go north and explore Baffin Bay and Lancaster Strait, and then come back to Cape Chidley, on the Straits of Hudson Bay. There they would be met by another boat, which was to sail, and has sailed on the 15th of July to meet them, give them coal, provisions, &c. The 'Neptune' is to come back and be relieved and be replaced by another boat, the 'Arctic,' which will be under the command of Captain Bernier, and which is to sail on August 15. This boat will carry an officer and ten men of the mounted police, apart from the crew of the ship. They will relieve the 'Neptune.' Their instructions are to patrol the waters, to find suitable locations for posts, to establish those posts and to assert the jurisdiction of Canada. The government has been induced to come to this action because it is evident that the time has come when our interests in these northern waters should not longer be neglected. At the present time there are whalers and fishermen of different nations cruising in those waters, and unless we take active steps to assert, what is the undoubted fact, that these lands belong to Canada, we may perhaps find ourselves later on in the face of serious complications. Perhaps the committee would understand it better if I should point out on the map the proposed routes of these vessels, and the places which I have mentioned.

Towards the erection of a monument to Champlain at St. John, $5,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting to this item at all, but I raised a question in this House some little time ago in regard to the erection of a monument to the memory of the late Hon. Thos. D'Arcy McGee. Has the right hon. Prime Minister considered that question ? While I am not objecting to the erection of a monument to the memory of Champlain I think that the late Hon. Thos. D'Arcy McGee is entitled to some consideration at the hands of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT. And I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has considered the question and if there will be something in the estimates this year for the purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid that there will be nothing in the estimates this year but this is an idea which will not escape our memory another time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there any special reason why this monument should be placed at St. John ?

Mr. GOURLEY. He landed there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, his operations were more in Nova Scotia than New Brunswick. I do not object to it. I am delighted to see that this monument is going to be erected there but the point I want to impress on the right hon. Prime Minister is that in case he should be so fortunate as to be in charge of the government another year I want the right hon. gentleman, or whoever may be in charge of the government, to remember the fact that Champlain visited the province of Ontario and that to this is due the inception of the Trent canal. It was from Champlain that the first intimation of the feasibility of the Panama canal came a fact which you will find recorded in Parkman's 'Pioneers of France in the New World,' as follows :

> Returning, he made his way to Panama. Here, more than two centuries and a half ago, his bold and active mind conceived the plan of a ship canal across the isthmus, 'by which,' he says, 'the voyage to the South Sea would be shortened by more than fifteen hundred leagues.'

We find that this intrepid soldier, who, I am proud to say, fought under the white plume of Henry of Navarre at the battle of Ivry side by side with Sir Walter Raleigh, made himself useful in his explorations in the new world. Those of us who come from the Midland district of Ontario recall with a great deal of pride the fact that Champlain was the first European to cover the route of the Trent canal which is now so much in favour with the people of this country. He ascended the Ottawa and the Mattawan passed through Lake Nipissing, descended the French river, passed down the shore of the Georgian Bay to the mouth of the River Severn thence proceeded to Orillia. Parkman in the same volume says :

> At the outlet of Lake Simcoe, they all stopped to fish.

I may say to my right hon. friend that the fishing was good in those waters. In the early part of the seventeenth century when they were first visited by Champlain, and it is excellent to-day and that accounts for the brain and brawn possessed by the people of the city of Toronto who go there to spend their summers.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that Champlain suggested the Trent canal also ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, he is partly responsible for it. Parkman continues :

It was the eighth of September, and Champlain, shivering in his blanket, awoke to see the bordering meadows sparkling with an early frost, soon to vanish under the bright autumnal sun. The Huron fleet pursued its course along the bosom of Lake Simcoe, up the Little River Talbot, across the portage to Balsam lake, and down the chain of lakes which form the sources of the River Trent. As the long line of canoes moved on its devious way, no human life was seen, no sign of friend or foe, yet, at times, to the fancy of Champlain, the borders of the stream seemed decked with groves and shrubbery by the hands of man, and mighty walnut trees, laced with grape-vines, seemed decorations of a pleasure-ground.

Trees and grape-vines similar to those which Champlain gazed upon are to be seen there to-day. Then, Parkman goes on to describe the adventures, battles and hunts that took place in that locality. We know the locality. The vicinity of the village of Fenelon Falls between Cameron and Sturgeon lakes was one of the Indian hunting grounds. At all events Balsam lake where the late George Laidlaw had established his home and where his son who saw service in South Africa now resides was one of the camping places of Champlain and I want to direct the right hon. First Minister's attention to the fact. We do not want a $5,000 monument erected here but we will be very much pleased to see something to commemorate the adventures of Champlain in that locality erected in the county of Victoria.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am most delighted to hear the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). We will be very happy to do for Ontario what we have been able to do for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There was a celebration this year at Annapolis of the 300th anniversary, of the landing of De Monts at Annapolis Royal. This Historical Society of Nova Scotia asked the government to contribute a certain amount towards the erection of a monument to Champlain. This appropriation which we ask parliament to vote has been asked for by the Historical Society of New Brunswick. Parliament has responded very cheerfully to that request and no doubt if any similar organization from Ontario were to send us a similar request it would meet with the same response. The city of St. John wants to put up a better monument than a monument which could be erected for $5,000. We give $5,000 and the city are to contribute an additional sum towards this monument. We shall be guided by the requests which are made upon us but we shall take into consideration any request that is made to us, and if it so happens that we are still in charge of affairs we will have still more pleasure in doing so.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is very proper that the erection of monuments to commermorate the achievements of the early French explorers should be started in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. De Monts, the first European subject to land on this continent made his first landing at Annapolis Royal in 1604. Champlain a short time afterwards landed at St. John. Therefore it is very proper, chronologically considered, that these monuments should be first erected in the places which these men made historic by their first association with them. Afterward, I have no doubt Ontario will have the right to follow the maritime provinces and I will be very glad to join in any movement to that end. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) read that history which I am rather familiar with. I said some years ago in this House : that Champlain and Cartier, the great early French explorers, had a better knowledge of Canada and its trade routes and its strong commercial position on this continent. than any men in Canada since, with all our education.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this going to be a contribution ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Valleyfield public buildings, $30,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total cost to be ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total estimated cost is $55,000. The total expenditure has been $25,000 and this vote will complete.

Mr. BELL. Does it include the land ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, everything.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a combined building for post office, &c.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes ; this is to complete the contract.

Seven Islands—wharfs, $60,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I handed my hon. friend the contract in this matter.

Mr. CLARKE. Who had the contract from the private parties to build this pier?

Mr. HYMAN. M. Connolly of Quebec.

Mr. CLARKE. Why did not the government allow Connolly to go on with the work for the company, in view of the statement made last year by the minister.

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer says that the department looked very carefully into the matter and that the transfer was in the public interest. The hon. gentleman has read the contract and he knows that the material and labour will have to be

certified by the chief engineer before any payment is made.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this company buy the material from themselves ?

Mr. HYMAN. Wherever they get it cheapest; the price of the timber has to be certified by the engineer and there is to be a certified sworn copy of the number of men and the wages and in addition we have a resident engineer.

Mr. CLARKE. How is the price of the lumber to be determined ? We were told yesterday it would be folly to ask for tenders to do this work because this company was in such a position of superiority that they might charge any price they liked. Are they to be allowed to put in any price they like now ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think so. Our engineer has a thorough knowledge of the price of timber all over.

Mr. CLARKE. It is not clear to me why the company were not allowed to go on and do the work themselves, and why the government assumed the responsibility of it when it was being done by a private corporation. This corporation had received pulp concessions and water privileges, and in order to make these valuable they had to erect deep water piers and they let a contract for that purpose, as I understand from the minister. When the work was pretty well under way the government stepped in and in a paternal spirit took it off their hands and allowed them $34,000 for the work done, and $21,000 for the material on hand, and then authorized them to go on and complete the work. Why did the government interfere ?

Mr. HYMAN. The reason the government, after acquiring the wharf, did not allow the contractors to continue the work was that there was really no plan that would satisfy the engineers of the department. Plans were prepared by the department, and it was on these plans that the work was proceeded with.

Mr. CLARKE. It has not been made clear why the government interfered and took over the work.

Mr. HYMAN. It was on the opinion of the chief engineer. The hon. gentleman knows that the minister has practically to follow his technical officer.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you the report of the engineer there ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. BELL. We are rather interested to find out how the engineer happened to go there. Who sent him there ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is not possible for the chief engineer to visit every place where work is being carried on.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the engineers drift in there by accident, and say : We ought to take this work over and extend it, and do it on a more elaborate scale ; we will give $34,000 to the contractor for the work done and $21,000 for the material ; we will take it from the contractor, and then hand it back to him and tell him to go on and complete the work ; and he will send us a statement of the materials supplied to him at a certain price and the amount paid in wages ; and if the engineer certifies to it, we will pay you ? Is that the whole plan ?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman looks at the papers, he will see that it was not done in that way at all. He will find, in addition to the certificate of our engineer, a certificate attached of Messrs. Ross and Holgate, both in regard to the amount of work done by the contractor and the amount of material on hand.

Mr. CLARKE. Is Mr. Holgate the company's engineer ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. BELL. The minister has not yet given us any reason for taking this work over. He has given us a description of the course followed in getting a report from the government engineer and also from the engineers of the company ; but what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is anxious to know is why the government wanted to take this property over at a time when the company were building the work themselves, and had spent $55,000 or $56,000 upon it. That is the point the hon. member for Toronto is endeavouring to make, and the minister does not seem to catch the point.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not understand the hon. member for Toronto to make that point. The reason for it is this. There is an item in the estimates for a pier at this place. It was explained last night very fully by the hon. Minister of Justice that this is the only harbour on the north shore of the St. Lawrence for a very long distance. It was felt by the department that the government should own and control the wharf at such an important harbour of refuge ; and when the government found that this company had started the wharf, they felt that they should, in the interest of the country, take it over from the company instead of building a new one, and the interest of the public was carefully guarded in the method pursued.

Mr. MORIN. Is this wharf to be built exactly where the old wharf was ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. MORIN. What kind of timber will you use in the wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mostly southern pine for the face timber.

Mr. MORIN. Is that pine grown in the southern states or at the Seven Islands ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand from the term 'southern pine' that it is grown in the south.

Mr. MORIN. Sometimes it is called southern pine, though it never grew in the south.

Mr. HYMAN. It is certified by two engineers that it is southern pine, and by southern pine the department understands pine that has grown in the south.

Mr. MORIN. Are you aware that is the fact ?

Mr. HYMAN. I take that from the engineers. I am not aware of the fact.

Mr. MORIN. There is another 'nigger in the fence' there.

Mr. BELL. The government allowed this Seven Islands bay to remain for a number of years without providing a harbour of refuge there. Now they are engaged in carrying on this work. No doubt their attention was called to it by some request either from parties interested in shipping or parties interested in the business. Is there anything on file in the department to show how the government discovered the necessity for this wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the engineer that it is purely the act of the government, just as I explained before.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be the act of the government without somebody drawing their attention to the necessity for a wharf ? Is the government sending engineers all around the country to hunt up places where there ought to be wharfs, without any applications being made for them, either from the shipping interests or the public in general ? We are told that this is the only harbour of refuge on that shore, but that has been told us in support of several different items, and that plea is pretty well worn threadbare. It is about time that some better excuse was offered. There might be some excuse if there was any population in that place ; but so far as we know, it has neither population or commerce to any extent worth mentioning and is comparatively speaking a wilderness. But simply because two or three enterprising individuals, finding that there were good timber limits and water-powers in that region, applied to the province of Quebec and got hold of these timber limits and water-powers and started business, and simply because, after they had begun building a wharf which was absolutely necessary to them in the prosecution of their industry, these people found it would be much more advantageous to them to have that work done as a public work, we find this government stepping in and taking the expense off their hands and on the plea of serving the public interest building a wharf for this particular firm. That is really what this expenditure amounts to. This company had done work on that wharf to the extent of some $34,000 and had lumber and other material there, estimated to be worth some $21,000, and the government repay them this expenditure, and then tell them to go on and complete the job and we will recoup you for what it may cost. There is not the slightest evidence that there has been any request from any shipping or commercial interests for this work except from the private company I have referred to. A more wanton piece of extravagance, to use a mild term, could scarcely be exhibited even by this business and reform government.

Mr. MORIN. I said last night that the government appear to be overflowing with love for these Messrs. Clarke, and I am still of that opinion. This place, called the Seven Islands, has been inhabited for no less than 200 years by fishermen and mariners, who navigate in small boats that draw from four to six feet of water, and who had all the accommodation they needed from the little wharf that was built there. During all this time, while these poor fishermen and mariners were the sole inhabitants of that region, no government thought it worth while to spend any money on public improvements on behalf of these people. But no sooner did the Messrs. Clarke secure lumber limits and water-power in that district and start a big business, than this government steps in and takes the wharf, which these people had begun to build, off their hands and are now about to complete it at a great expense to the country. This of course will be eminently satisfactory to the Messrs. Clarke, who own the whole country for several miles up the river and several miles back. They own that country absolutely. Under the charter given them a couple of years ago, no one has the right to build a store there or a hotel or start a place of commerce of any kind. Mr. Clarke owns everything, and yet this paternal government is going to build a wharf especially for him and his associates. Looking at it in any light you please, it appears to me the height of absurdity that any government should have so much love for some men and so very little for others. These poor fishermen and mariners who were in that place long before the Clarkes, were just as much entitled to government favours, but they never got anything. And this government, which claims to be the protector of the people, which claims to carry the whole country on its hands, which, we are told, was going to give a great example of reform, never dreamt of doing anything for the poor people in that locality. But no sooner did the Clarkes take possession of it, than these ministers are ready to kneel down and pray for them.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand from the records, this work was being proceeded with by the company which owns the limits before the vote of last year was asked for. If the government knew anything about the matter, they must have known that the company was then constructing a pier of its own for its own purposes. The House was not put in possession then of any of the information we have to-night, although if the government engineer had been down there and had made a report on the necessity of constructing a pier for the purpose of establishing a harbour of refuge, he would certainly not have failed to mention all the facts. I have not yet been able to satisfy myself that there was any justification for the interference of the government in this work. The privileges which this company had obtained had to be exploited, and in order to exploit them the company had to build a wharf, and were doing it when the appropriation was voted by parliament last year. The next thing we find is that the work which was being performed by this company has been taken over by the government, and the government has undertaken to pay the company some $50,000 to $60,000 for work done and material in hand. That certainly is not a very satisfactory proposition to my mind.

Mr. BELL. It would appear from these papers that months before the government asked for a vote of $25,000 last year, this work was under way. It was begun by the company in April, 1903, and continued until November. The sum of $34,000 had been expended by the company at the time the government asked parliament for a vote for the purpose of erecting a wharf of its own. It now appears that the purpose was to purchase the work which the company had begun. And we find that the government had undertaken to do this without any interested party, unless it be this company interested, asking that it be done. The public of Canada has not asked for this work. The shipping interests have not approached the government in order to have the sum of $25,000 put in the estimates to pay for the work which was being constructed by private parties. But in the course of the early months of 1904, the government bound itself to pay the company for the portion of the work already constructed, the sum of $34,433.75, and the agreement goes on to provide :

That over and above the said sum, for all the materials, including pine, spruce, iron, &c., which have already been delivered on the site and for the purpose of the contemplated works, the government bind itself to pay the said company, once for all a further sum of $21,485.34, it being clearly understood and agreed that all such materials are to be used in the carrying out of the construction of the balance of the works contemplated.

5. And it is understood and agreed that the said company are hereby entrusted with the performance of the balance of the works required to complete the works set out or referred to in the specifications hereto annexed, marked 'A' and set out or referred to in the plans prepared for the purposes of the said works, which said specification and plans are declared to be part of this contract.

6. That the balance of the works in the preceding clause referred to shall be so performed and carried out under the immediate supervision of an engineer delegated by the Department of Public Works of Canada, whose decision when approved of by the said Minister of Public Works shall be final and decisive as regards both the materials and the quality and the quantity of the works.

7. That whatever disbursements will have been made by the said company in carrying out and performing the balance of the works hereinabove referred to shall be reimbursed to the said company by the government in following manner, that is to say :

8. As to the materials the said company shall produce vouchers containing a certificate to that effect that the materials outside and apart from those mentioned in clause four (4) of the present agreement, have actually been purchased and are necessary for the carrying out of the balance of the works hereinabove referred to, such certificate to bear the signature of the secretary-treasurer of the said company as well as that of the resident engineer hereinabove mentioned.

9. As to the labour the said company shall produce pay-rolls duly receipted and containing a certificate signed in the manner determined in the preceding clause to the effect that the labour mentioned in such pay-rolls has been actually and necessarily performed and paid for in connection with the carrying out of the said balance of the works.

And this is the plan on which the government generously came to the relief of this company. They took over work for $10,000 more than parliament had justified the government in spending, and also covenanted to pay them $22,000 for material which the government had not authorized them to pay at all, and then bound themselves to go on and spend nearly $100,000, and perhaps more——

Mr. HYMAN. Not more.

Mr. BELL. Probably more, because there is no limit.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Bell) does not wish to be unfair. He knows very well that there is a limit. I have told him that there were plans and specifications, and they are referred to.

Mr. BELL. If, under the operation of this peculiar contract the government vote is exhausted, the minister has prudently made provision——

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman knows that the vote as taken is mentioned. Last year I think the minister told the House that it would require $60,000.

Mr. BELL. But it is evident that the minister contemplated that the company would spend more than the vote, because he has put in this provision.

Mr. HYMAN. Because the plans might be changed.

Mr. BELL. He has put in this provision :

10. Should the amount now voted by parliament and applicable towards payment for the works hereby contracted for be at any time expended previous to the completion of the said works, the contractor shall not be entitled to any payment for work done beyond the amount voted and applicable as aforesaid until the necessary funds shall have been voted by parliament in that behalf.

Mr. HYMAN. We only had $25,000 at that time and so that seemed a necessary provision.

Mr. COCHRANE. Quite an amount for an ordinary wharf—$25,000. We would be glad of half of it in our section.

Mr. BELL. This is clearly one of the most extraordinary transactions that have come before the notice of this House. In discussing this matter last night attention was called to the fact that no tenders were called for this work. The reason advanced by the minister for this course was that no person would be in a position to tender except the company interested, because material could be supplied by them to better advantage than by any one else. Now, I find in the specification of timber as submitted by the government engineer that the greater part of that timber is southern pine, valued at $28 per thousand.

Mr. HYMAN. It is $27 per thousand is it not ?

Mr. BELL. Perhaps it is ;—$27 or $28 per thousand. Certainly, any other company as well as one engaged in the production of pulp on the St. Margaret river would be in as good a position to procure southern pine as they would. So, there is nothing whatever to justify the government in spending $85,000—supposing it be no more —in violation of the Act that requires that works of this kind should be carried out by tender and contract. That Act provides as follows :

The minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department—

Mr. SPROULE. This is not by officers of the department.

Mr. HYMAN. Certainly it is.

Mr. BELL. I understood that the only officer there was a resident engineer.

Mr. HYMAN. All those engaged in the work under that clause are officers and servants of the government while engaged on the work.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. BELL. In that case, the North Shore Power and Pulp Company is an officer of the government, because that is the party doing the work.

—or in cases where the estimated cost is less than $5,000.

Regarded from every point of view, there is really nothing that has been said to this House that justifies this transaction. The idea of this being built as a harbour of refuge is one that escaped the attention of the government for seven years. Only now, when certain parties want to build it do they make the discovery that it is necessary to make these important works. The reason given for not publicly calling for tenders is quite inadequate and offers no justification for adopting this course. There was no question of emergency, and there is nothing to show that it is more in the interest of the government to build this without tender than in the case of any other contract in which the government are engaged. If the government can take refuge under that section to justify the carrying out of this work in the way they are doing it practically they have set aside any other obligation resting upon them to perform any part of the public works of this country by tender and contract. If this is to be the interpretation placed upon the section by the minister, the whole system that has been looked upon as, in a certain measure, a security to the people of the country is wiped out. Because, there is no public work going on in Canada for which such justification could not be found if the government chose to do the work in the manner in which they are doing it here—by buying the materials and supplying the labour.

Mr. MORIN. I suppose the engineer has given to the minister the height, length and width of the wharf, and how many thousand feet of lumber and timber will be used in the contruction ?

Mr. HYMAN. He made plans of the wharf, and, of course, those plans give all the measurements.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister tells us that there were plans and specifications, and, as I understand, work was done under them. But now a new plan has been adopted. How are the engineers going to apply the work done under the old plan to the lines of the new ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has the report which explains the matter.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these all the documents connected with the matter that are on file in the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. All the documents under which this contract is made. I asked for all

the documents and these are all that were laid before me.

Mr. CLARKE. This item was discussed on the 9th October last year. The statement made by the Minister of Public Works was a very brief one. He said :

This is to make provision for the construction of a deep water pier on the west side of Bay of Seven Islands. The pier will run out in a northerly direction, nearly at right angles to the shore, and it will have a total length of 1,325 feet, reaching a depth of 48 feet at low water spring tide. The estimated cost is $65,000. The reason for the work is that there is a most important development going on at that place, and there are now large pulp mills in that district which was up to a year or so ago almost unknown.

That statement was made on October 9. That statement bears evidence that the department had sent an engineer down there, and that the engineer had made a survey——

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman can make any deductions he pleases ; as a matter of fact an engineer had not been sent down at that time.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman can then explain the meaning of the language which his colleague used in asking the committee twelve months ago for this appropriation. He gave particulars as to the location of the dock ; he told us in what position it was to be located ; he told us how it would run out ; he told us it would be at right angles to the shore running out in a northerly direction ; he told us it would have a total length of 1,354 feet and that it would have a depth of forty-eight feet at low water spring tide. The estimated cost was $65,000. We have surely the right to infer, if any value is to be placed on the statement made to the committee last October by the Minister of Public Works, that he had data upon which he made that statement and gave those particulars. If there had not been an engineer down there then we cannot attach much value to the statement. If the department had not sent an officer to make a survey of the harbour, to decide on the best site for the pier, of what dimensions it should be, and how it should run, if this statement of the minister is all to be cast aside, then I cannot say much more about it. The House or any person reading his statement would certainly conclude that the minister was speaking on the authority of some information given to him by an engineer of his department. How did he know the length the pier would be, or what it would cost ? Have we a right to infer that the minister imagined these things, or that he had some officer in his department who advised him as to what the probable cost would be ? How could he ascertain what the cost would be if he did not know the dimensions of the pier and the probable cost of material down there ?

Those remarks of the minister were made on October 9. Parliament prorogued about October 24, and this correspondence commenced, so far as the papers brought down show, on November 23. The first letter is dated from Quebec less than a month after prorogation, and six weeks after the statement of the minister. It is as follows :

NORTH SHORE POWER, RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

118 St. Peter St.,
Quebec, Nov. 23, 1903.

Hon. Jas. Sutherland,
Minister of Pubic Works,
Ottawa.

Sir,—We beg to hand you herewith our statement of work on Seven Islands wharf to end of season, showing expenditure of $34,433.95. Tenders were received for this work, but as none were satisfactory, all were rejected and the prices inserted in the bill herewith are contract figures and less than any tender received. They were arrived at after lengthened discussion with contractor Connolly. We affirm that the figures are fair and reasonable for the locality.

Certificate of engineers Ross and Holgate appended.

We submit the account for your approval, and shall be glad of early payment.

We beg to remain,
Yours very respectfully,
North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company.

THOS. MEANEY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Six or seven weeks after the House was asked to vote $25,000 as an initial appropriation to enable the government to construct a pier in a certain place, and of certain dimensions, a demand is sent from the secretary-treasurer of this company asking for payment of $34,433.95. There must have been some correspondence between the minister of the department and these gentlemen prior to this. This surely is not the beginning of the correspondence, where a person writes demanding the payment of $34,433.95.

Then on the next page, we have the account for work, which is as follows :—

NORTH SHORE POWER, RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Account for work on Seven Islands wharf. 1903.

Rock filling in approach, 17,695 cubic yards at $1.25, equals..	$22,118 75
Gravel top filling, 1,500 cubic yards at 30 cents, equals..	450 00
Timber, 205,548 feet B.M. at $27, equals	5,549 80
Framing timber, 17,129 cubic feet at 10 cents, equals	1,712 90
Rock filling in crib, 3,190 cubic yards at $1.25, equals	3,987 50
Iron in crib-work, 20,000 pounds at 3 cents, equals..	615 00
Total value of work done....	$34,433 95

And then this is the certificate attached:

Robt. A. Ross, C.E. Cable address 'Rossgate'
Henry Holgate, C.E. Telephone Main 4223

ROSS & HOLGATE,
Consulting and Supervising Engineers,
80 St. François-Xavier Street,
Montreal, November 21st, 1903.

The North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company,
Quebec.

Dear Sirs,—The work in connection with the construction of the wharf at Seven Islands bay was commenced in April last, and carried on continuously until the first week of this month, when it had to be discontinued on account of the severity of the weather.

The approach to the wharf comprises the rock filling of about 530 feet in length. This was nearly completed, and one length of 200 feet of cribwork was sunk, and built up to elevation 110·00.

The expenditure on the construction of the wharf to date, for work, has been as follows :—

Rock filling in approach, 17,695 cubic yards at $1.25	$22,118 75
Gravel top filling, 1,500 cubic yards at 30 cents	450 00
Timber, 205,548 feet B.M. at $27	5,549 80
Framing timber, 17,129 cubic feet at 10 cents	1,712 90
Rock filling in crib, 3,190 cubic yards at $1.25	3,987 50
Iron in cribwork, 20,500 pounds at 3 cents	615 00
	$34,433 95

We beg to certify that the above statement is correct.

Truly yours,
ROSS & HOLGATE.

PRICE LIST.

Wharf timber at Seven Islands.

12 x 12 per appended statement, 691,309 feet B.M., $27 per M. feet B.M.

10 x 10 sawn cedar, 70,000 feet B.M.,

10 x 10 spruce, 20,000 feet B.M., $18 per M. feet B.M.

10 x 10 white pine, 30,000 feet B.M.,

Iron.

22,000 pounds ¾ round at 3 cents pound.

Then on December 16th, nearly a month after the payment of $34,433.95 was demanded by the secretary-treasurer of the company on account of the work done, we have this memorandum from the department of Public Works :

Copy. No. Subject, Seven Islands, Q.
Ref. No.

Department of Public Works of Canada,
Chief Engineer's Office,
Ottawa, December 16, 1903.

Sir,—During the last session of parliament the sum of $25,000 was granted towards the construction of a breakwater in the harbour of Seven Islands, county of Saguenay, Quebec. The building of a breakwater was, however, commenced by the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company, under contract with Mr. Michael Connolly, the amount expended by the company to date being, according to the inclosed letter from Mr. Thomas Meaney, secretary-treasurer of the company, $34,433.95. The contract prices were fixed by the company after calling for tenders from a number of reliable contractors. None of the tenders being found satisfactory, an agreement was entered into with Mr. Connolly to perform the work at prices lower than those of any tender received, and I am satisfied that the prices affixed to the different quantities of work already performed are fair and reasonable. I therefore believe it would be in the interest of the department to purchase from the company for the amount of the expenditure incurred to date, the portion of the work which they have already built, and to continue the breakwater to completion on the site adopted by them, which is the one they have deemed best suitable for the purpose it was intended to serve.

The company are the owners of the site of, and the approach to, the work commenced by them. It would therefore be necessary, should the department take over the work, for the company to vest in the Crown the deep water lot upon which the wharf is to be built, as well as all the land required for freight sheds, &c., and the road across the property, for the public use.

With the plans at my disposal I am unable to locate and properly describe the land required for the road and storage accommodation, and it is impossible at this season of the year to send an engineer to make the necessary survey. This, however, if an agreement is entered into with the company, could be done as early as possible next spring, and before the actual work of construction was commenced. I have not at my disposal the necessary plans with soundings on the site of the proposed work, and I will cause contract plans and specifications to be prepared as soon as I am advised that the work already performed by the company has been vested in the crown, and that the company have agreed to give all the land required for the public use of the wharf when completed.

The company have on hand on the site of the proposed work the following quantities of materials :

Southern pine, 12 inches by 12 inches square, 691,309 feet B.M.

Sawn cedar, 10 inches by 10 inches square, 70,000 feet B. M.

Sawn spruce, 10 inches by 10 inches square, 20,000 feet B.M.

Sawn white pine, 10 inches by 10 inches square, 30,000 feet B.M.

Iron, ¾-inch round, 22,000 pounds.

I understand from Mr. Meaney and the company's engineer, Mr. Holgate, of Montreal, that the prices paid for these materials are as follows :

Southern pine $27.00 per M. B.M.

Cedar, spruce and white pine, $18.00 per M. B.M.

Iron, 3 cents per pound.

At these prices, which I deem fair and reasonable, the above-mentioned materials would cost $21,485.34, and as they are already delivered on the site of the work, a clause might be inserted in the specification to the effect that intending contractors would agree to take over these materials at the prices mentioned. Annexed to this letter is a statement of the quantities and prices of these materials.

I may add that the work already performed by the company includes the building of a stone embankment or approach to the wharf, about

530 feet in length, any one crib 200 feet in length, sunk in position. According to the building plans left with me by the company, the work has been performed in the manner in which such works are usually built by the department. I would, therefore, be at liberty to accept the work already performed.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) EUGENE LAFLEUR,
Acting Chief Engineer.

This is all the correspondence in this bunch except some one or two typewritten statements as to quantities of timber, southern pine, &c. It was pointed out by the Minister of Justice last year that this work ought to be done. In the course of the speech which he made recommending the appropriation of $25,000, he said :

It is of the greatest importance to the navigation of the St. Lawrence that there should be a port in the Bay of Seven Islands, which would be a place of refuge for the vessels, and where they could be repaired. It would be in the public interest to have a wrecking plant and a dry-dock there. It is really more central than Quebec, where there is a wrecking plant now. When a vessel gets aground, it is of the utmost importance that she should be taken off at the earliest possible moment, so as to be saved the consequences of the terrible battering she would get if a storm came on. If a vessel happens to be stranded and is allowed to remain on the rocks for a week, and one of those terrific storms which we have down there comes on, she will, as the saying is, practically pound the bottom out of herself. This place is not in my constituency, but is in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Girard) ; but it is the only point on the lower St. Lawrence where there is a harbour, and it is important that we should have at that central point conveniences for enabling us to go to the help of vessels which may be wrecked in the locality. This work is not for the benefit of one firm only. All those American firms which come in there for the purpose of exploiting our spruce limits will use this port as a port of shipment. How can you ship pulp from the lower St. Lawrence if you cannot get vessels into a harbour whence it can be shipped ?

Just a few weeks after that statement was made as to the necessity of this work we find the government in negotiation to acquire a property about which the engineer practically knew nothing, because he makes no certificate as far as I can see here. He says that it is impossible to send an engineer down at that season of the year. He accepts a work constructed by a private company on its own property. He accepts the statement of the secretary treasurer of the company accompanied by the certificate of the company's engineers, and upon the strength of that he recommends, and the government accept the recommendation, that this pier at Seven Islands, and which was being constructed by this private company in its own interest, should be taken over at the company's price. The government also assume the responsibility for the completion of the work and pay for all the work and materials which the company have done or supplied and the government's engineer certifies to the account. If this is a satisfactory way of doing business, why then I do not think I should occupy any more of the time of the committee. It seems to me to be a most unbusiness like proposition. It seems to me that the committee was not placed in possession of all the information which it had a right to expect from the hon. minister when he asked for this vote last year. There has been no reason advanced yet why the government should have taken this work over and made the contract which it has made with this company. I enter my protest as one member of the committee against this method of doing business because I think it is not in the public interest that business should be done in this way. The hon. gentleman may have all these letters and documents now.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the hon. mintser please answer that question ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have endeavoured to explain the item several times.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman did not explain the question I put to him.

Mr. HYMAN. What was the question ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I thought the hon. minister was paying some attention to what I was saying.

Mr. HYMAN. It is pretty hard to remember the question after the long oration we have had from the hon member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke.)

Mr. COCHRANE. The question was if the wharf was partly built in accordance with one specification how the government could adopt a new specification and work it out. This is an extraordinary position to take and I think the hon. acting minister will see how fallacious his statement is when he pretends to shelter himself behind the wording of the statute. I know that when he thinks the matter over he will see that the statute was never intended to cover a case like this. I am here to tell the acting minister that if he has no alternative, but to accept the recommendation of his engineer he had better get out of the business. The hon. minister has power to either accept or reject the recommendation of his engineer. I never knew that the department was run by the engineer. I knew it would be pretty hard for the minister to adopt every recommendation of the engineer, but I never knew that the minister was compelled to accept every recommendation that the engineer made. If that is the stand that the minister takes he is in a very absurd position. If a private individual got money in the same way that the hon. Minister of Public Works got money from this committee last year he would soon be put behind the penitentiary bars. He got the money under false pre-

tenses. He asked for money to commence a work when it was already commenced, and it cost the country somewhere about $34,000 to pay for the work that had already been done. I think it is an absurd proposition to say that if they change their minds in reference to a work they cannot call for new tenders. They had to change their plans and specifications. I would like to ask the hon. minister what there was to hinder him from asking for public tenders for the work. The hon. minister will realize that he cannot shelter himself behind that clause of the statute because that clause of the statute was framed to meet a different situation. Should sudden emergency arise on a canal or public work the statute was designed to enable the government to employ the men on the canal or public work in finishing up the work. It is absurd to say that because these men are hired by the government they are officials of the government. It is absurd to say that the labouring men employed on this wharf are government officials. The engineer is a government official, but outside of that they are not government officials; they are hired men. We all know, from what has transpired here, that it costs about twenty-five per cent more for the government to do work by day's labour than by contract. If this work is necessary, I am prepared to vote the money, but I must be sure that it is in the best interests of the people of Canada, and that no private individual will be reaping a rich harvest out of the hard earnings of the people of this country.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) sees his words in 'Hansard' he will regret stating that the Minister of Public Works last year asked the House for money under false pretenses.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. There is not one tittle of evidence before this committee——

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the minister tell me——

Mr. HYMAN. Excuse me; I have the floor. There is not one tittle of evidence before this House which would show that in October last, when the minister asked for this vote, he had any knowledge whatever of the fact of there being a wharf there that time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then how did his officer make a report?

Mr. HYMAN. I am stating, in answer to the charge made, that when the minister asked for this vote there is not a tittle of evidence to show that he knew there was a wharf in existence. He said it was proposed to build a wharf there; he gave the cost at $65,000, and he pursued the usual course in initial votes in asking for a sum in the estimates sufficient to enable the department to enter into a contract, but not enough to complete the work. It was decided afterwards that it would be more in the public interest that the government should acquire the property that had already been constructed.

Mr. COCHRANE. And the minister did not know it. When ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise.

Mr. HYMAN. Very often, when a work has progressed to the extent of forty or even fifty per cent, if in the opinion of the engineer it is in the public interest to change the plans, the plans are changed without in any possible way interfering with the work already done. In this case there were certain changes made in the plans of the engineer, notwithstanding that there had been an expenditure of $34,000. It is quite true that a minister does not of necessity have to follow the reports made by his engineer, but he must be very largely guided by these reports. I do not say in all cases the minister is obliged to concur, but it is a very serious matter if he goes against his engineer's reports, and if I tried to justify such a thing in this House I have no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite would make a serious attack on me.

Mr. COCHRANE. I referred to the engineer's recommendation.

Mr. HYMAN. His recommendation in writing and his report are practically the same thing. The engineer is a technical officer and it is a serious thing for the minister to override on a purely technical question, the report of an engineer who has been in the department for many years.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister has left his department in a worse hole than before he attempted a defence. I can tell him that when I see 'Hansard' I will not be sorry for what I said.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sorry you won't.

Mr. COCHRANE. You need not be sorry for me; be sorry for yourself. You are responsible for the blunder you made in playing into the hands of a certain party that you think more of, it looks to me, than you do of the public funds of this country. What is the position of the minister after challenging me for my impertinent statement?

Mr. HYMAN. I never said that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Let me speak now.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is quick enough to interrupt me——

Mr. COCHRANE. Sit down; I have the floor; that is what you told me. If I understand the matter rightly, the Minister of Public Works did get money under false pretenses. Will the hon. gentleman now

tell me that from the time parliament prorogued until the time they made this contract, they could expend $34,000 without the knowledge of the department? The minister last year asked for that appropriation to commence a work that had already been commenced and had been going on for nearly six months, and then the hon. gentleman tells this committee that the minister did not know anything about it. Well, when ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise.

Mr. CLARKE. Or otherwise.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the company were constructing a work there and willing to spend their money on it, I cannot for the life of me see why the government should assume that work.

Mr. HYMAN. The vote was passed in October, 1903. There was no payment made to the company until after the report of the engineer of the 25th of June, 1904.

Mr. COCHRANE. But the work was done.

Mr. HYMAN. The papers show that the work had been commenced by the company in 1903.

Mr. CLARKE. I can appeal to the hon. gentleman that if time has been taken up on this item, it is due to the paucity of the information which he gave to the committee when this matter came up yesterday. There is some cause for complaint that the full information to which the committee was entitled has not been laid before it; because I maintain, with all respect for the hon. gentleman's officers, that the file of correspondence which has been laid on the table does not contain all the correspondence which took place between the persons from whom this wharf was purchased and the department. That is rather an unfortunate state of affairs. The engineer did not recommend that the site of this company's dock should be accepted. He did not recommend that the proposition made to this committee by the Minister of Public Works last year should be abandoned altogether. He does not say that the wharf which the government has taken over is on the same site and in the same location and is for the same purpose for which a vote of $25,000 was taken last year to commence the construction of a government pier. The engineer should not be held responsible for the action of the government. The engineer's report speaks for itself. The engineer is very prudent and very cautious in making his statement, and that statement was not made until almost a month after the secretary-treasurer of the company had sent a certificate to the minister of the value of the work done on the wharf and asked for a cheque for it. The statement of the engineer points out that this wharf or pier is on private property, and that before the government can do anything in the matter the property will, of course, have to be deeded to the Crown. The engineer recommended further that the material for which the country is to pay, or has paid, $21,000 or $22,000, should be charged up to the contractor for the work at the same price that the government paid to the company. That, it seems to me, would imply that the engineer of the department desired that the remainder of the work should be done by contract. Will the hon. gentleman pass over the report or read that portion of it?

Mr. HYMAN (reading):

> At these prices, which I deem fair and reasonable, the above mentioned materials would cost $21,485.34, and, as they are already delivered on the site of the work, a clause might be inserted in the specification to the effect that intending contractors would agree to take over these materials at the prices mentioned.

Mr. CLARKE. If the engineer knew what he was writing, and I suppose he did, he intended that tenders should be called for the completion of the work, because he recommended that if tenders were called for, the successful tenderer should be charged the same amount for the material on hand that the government had paid the company for it. The transaction all through is in a very unsatisfactory shape, and if we reach wrong conclusions in regard to it, it will be because we have not received all the information we are entitled to. I understand the peculiar difficulty the acting minister finds himself in, because this correspondence took place and this report was made prior to his assuming charge of the department; but it was the duty of his officers to supply all this information, so that we might form an intelligent judgment upon the matter. I think it is a vicious principle for the government to ask parliament for a vote for a specific purpose, and then to ignore the intention of parliament, apply the money to another purpose, purchase private property, and do it all in the most careless and slipshod way. The hon. gentleman said this money was not to be paid over until June last. The contract was not completed until the 23rd of June, the date on which it was signed. Have the officers of the department obtained any information as to whether the storms of last fall and winter damaged the work that was constructed?

Mr. HYMAN. We have no information as to any damage having been done to the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the opposition have a perfect right to object to this item. Last year the government prepared their estimates in Council, laid them before parliament and asked for $25,000, and the minister, when asked by this side of the House what that was for, stated that it was for the purpose of erecting a wharf, giving the name of the place, the kind of wharf that

was to be constructed, the necessity for it, its dimensions, and everything else connected with it. The opposition accepted the minister's statement that it was a work of necessity and in the interest of the country, and supposed that the government would proceed with the work as all public works are carried on, by first getting a report from their engineer and then calling for tenders. But what do we find to-day? If there is any truth in the statement which I have in my hand, and which I am going to read, the government must issue a commission and have this matter investigated. A party who has been on the ground writes this letter:

Dear Sir,—I regret to say that conditions were not favourable to take a photograph of the work I saw going on at 'Clarke's City,' in the bay of Seven Islands, for I would dearly like to show the people of this country how they are being 'flim-flammed' and their money squandered in aiding the schemes of unscrupulous adventurers, from across the border, for a consideration, enlist the active support of one of the members of this 'business' government.

In this instance I refer to the operations of the company known as the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company, a body corporate and politic, with head office in New York, though I think they have an office in Quebec, for which, like Gaynor & Green, the firm of the Hon. (?) Charley Fitzpatrick is counsel, &c. Anyway, it was that hon. gentleman, who got this company its charter, and has ever since watched over it with fatherly care.

Some two years ago, this aggregation of New York adventurers, through the efforts of Fitzpatrick's firm, of which Mr. Parent, premier of Quebec, is a member, secured a tract of timber and pulpwood lands, situated on the River St. Marguerite, about three hundred miles below Quebec. After this, they purchased, for a nominal sum, the water power of the River St. Marguerite, and began to make such improvements as seemed necessary for the manufacture of pulp. For this purpose, it was necessary to have an outlet on Seven Islands bay, so a railroad about nine or ten miles long running from the first falls of the Ste. Marguerite to Seven Islands bay was projected—but I understand it is not yet finished—all the rolling stock of which has been allowed in free of duty; but this is not the worst feature, from a public standpoint, of the 'encouragement' that has been extended to this 'infant industry.' A deep water terminus was necessary, so this company set to work to build a wharf, by extending out in the bay, a rock embankment, from the excavations along the line of railway to a distance of about eight hundred feet, or to a depth of about ten or twelve feet of water, where the first section of a timber wharf about two hundred feet long and thirty wide was placed, and filled up to low water with stone from the excavation. This much was accomplished last year; but towards the close of the season, the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company discovered that they had undertaken an expensive experiment, and ways and means were discussed to induce the government to undertake the expense of providing this company with the wharf and terminal facilities for their own business; and strange as it may seem, the Department of Public Works have taken over, and paid for all the work and material supplied by this company on account of the terminal facilities required for its own use. There is not a habitation or living man residing within miles of this wharf, and no person will ever use it, but this pulp proposition (if it ever is finished.)

I understand this scheme was worked last year by the Hon. 'Charley' Fitzpatrick, who induced the Minister of Public Works to put an item in the estimates ($25,000) for a wharf at Seven Islands. This passed the House all right, for Seven Islands is an old Hudson Bay post, and still something of a trading station with the Indians; but is fully nine miles across the bay from Clarke City, where the wharf is being built. Then during the present session of parliament, another appropriation of $60,000 has been asked, making in all so far $85,000 to aid a scheme that is no earthly use to any one outside the aggregation comprising this pulp syndicate, Fitzpatrick, Girard et al; but presumably some of this money will be laid aside to help Girard, M.P., for the district, and the Hon. Charley through the next election.

I am credibly informed that the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company is building this wharf by days' labour, and furnishing the material at abnormally big prices, and the Department of Public Works is paying the bills monthly.

No wonder Fitzpatrick et al were desirous of getting rid of the Auditor General.

Why should these bills be paid? Even if the work were required for the general good of Canada, the Public Works Department, has no authority to assume the expense of such a job without letting the work by public tender. It is easy for such cattle to find money to debauch the electorate, if they are allowed to go on in this manner.

Ask for a royal commission to investigate the matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Signed by whom?

Mr. TAYLOR. By a gentleman who, if given the commission, will produce evidence to substantiate every word that is in that paper. If these are the facts, it is the duty of the government to name a commission and see whether these statements are correct or not.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the hon. gentleman pass me over the paper? I find there is no signature to this document which the hon. gentleman has read. Kindly give us the name.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman name a commission?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Either one of two things. The hon. gentleman has read a document which——

Mr. TAYLOR. Which was placed in my hands by a responsible party, who, he says, will verify every statement it contains.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman said that it was signed by a responsible party.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say it was signed, but that it was placed in my hands by a responsible party.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will he give the name of the responsible party or, in the alternative, make himself responsible for the truth of those statements, and they will be met very quickly.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another alternative. These statements just read are alleged to be correct. We have no knowledge whether they are correct or not. They were read before the Minister of Justice, who is one of the parties named, and the reading of these statements affords him an opportunity of either denying or explaining them or attaching what weight to them he thinks fit. They are made in such a way that he can set this House right. If any members of this House are improperly informed or wrongfully informed, or if the allegations are not correct, the opportunity is given him of setting the House right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I must confess that I am surprised that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) for whom, as he knows, I have very great regard, would take the responsibility of saying here that an anonymous document of this sort must be answered in this House. The document has been read in the House, and I ask now that it be laid on the table to form part of the records so that we may know with what we are dealing. Independent altogether of the statement appearing in 'Hansard' which gives it some weight, in view of the fact that it was read by the chief whip of the opposition, I want this document to be in the custody of the House because I know something of this document and I know it did not reach the chief whip of the opposition direct but came to him through another channel. In this paper, these gentlemen, the Clarke Company are said to be a firm of New York adventurers. Sir, there is not a member of that firm, so far as my recollection goes—and I am pretty certain that I am correct—who is not a Canadian. The members of the firm are the Clarke Brothers of Toronto, who also do business in New York, but who have remained British subjects. They never changed their allegiance. It is said here that this firm acquired these timber limits by—I do not know exactly what process described, but evidently the writer of this paper suggests that they were acquired by some improper method. Sir, they were acquired by that firm at public auction after competition. No public timber limits can be sold in the province of Quebec except at public auction. That is provided by statute. With respect to the water-powers, I do not know anything about the way they were acquired. Nor do I know anything about the incorporation of the company. I left my law firm in 1896, and have never been actively engaged in the management of it since then. I know absolutely nothing of what was done and am absoutely unconnected with the management of my firm in any way, shape or form, except that my name appears in it. In view of these facts and in view of the fact that this production is anonymous——

An hon. MEMBER. Disreputable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it is, to say the least, unfair to make it the basis of an attack upon me. I do not know of anything I have done at any time since I have been connected with the House which would justify any gentleman in assuming, on the strength of an anonymous letter, that I would for a consideration—for that is what is stated—commit this House to an improper vote. All I know is that—as I stated last year and repeat now—this coast, extending from Tadousac to the entrance of the Straits of Belle Isle, a distance of 600 odd miles, with a population of over 10,000, should have some facilities, and there is not a public wharf in the whole of that locality except at this point. As to whether or not the bargain was a provident or an improvident one, that is something which hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves. At all events I had absolutely nothing to do with the drawing of the contract. I never saw it until I read it to-night. I never saw anything of the correspondence exchanged until this moment, and I fail to understand what is the reason of this personal attack. It seems to me we can discuss matters of this sort without having recourse to such methods.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that all the explanation the minister has to give ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What further explanation do you require ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister will be fair enough to admit that we are doing him an act of great kindness and justice when we bring to his attention the rumours which he alleges are entirely false, and which would create an erroneous impression if not explained by himself or some one else who knew the situation and the circumstances and could put the matter right. But when we give him this opportunity, he thinks we are doing him an act of unkindness. The hon. minister says I took the responsibility of that article.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not say that the hon. gentleman did. I said I was sure that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) would not do it.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I would not, but since it is there, let me point out what is likely to be the public impression created by

it. The Minister of Justice, who is a member of the firm of Fitzpatrick, Parent and—what is the name ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are five or six names in it.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Parent is the premier of the province of Quebec and has under his control practically, or that of his government, the disposal of the timber lands and the water-powers in that province. The Minister of Justice has given us a piece of valuable information, to my mind, and that is that the timber lands are sold by public auction. That being the case, we must assume that the gentlemen who purchased these limits, purchased them at their value in the market. So that there could be nothing wrong about that transaction whatever firm bought the limits. But the impression would have been left on the public mind, without such explanantion, that in some way or other the premier of the province of Quebec, who is a partner of the Minister of Justice, had secured for this firm valuable timber limits and water-powers. There is no information as to it being secured properly or otherwise ; it is secured. There is no insinuation, so far as I know that any of the parties have individually profited.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is aware that, under the law of our province, there can be no sale of timber lands by the province except by public auction.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an illustration of what I have just said—that this gives the Minister of Justice an opportunity to make an explanation which the world at large does not know, and which puts a very different face upon the matter. With that explanation, it is clear that the firm could not have obtained the limit for less than it is worth. I do not know that any one has insinuated or would insinuate, after hearing this read together with the explanation of the minister, that either Mr. Parent or Mr. Fitzpatrick profited by this.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is insinuated that I got it for political purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. But, after this firm becomes possessed of the timber and water-power through one member of the legal firm, another member of the same legal firm, who happens to be in the Dominion government advocates the building of a wharf there, and secures—or, if he does not secure it, at least there is secured through the Minister of Public Works—an item in the estimates for the building of that wharf. And, if the allegations be true that there is no settlement there and no commerce to be provided for, there would be no need for a wharf except to improve the facilities for this corporation. There is another corporation there of which I happen to know in Ontario as a respectable firm. I say nothing against the firm of Clarke Brothers, because I know nothing about them. But we cannot suppose but that people will draw their own inferences from the facts that are placed before them. The fact that the Minister of Justice happens to be a member of the law firm that got the land and water-powers for this concern, and, immediately after, the Dominion government, of which he is a member, buy a portion of the wharf that this lumber firm are building and add money to build a wharf which, according to the allegations made can be of no use except to further the interest of these parties ; and this is done upon an engineer's report which does not show that he has measured or verified in any way the quantity of work taken over but simply says that he believes the estimate of the timber is reasonable ; and on the strength of this the money is paid. The Minister of Public Works says that he knew nothing about the existence of a wharf there or of one being built. But the Minister of Justice had already told him by his statement in this House, which was as follows :

> I know something of the bay of Seven Islands and this wharf partly built by a private company.

This statement was made when this item was under discussion. Yet, the Minister of Public Works says there is not a word to justify the statement that the Department of Public Works knew that there was such a work under construction, and there is no reason to insinuate that he knew that anything was being done except to begin de novo a wharf undertaken for philanthropic purposes or to facilitate the commerce of that region. We are told that there is no wharf for a great distance along that coast, and that these waters are considered the graveyard of the St. Lawrence. That would be a strong argument in favour of building a harbour of refuge. I felt like asking how many wrecks had taken place in these waters within the last twenty or thirty years. Because, if it could be shown that many wrecks had taken place, that would be an exceedingly strong argument in favour of a harbour of refuge. If, in addition, it had been shown that the navigators of those waters had applied to the government for a harbour of refuge, I would say that that also was a strong argument in favour of it. But we endeavoured to get that information from the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) and also from the Minister of Public Works himself (Mr. Sutherland), but we got no information at all along that line. So, we have the right to assume that there was no demand and no application from the shipping interests of that section for a wharf. Taking all these things into consideration, we had just grounds for the assertion that this wharf

was built in the interest of this one concern and of this one concern alone. I am far from saying that even then it would not be justified, for, when people build up a great industry and give employment to labour, they are entitled to consideration, and they have their claims to be furnished with facilities, as well as people in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I suppose that document will be placed on file in the House ? I request that it be placed on file.

Mr. SPROULE. There would be no object in doing otherwise. It was for the purpose of bringing out the information that it was brought forward. And my own suggestion regarding it was to have the name of the Minister of Justice mentioned in a document of this kind and in connection with such rumours as were current means either that the rumour should not be circulated or else there must be something behind it, that we did not know. Now, I thought it would do the minister greater justice to read it in his presence and allow him to make such explanation as he thought fit to have such a rumour going around the world where he was in no position to defend himself by making such explanation as he could make here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was not this company incorporated by this parliament or was it the railway company ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK : Not this company, but the railway company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I remember the minister making the explanation about this very place. I would like to have the plans of this shore and the wharf laid on the table that we may see whether this is going to be a harbour of refuge or simply an accommodation for the pulp factory. If the government fairly make the excuse that it will be a harbour of refuge, that will be something in favour of this vote. But, if it is merely for the accommodation of this one corporation, the item has to come out so far as the opposition are concerned. I wish to point out to the minister that the sums involved in this work and in that of Grande Vallée for the benefit of two lumber companies on the River St. Lawrence where there is no settlement would open up a hundred miles of navigation in a country that is well settled in the county of Victoria and Haliburton, by connecting a number of lakes and thus give the people there access to the world. And yet, we cannot get a dollar for those works. But these lumber companies walk up and get for such works as this and the Grande Vallée wharf, sums that are almost fabulous, the spending of which increases the value of their property, and the voting of which is so suspicious that a deal is charged by one of the government supporters in this House. And the Minister of Justice knows it. I will not say he (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is a party to this matter. It is a Montreal district man who made the deal. And here is this other which looks like a deal, though we do not know the nature of it. If there is a harbour of refuge there well and good. But we ought to see the plans.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will not need to look at the plans. If he will look at the map, he will see that this is on the north shore of the St. Lawrence opposite the eastern extremity of the Island of Anticosti. This is a bay that is eleven miles wide and at least eleven miles deep and practically land-locked. It affords perfect protection from the storms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where is this dock, in the bay ? If so, what do you want a dock for in a harbour of refuge ? If you get into a land-locked bay what more do you want ? Why are not the plans of these things brought here ? We tried to get the plans for the Grande Vallée dock and I never saw them.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the engineer, as the Minister of Justice has already said, that this is a perfect harbour. This wharf is built there to close up part of the mouth of the harbour and thus reduce the width, making it a better shelter harbour, that is reduce the width of the mouth of the harbour and add material to make it a shelter harbour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was the depth of the harbour at their dock ? It is largely sailing vessels that are used there and these would want a wider entrance to come in.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is steamers altogether.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These sailing vessels would not want to make port through a narrow entrance.

Mr. HYMAN. The length of the dock is 1,100 feet.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let us have a chart.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We will get Bayfield's chart.

Mr. BELL. Had we not better let this item stand ?

Mr. HYMAN. The matter has been fully discussed, and I do not think it should be discussed any longer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not think it should pass at all.

Mr. HYMAN. Then move to strike it out.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely, in view of the statement which has been placed in my hands by a responsible party, who says he

has been there, and in view of the fact that there is no contradiction of his statements, it is proved that the government came down last year and asked and obtained $25,000 to build a wharf, and at the same time, and six months before, the company were at work building a wharf. Now they come forward and ask another appropriation of $65,000. From the papers laid on the table of the House it is proved that no tenders were advertised for, that there was simply a bargain with these people who are to go ahead and complete it. If last year, when the committee was asked to vote $25,000 to commence this work, they had known all these circumstances, the opposition would have voted that this appropriation be struck out. I would, therefore, move that this item of $65,000 be struck out.

Mr. BELL. In listening to the reading of the certificate by the engineer I thought it was a very cautious one. Were there any subsequent surveys obtained by the department before they paid the money ?

Mr. HYMAN. The money was paid upon an account by the company upon the certificate of the two resident engineers and the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. CLARKE. Who were the two engineers ?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Tassé and Mr. Lamoureux.

Mr. HYMAN. Are they engineers of the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. They are both engineers of the department. One is district engineer and the other is resident engineer.

Mr. BELL. And they certify both as to quantity and price ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the certificates of these engineers there ?

Mr. HYMAN. They will be on the bill rendered by the company.

Mr. CLARKE. Have we that bill before us ?

Mr. HYMAN. What is here is simply a statement of the expenditure.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no certificate of any engineer there.

Mr. HYMAN. That will be filed.

Mr. CLARKE. There must be some more papers filed, because certainly that file is incomplete.

Mr. HYMAN. The bill rendered by the company would not form part of the papers in the possession of the department in any case.

Mr. BELL. If this embankment was constructed, as it has been said, by the company simply dumping in the harbour the stone from the excavations on the railway, and they were paid $1.25 a yard for that, the company must have reason to look on this as a fairly paternal government. That is a very fair rate of pay. We have not very full information in reference to this matter, and if the minister can assure us that he can give some further information, I think he should let the item stand until Monday.

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me that there is really no further information that can be laid before the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely there is some more correspondence that can be brought down. There must be the first application for a grant, and then an attempt should be made to reconcile the statement of the minister last year when he asked for the $25,000. I have produced here a statement that there is not a man within nine miles of this place. Surely, in the face of this statement, the government are not going to force it through.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the mouth of what river is this pier being erected ?

Mr. HYMAN. The engineer informs me it is at Pointe Noir.

Mr. CLARKE. This committee are entitled to know if the government are in possession of any information or report from the engineer. We passed a vote of $25,000 last year to commence the construction of a pier for a specific purpose. The hon. gentleman's predecessor gave us particulars last year when he asked this vote of $25,000. It is not creditable to the department that we have to drag these statements out in order to get information to enable us to know what we are doing. The minister made specific statements as to the location of the dock, the length of the pier, depth of water, &c. He must have done that from some advice or report of his engineers. We are entitled to know why the engineer abandoned the location, why he accepted this new property, and if it will suit. He has made no statement to that effect in the documents which have been submitted to us.

Mr. HYMAN. I am informed by the engineer that the work which this vote is asked to complete will fulfil all the requirements that it was intended to fulfil when the vote of $25,000 was asked for.

Mr. CLARKE. I can only say that in so far as I am personally concerned that statement by the engineer will mitigate the conditions considerably, but we have a right to have some report from the engineer to justify this departure from the policy announced by the hon. Minister of Public Works last year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I find that by the letter read that this wharf is not near the west side of the harbour of Seven Islands at all. It is said to be at the mouth of the St. Margaret river according to the letter

produced and it is shown by the chart in an air line to be seven and a half miles from the entrance to the river and up towards Quebec. I think you may assume that this is correct and the acting Minister of Public Works is ignorant of any knowledge as to where the wharf is to be.

Mr. HYMAN. Is the wharf marked on the chart ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, but I have the chart here showing that the St. Margaret river is seven miles west. The railway charter called for a road in the valley of the St. Margaret river. That is where the charter requires the railway to run, and here we find the St. Margaret river entering the St. Lawrence seven and a half miles above the harbour of Seven Islands. Seven Islands and the Hudson Bay post are away on the north side, and in an air-line across the isthmus it is eleven miles as stated in this report which has been read by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I think that in face of all this the hon. minister should bring down some plans and not attempt to have this committee deceived by stating that this wharf is to be at the entrance of the Bay of Seven Islands. It is not according to the letter read, but is on the St. Margaret river and away up from the mouth of the harbour. Surely the hon. minister is not going to attempt to ask for a vote of this kind ?

Mr. HYMAN. I will ask the hon. gentleman not to use such intemperate language. I am making no attempt to deceive the committee at all. The hon. gentleman is making his statement upon an anonymous letter read to this committee by the hon. member for Leeds ; I am making my statement upon the statement of the engineer who assures me that the wharf is where I have stated it to be at the entrance to the harbour of Seven Islands. Surely I cannot be charged with misleading the committee under these circumstances.

Mr. BELL. Upon which side of the harbour is it, the east or the west ?

Mr. HYMAN. On the west side of the harbour.

Mr. BELL. How far is it from the village of Seven Islands, which I understand is on the east side of the harbour ?

Mr. HYMAN. The statement was made last year that the wharf is eight or nine miles from the village of Seven Islands.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, then, all we have to do is to get the plans of the department.

Mr. HYMAN. The plans will not show the position of the wharf on the shore.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The plans will have to show where it is on the shore. They cannot show it in open water. I want to tell the hon. minister that if he says the harbour is on the west side then his statement a little while ago was absolutely unfounded. The hon. minister has made the statement based on the random and vague expressions of some of the officials of the department that this would narrow the entrance to the harbour.

Mr. HYMAN. The statement I made was that this would narrow the entrance of the harbour and I still maintain that is perfectly correct.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, then I will tell the hon. gentleman that his statement is absolutely wrong because the entrance to the harbour is on the southeast side of the bay and not on the west side of the bay, so that he had better look up his geography. I will send the plan over to him if he wants to see it.

Mr. HYMAN. Well, the hon. gentleman is making the statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, he is not making that statement. He knows what he is talking about.

Mr. TALBOT. That is something new.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, as hon. gentlemen know to their cost it is not something new. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) will know it if he is not very careful. I will take him in hand some of these days and I will endeavour to civilize him a little.

Mr. MACPHERSON. He will take care of himself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He will skip out the same as the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) did to-day.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next time the hon. gentleman has anything to say to the member for Hants I hope he will say it when he is in the House and not when his back is turned.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I never take anything back. The statement of the hon minister is entirely wrong.

Mr. HYMAN. The statement is not entirely wrong. The statement is perfectly correct. The wharf is built on the west side of the harbour and narrows the entrance of the harbour of Seven Islands.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We will take the statement here, although the engineer has not his plan, which is to the effect that the entrance to the harbour is on the southeast side of the bay and not on the west side. The hon. minister said that it was at the west side.

Mr. HYMAN. I said from the west side.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister did not say from the west side. He said at the west side. However, if he says he said from the west side I suppose I will have to accept his statement although I know what

he said. He may have meant 'from' but he said 'on.' I had the chart in front of me at the time he made his statement. We find that the engineer has never visited the place and has no plan of it. He says that this railway runs along here. I want to see a plan of the harbour and I want to see where the railway line runs. If the railway is surveyed you can get the plans in the railway department. The plans must be registered, if so they must be in the Railway Department, and they will show where this line or railway runs, and also show its relationship to the bay, and we will be able to ascertain then when we see whether there is a dock there at all or not, nobody ever saw the dock.

Mr. TAYLOR. In view of the information laid before the committee to-night and in view of the statement which I have presented from a party who says that he knows the facts to be correct as given, it is plain that we were humbugged last year in voting $25,000 on a statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works which was not in accordance with the facts as represented to the committee to-night. We are now asked to vote $60,000 to carry on this job—it is nothing more or less than a job—which is being perpetrated so that this amount of money can be given to a company of Americans. The hon. Minister of Justice says that these gentlemen are British subjects although living in New York. Notwithstanding the fact that they are living in New York he says that these men have never become naturalized. Their business is carried on from New York and the hon. Minister of Justice has not contradicted the statement made in that letter.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. What letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, that statement.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. It is not a letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a statement.

Mr. GALLIHER. From Mr. Anonymous.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) to ask the government to grant a commission and this gentleman will prove every statement made there.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would expect from a member with the long experience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) that he should know more than to stand up in this House and ask a commission on the strength of a statement made by a man who is either ashamed to sign it, or is too big a coward to sign it, or is a liar on the face of it. If this is the kind of statement the hon. gentleman expects a commission should be appointed on, I am afraid that his ideas of the dignity of this House are far below the mark.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been in the House for twenty-two years, and I know that when the Liberals were in opposition dozens and dozens of charges were made against the Conservative party on the basis of such statements.

Mr. GALLIHER. If that be so, I do not believe in it.

Mr. TAYLOR. When information of this kind comes to the opposition, it is their duty to bring it to the attention of the House no matter from what source it comes, and this communication is from a reliable source. The hon. gentleman who placed that in my hand is reliable and he says that if he is granted a commission he will establish every statement he makes and pay his side of the expense too. This is placed in my hands, as whip of the opposition, telling me it is my duty to bring it before the House, and I assume the duty and responsibility. If the statements there are true, this government ought to be swept from power at once. The Minister of Public Works stated last year when $25,000 was voted that it was in the public interest to build a dock there, but now the government comes forward and says that the Minister of Public Works did not know what he was talking about last year. When this money was voted they paid that company $34,000 and appointed them their agents contrary to the law which says: that no public money can be expended over $5,000 unless let by tender, except it is a work of necessity or where in the opinion of that department it can be better done by the officers of the department. What employees of the government are doing this work? It is done by an American firm with its office in New York, who have a gang of men building a railway and they are dumping the ballast down the side of a hill and get $1.25 a yard for the filling. And what is the dock for? Some one said yesterday that a large village was going up in the neighbourhood. Why it is seven miles across. This gentleman says that there is not a man living within seven miles of it, nor a man who will use it except this American pulp company. The Minister of Justice says that the Clarkes, of Toronto, are British subjects, but they are in New York and have been there for years doing business with their associates.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand the Minister of Justice said that the firm of Mossom, Boyd and Company, of Bobcaygeon, are engaged with this firm.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. I said they were the owners of the adjoining limits; that they intend putting up a large pulp mill in the neighbourhood on a power they have in the immediate vicinity; that this will enable them to export the pulp, and that it is necessary for them to have wharf facilities in this place. That I know from one of the Mr. Boyd's, who told me so himself a year and a half ago or so,

in Quebec, and from the gentleman who acted as his lawyer—I forget his name but he is a well-known lawyer in Toronto.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Mr. Wickham ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says it is the duty of the opposition to bring a matter of this sort before the House. I understand it is the duty of the opposition to discuss the estimates to the full extent, and so far as their criticism as to the manner in which the work is carried on I have nothing to say. But, when the hon. gentleman says it is the duty of the opposition to produce anonymous documents as he has done, it is the duty of a gentleman to deal with such a thing as the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has dealt with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I produced the documents of a gentleman who was there and knows whereof he speaks. Grant a commission and that gentleman will come forward and substantiate the statements. I accept fully the statement of the Minister of Justice that he has nothing to do with the legal firm that is engaged in this transaction. But here is the statement made by that gentleman that these negotiations are carried on through the firm of which the Minister of Justice himself admits he is only a member in name. They were carried on through Mr. Parent and the members of his firm, but so far as the Minister of Justice is concerned he certainly was a party to advising the government to put $25,000 in their estimates last year and $60,000 this year for this work ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes ?

Mr. TAYLOR. He must assume the responsibility for that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course I do, and I justify it.

Mr. TAYLOR. He must assume the statement made by the Minister of Public Works last year when he asked us to vote $25,000 that it was to build a dock down there when that was not true. To-day the acting minister of Public Works states that the government did not build the dock but went to work and negotiated with a firm that had $34,000 expended on a private enterprise and took if off their hands, and allowed that firm to go on building it without public tenders being called for. This work was undertaken, so far as the papers show, without a request from anybody, without a report from the engineer, without a plan of the work or anything else. And in the face of that it must convince every candid man in the House that the statements made by my hon. friend in that document are absolutely correct, that it is a job and a job of the very worst sort.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did my hon. friend hear what the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does he agree with the member for Grey that the explanation was satisfactory as respects the acquisition of this property by that company ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, but is it not correct that this firm through their lawyers, Parent and Company secured these timber limits ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is not correct ; it is untrue.

Mr. TAYLOR. And Parent and Company bought it at auction.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not true.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was Mr. Clarke present ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I don't know.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who were the parties representing Clarke that bought that timber in? Clarke was not on the grounds; it was bought by agents and the firm of Parent were the agents that secured it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely untrue.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, that is what this gentleman says.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He doesn't say it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I accept the statement of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How does the minister know when he is not connected with the firm ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is absolutely untrue that any member of the firm would go and buy in that limit.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because one of the members of the firm is the Commissioner of Crown Lands who sold the property.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would that stick them ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes ; they have some regard for decencey.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who bought it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If it were bought at public auction, as it must have been, it was bought by some person other than a member of that law firm. I know absolutely nothing about who bought it, and what difference does it make anyway who bought it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It makes no difference, and I am not saying there is anything wrong in buying the land, and the statement does not say anything about it. But through that firm he acted as agent for this American firm.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, that is the statement, and we will have it investigated under oath.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. It seems to me that no more contemptible course could be followed in this House than that followed in this debate. An anonymous letter is read——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. What is the point of order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order, I understand, is that the hon. member used the word 'contemptible.'

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. I think that was a perfectly parliamentary term to apply to this case.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think it is quite parliamentary to use the word 'contemptible.'

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. If that is not parliamentary, I will say a course which this House would not care to see followed by any hon. member. An unsigned letter is read, a letter which the writer is afraid to sign, as an honourable man would sign a letter; the Minister of Justice rises in his place and categorically contradicts it. As soon as he has done that, the member hands the letter to a reporter at the door of the chamber for the purpose of having it taken into the press gallery and put in the press of the country; while his colleague sitting beside him honourably rises and accepts the explanation of the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me ask the hon. member this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am going to ask him a question, with his permission. I was going to ask if it could be seriously objected that a reporter got the letter when the Minister of Justice asked that it be placed on the table of the House, where any one could get it ?

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. I am discussing the propriety of a member of the House handing that paper to a reporter after the statements in it had been absolutely contradicted by the Minister of Justice. I say that is a course which no reputable member of the House would take.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Order. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order——

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. I say, should take——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Order. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman said no reputable member would do as the hon. member for Leeds has done.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot directly impute to a member anything disreputable.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has done so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If he has done so, he will kindly withdraw the expression.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. I say should not take that course. I am not prepared to accept any criticism along that line from the gentleman who rises to correct me, a gentleman who, so far as I have been able to gather during the last few weeks, distinctly lowers the tone of every debate in which he participates.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am very much pleased with the elucidation the gentleman has given to this subject.

Mr. FIELDING. Order. I think the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has the floor.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are you the chairman ?

Mr. FIELDING. I was protecting the right of the hon. member for Colchester.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It has been my privilege to bring into line one or two gentlemen on the other side of the House who forgot what was due to decency and decorum in this House, and there are a couple of others I wish to bring into line.

Mr. LANCASTER. While the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) was giving us a lecture as to what is proper and reputable conduct and what is not, I wonder that he did not ask the government whether their conduct of last session was to be regarded as reaching the highest extent of propriety, in getting a vote put through on the representations made by the then Minister of Public Works, and not apologizing or explaining more than they have done to-night. The hon. member for North Essex, we quite realize, is anxious to support this government in all they do. If he were half as anxious to know the facts of the case when he is voting away the money of the people of this country, he would be serving his constituents better than he is doing in lecturing people who are just as able to understand what their duties in this House are and to know what is proper and what is not, as he is. The highest sense of propriety that ought to prevail in this House is that propriety of doing our duty to our constituencies. Before we go into these finer and higher questions of propriety and ethics which the hon. member for North Essex wants to talk about, we had better do our plain duty to our constituents, and ascertain when voting money whether we are voting it in the interests of the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, is not the hon. member for North Essex the gentleman who plagiarized the resolution of another member of this House last session ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to say that an hon. member has plagiarized.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he got any comfort out of what he wanted to do in that respect, he can have it. The gentleman who promoted the matter to which the hon. member for North Victoria refers succeeded in doing for the people of Canada what he wanted to do after three sessions fighting, and got the support of the hon. member for North Essex afterwards. Whether it was right or wrong for that hon. member to endeavour to take credit for what he was not entitled to and had opposed until then is a different matter. That is all over now, the people got their rights, and they know whom to thank for them. But the people will not thank any hon. member of this House for turning away from the issue before the chair, which is the expenditure of a large sum of money for works for which the original vote of parliament was not intended. Speaking for myself, as a humble member of this House, but representing a somewhat important constituency, which pays a large share of taxes to the general funds of the country, I am not satisfied to pass this vote as it stands. As the issue is before the chair at this moment, I feel that this item ought to be struck out, and I shall be obliged, if it is pressed, to vote for the motion for the hon. member for Leeds. I do not care whether the hon. member for Leeds reads a letter that is not signed, or a memorandum or a statement ; I do not care what he says is the source of his information. He stands in his place in this House and says he has certain information. What does it matter whether that information is in a letter, the writer of which has not given the permission to use his name, or has come within his knowledge in any other way ? I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite are tumbling over each other to find excuses for voting this money through.

I cannot see how that fact can alter the question before the House, and that question is whether the allegations stated in this paper are true. What difference does it make who wrote that letter, or whether that letter was signed by one man or another ? The member who produced the letter has told the House that he is satisfied the statements are true and should be investigated. That hon. gentleman is surely not anonymous. He stands on his feet and makes an assertion and is courteous enough to state the source of his information although not obliged to. He says it is from a reputable gentleman whose name he is not at liberty to divulge at this particular moment. But these gentlemen opposite are disappointed and want to go off on a tangent, and quarrel about whether that gentleman who wrote that document should have his name disclosed on this particular occasion or be produced when the commission is granted. If the government have good reasons for wanting this item to go through, they can always give them. If they have information to show that the statements made by the hon. gentleman who wrote that letter are not true, they can give it. They can produce the reports asked for from the engineers, the plans made by the architects or engineers showing the necessity of the work, if they have such reports and plans, and they can explain, what they have not done at all yet—not that I have noticed, at all events—how it is that this grant was asked for last year on an entirely different condition of things from this year, and how it is that a much larger amount is asked for this year in addition to what was voted last session. The people of this country do not want the public money voted under false pretense. I do not mean to use that word in any insulting or improper way, but it amounts to a false pretense to ask parliament to vote the people's money in order that we may build a certain work, employ labourers doing work for the King, and build this work as a government work, start it from the beginning and make it a government work, and then after that money is obtained on that representation use it to buy from somebody else some work that the government say will do as a substitute and pay an extravagant price for what is apparently supposed to have been done in that connection. The government should have known last year what they were going to do. I presume they thought they were going to do what they asked for. I presume they thought they were going to build the wharf when they got that grant ; and if they have changed their policy, they should be able to give more information than they have given as to their reasons for the change and show what necessity there was for acquiring from these people—who are practically Americans and not Canadians, who are practically people belonging to the adjoining republic and not to Canada at all—a transfer of their property without any benefit whatever coming to the people of Canada. We are too fond of voting away the public money just for the mere sake of voting it away. We should only vote away money when it is going to do the Dominion good. If any money is asked to be voted which is not going to give full value to the people for every dollar voted, we should not vote it. There is no use in our voting money for the mere sake of voting it. If it is not going to benefit the people, there is no reason for voting it. Hon. gentlemen, particularly on the government side, appear to forget that they should first prove the benefit Canada is going to get from an expenditure before voting it, and it has not been shown that Canada will get one particle of benefit from this expen-

diture. We can assume, from the evidence before the House, meagre as it is, that these people from New York city are going to get some benefit. And by a strained construction we may assume that as they are doing the work in Canada somebody in Canada will do the work and get part of the benefit in the wages from them for doing it. But that is not what we are voting money for. We are voting money because the work will be of some benefit to Canada, and until the government can show it is of some advantage to the people, I am not prepared to vote for this expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) took occasion to rise and criticise my conduct as an hon. member of this House, because I read a statement which has been placed in my hands by a responsible party, and he said that the Minister of Justice categorically denied every statement in that paper. Well, I am going to take every statement in it, and put the question to the hon. minister with respect to each one whether he will deny or admit it. What is the first statement? It is this:

I refer to the operations of the company known as the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company, a body corporate and politic, with head office in New York.

Did the minister deny that statement? The writer of this paper did not say whether they were Canadians or Americans. This statement does not say so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, it does.

An hon. MEMBER. It says a lot of New York adventurers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. American adventurers.

Mr. TAYLOR. That does not say they are living in New York. My hon. friend says they are living there but never foreswore their allegiance. The writer of this paper does not say they are American or British subjects.

I think they have an office in Quebec, for which the firm of Mr. Fitzpatrick is counsel.

Does the hon. gentleman deny that statement? Then the writer says:

Anyway, it was that hon. gentleman who got this company its charter and has ever since watched over it with fatherly care.

Was he the hon. gentleman who got that company its charter? Did he deny that?

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. What would that have to do with the question?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) said that the Minister of Justice denied categorically every statement.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. And I repeat that he did, in so far as it affected the case.

Mr. LANCASTER

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement you made—and 'Hansard' will prove it—was that the Minister of Justice denied categorically every statement made. I have given two already which he did not deny.

Some two years ago, this aggregation of New York adventurers——

He does not say living in New York, but that their head office is in New York. The only contention of the Minister of Justice was that these gentlemen had not foresworn their allegiance. But if they are living in New York, they may be New York adventurers all the same. Then the writer says:

Through the efforts of Fitzpatrick's firm, of which Mr. Parent, premier of Quebec, is a member, secured a tract of timber and pulp wood lands.

The statement of the Minister of Justice in answer to this was that the only way land can be secured in the province of Quebec is at public auction. That may be the case, and they may have secured them at public auction. The lands may have been put up at public sale, and they may have had an agent buy them in for the firm. This firm did not attend the sale and buy themselves, so I am informed, but they were bought by an agent. The Minister of Justice explained, and I accept his explanation, that the lands were sold at public auction.

Mr. BUREAU. That is the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some one bought them for this firm.

Secured a tract of timber and pulpwood lands, situated on the river Ste. Marguerite, about 300 miles below Quebec. After this, they purchased for a nominal sum, the water power of the River Ste. Marguerite.

The Minister of Justice did not say whether they did or not. The statement is that they purchased the water power there at a nominal sum, and that statement the Minister of Justice did not contradict.

For this purpose, it was necessary to have an outlet on Seven Islands Bay, so a railroad about nine or ten miles long, running from the first falls of the Ste. Marguerite to Seven Islands Bay was projected—but I understand it is not yet finished—all the rolling stock of which has been allowed in free of duty.

Did the Minister of Justice reply to that? Did he say whether it was or was not true? That this company got its rolling stock in free of duty?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absurd.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister did not contradict the statement that they got the charter, that they built this short road and that they got their rolling stock in free of duty. And yet, the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) said that he contradicted every statement and charge made.

—but this is not the first feature, from a public standpoint, of the 'encouragement,' that has been extended to this 'infant industry.' A deep water terminus was necessary, so this company set to work to build a wharf——

Did the minister contradict that statement or say whether this company had begun to build this wharf for themselves or not? The statement made by the Minister of Public Works to-day is that they began to build it and expended $34,000 upon it.

—by extending out in the bay, a rock embankment from the excavations along the line of railway to a distance of about eight hundred feet, or to a depth of about ten or twelve feet of water, where the first section of a timber wharf about two hundred feet long and thirty feet wide was placed, and filled up to low water with stone from the excavation. This much was accomplished last year; but towards the close of the season the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company discovered that they had undertaken an expensive experiment, and ways and means were discussed to induce the government to undertake the expense of providing this company with the wharf and terminal facilities for their own business; and, strange as it may seem, the Department of Public Works have taken over and paid for all the work and material supplied by this company on account of the terminal facilities required for its own use.

There is another statement that the Minister of Justice did not deny. And the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) proves that the statement is correct.

There is not a habitation or living man residing within miles of this wharf, and no person will ever use it, but this pulp proposition if it ever is finished.

Did the hon. minister contradict that statement? We were told last year that there was a village growing up around there, and yet this sentence says that there is not a habitation within miles.

I understand this scheme was worked last year by the Hon. 'Charley' Fitzpatrick, who induced the Minister of Public Works to put an item in the estimates ($25,000) for a wharf at Seven Islands.

Twenty-five thousand dollars was in the estimates last year and the House voted the money on the statement made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland), who is not now present. Who induced him to put that $25,000 in the estimates? We have no correspondence on the subject before us. The Minister of Justice is the member of the cabinet for that district, and no doubt it is through him, as stated here, that the item was put in the estimates by the Minister of Public Works. If there is any correspondence on the subject it is not brought down. Is it not fair to assume that the Minister of Justice must have been consulted in reference to this $25,000 that was voted last year? The Minister of Justice did not contradict that and did not say that he was not a party, with the Minister of Public Works, to puting this item of $25,000 in the estimates of last year. The hon. minister has not contradicted a single statement made here, except that he is not a member of the firm of Parent & Co. I accept that statement of course. But this document does not say that these timber limits were bought in any but an honourable way—

Then during the present session of parliament an appropriation of $60,000 has been asked——

And it will hardly be said that the hon. minister contradicted that statement for we have this item of $60,000 now before us to carry out this scheme not in the interest of the country but in the interest of this pulp company.

—making it all so far $85,000 to aid a scheme that is no earthly use to any one outside the aggregation comprising this pulp syndicate.

Did the Minister of Justice say that this expenditure would benefit anybody else? He says that it will make a harbour. But there is a harbour there, and building a dock will not improve the harbour in any way. It is not put there for the purpose of the harbour, for vessels that are under stress of weather can go in there now and anchor and so avoid the storm. The only reason for building the dock is that vessels may go there and take away the pulp wood, as was intended by the company when they began to build this work. Every one thought that the Minister of Public Works last year was making correct statements, and yet we find the facts to be different from what we understood them to be from his explanation. I have read this document, and it will be seen that the minister has not contradicted categorically or otherwise any statement except that he is not a member of the firm of Parent & Co., but he cannot say that he is not counsel for this company and that they were not the parties who got this charter. And so in every respect it is seen that the statement of the hon. member for North Essex is not correct.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. I will only say, in answer to the remarks of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that the whole tone of his address after reading that document would convey the impression that in some underhand and improper way the Minister of Justice or his friends had given a benefit to these people, and I said that categorically the minister had denied every such imputation.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not lay it at the door of the Minister of Justice, but I say that it is done by the government. But the evidence as we have it here, including the statements made by the Minister of Public Works last year and by the acting Minister of Public Works this year, can lead to no other conclusion but that there is a job behind this vote. And it will be the duty of the opposition now, and in concurrence if

we are voted down in committee, and in the country if we are voted down in this House, to fight this vote as one of the most nefarious jobs ever perpetrated by this government.

Mr. INGRAM. When this vote was asked for last year it was granted under an explanation of policy made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland). That hon. gentleman said that his policy would be, in carrying out any new work, to carry it out by contract after publicly calling for tenders, and that he would lay before this House a proper estimate, made by the engineer of his department, of the cost of the work, so that hon. members on both sides might know what they were voting for. Now, if hon. gentlemen will read 'Hansard' of last year, they will see that the House was led to believe that the money then voted was to be spent upon an entirely new work. There is no question about that. But something has leaked out since to prove that the work was not a new work. Within a week after the money was granted last year there was a demand made by the North Shore Power and Navigation Company for $34,000 for work done by that company. Now what I ask—and I ask it in all fairness because I do not wish to discuss this matter in a carping way—is, where is the correspondence that took place before this demand for $34,000 was made ? There must have been such correspondence and we as members of this House are entitled to see it. The fact that the government did not carry out the work by contract, and the fact that they did not let the House know that a part of the work had been done, is sufficient evidence to any reasonable man that there is something wrong. There was concealment. Whether that concealment can be justified or not, I do not know, but concealment itself indicates that there was something wrong. Now, what have we at this moment ? We have an item for $60,000 more, and we are asked to vote that $60,000 directly in the face of the statement made by the hon. gentleman who was then Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland) and who, I understand, is still Minister of Public Works, and for whom my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) is acting at this moment.

That is the public impression, that is our impression, and we have never been notified to the contrary. That being the case, we are still under the old system as inaugurated by that hon. gentleman and we have a right to assume that this work should have been carried out by contract instead of in the way it has been carried out. Will the hon. gentleman who is administering the department now tell the House that Mr. Sutherland has nothing to do with the Public Works Department and that this is a new system he is going to carry out himself to have work of this character and of this magnitude $85,000 done by day labour or under the supervision of a company over whom we have no control ? If that is the case the sooner we know it the better. For my part I have listened carefully to this discussion and I cannot make up my mind to support this item without some information that is being concealed at this moment. The minister has not told us that his engineer has inspected this work. I infer it was the engineer of this North Shore Navigation Company that did this work ; it certainly was not an engineer of the department. That being true we were certainly misled last session because the work was partially done by a private company and you must take into consideration that you are inaugurating a peculiar system. I care not what limits are in question or who purchased these limits, but I ask are the people of Canada going to vote money to every company who choose to buy timber limits anywhere, who choose to start in to build a wharf for their own accommodation? Are we to accept the word of an engineer whom they have instructed to da that work? Are we to take the opinion of any engineer other than the engineer of the Public Works Department who is responsible to this House through the minister, for every report he may make ? I must say to the hon. minister that we have a right to get more information than he has given to-night in connection with this. We have a right to get that portion of the information which is being withheld, whether intentionally or not I do not know. We have a right to see the correspondence that led to this demand for $34,000. If hon. gentlemen in asking the $25,000 had told the committee candidly and frankly : The reason we are asking this $25,000 is that a certain company has started to build a wharf, that we believe they are doing right and we want the $25,000 to help to recoup them for the money they have expended on this wharf and next year we may ask an additional sum—if that statement had been made on that occasion there would have been no reason for this discussion to-night. I for one, will not vote for the item of $60,000, thus making a total expenditure of $85,000, until the necessary information is brought down.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor) negatived, yeas 21, nays 35.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want the minister in all fairness to hold the item over until the plans are brought down. We have come to the conclusion that we have been too easy in taking the word of ministers in reference to such works as this and the similar work at Grande Vallée. If it can be shown that this harbour will be useful as a harbour of refuge I am satisfied that the opposition will not hesitate to vote this sum. Will the minister undertake to bring the plans over ?

Mr. HYMAN. The item I think has been sufficiently discussed. The committee is aware that for the Public Works estimates there are hundreds of plans and to bring over the plans in connection with each work would be simply impossible. If the hon. gentleman will pass the item I have no objection to-morrow to let the hon. gentleman see the plan.

Colonization roads in Manitoba and Northwest Territories, $25,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman give us an idea of where they are to be constructed ?

Mr. HYMAN. This item appears in the estimates at the request of the Department of the Interior, the reason being that settlers are coming in very fast and these roads are necessary to permit settlers to reach Dominion lands. The localities which it is proposed to serve are as follows : Northwest Territories, road from Athabasca river to Lesser Slave lake to be re-opened and improved, road from head of Lesser Slave lake to Peace river to be further improved at an estimated cost of $15,000 ; road to be opened and improved from a point near Sprague northwards for a few miles on the route which is followed by immigrants coming into Canada from Minnesota at an estimated cost of $2,000 ; road between lake Winnipeg and lake Manitoba to accommodate new settlers going into that country, $3,000 ; road to be graded from a point on the Prince Albert branch of the Canadian Northern Railway west of Erwood to a point north of Carrot river, $5,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How will this money be expended ? Will there be contracts let or will men be put on the work ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that the question has occupied the attention of the officers of the department as to whether contracts will be let or not. I fancy it will be a somewhat difficult matter in regard to the smaller amounts to let contracts for roads of this character as naturally the drawing up of the plans would render it almost impossible to get contractors for the roads. I have no doubt that a certain amount of work will be done by contract, but I do not know whether or not all of it can be done by contract.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In regard to the road to the Peace river I suppose that is to re-open the old road built at the time of the Yukon excitement. I am satisfied that if the hon. minister makes inquiries from persons who are competent to judge he will find that the road is not put in the best locality. The road from Athabasca river to Lesser Slave Lake is built through a rough and hilly country. A much better route will be found farther west and one which is much more along the line of future settlement. Is it intended to build this road to the head or foot of Lesser Slave lake ? The hon. minister is making two roads when there should be only one road to the Peace river country. People going into that country will travel either by wagon or by boat. If they travel by boat they will not go by way of this road at all. They will go down the Athabasca river and then up the Peace river. If they are going by wagon they will go across country from the Athabasca river and then down the Peace river. If they are going by wagon they will get nearer to the mountains than the road which the hon. minister outlines here. I know what I am speaking about and I am satisfied that if the hon. minister consults any person who travels in that part of the country and who is familiar with the conditions there, he will find that the statement which I make is borne out. From Athabasca river at Fort Assiniboine, he can get a very good road through a good country to Peace river and then if he wants to branch down to the lower Peace he can go down by water or by the road. The first road known as the Edmonton Trail was not built in a good locality.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that all these expenditures in the Northwest were made through the Northwest Council. I think they have usually built these roads and that we have voted the money. Is it not intended to use this money in the same way ? Are we commencing to build roads independent of the Northwest Council ?

Mr. HYMAN. In a general sense that is the case, but in this particular case I am advised by the Department of the Interior that the object of the construction of these roads is to reach fertile districts and to enable settlers to get through. These districts are very sparsely settled at the present time and the Department of the Interior have recommended that it is in the interest of the Dominion in order to enable them to open up these lands that the Dominion shall make these small expenditures.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the part that I am questioning at all. My question is : How will the money be spent ?

Mr. HYMAN. The money will be spent by this department.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it not be spent by the Northwest Council ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it will be spent by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. We are to commence spending money that heretofore has been spent through the Northwest Council ?

Mr. HYMAN. In this case.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a departure from the policy which the government have followed for some years back ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have stated that this is an exceptional case. This vote is put in at the request of the Department of the In-

terior. There are certain Dominion lands which are valuable, and for the purpose of enabling settlers to reach these lands it is necessary to construct these roads. Our information is that the settlers are going in at a very rapid rate, but the country is very sparsely settled at present. In so far as this vote is concerned we are departing to that extent from the general policy of allowing the roads to be built by the Council of the Northwest Territories. The lands are Dominion lands and the Northwest Council do not care to assume these particular expenditures. This government consider it to be in the interest of the country that these roads should be built so as to open up lands which are owned by the Dominion.

Mr. BOYD. It seems to me that as far as Manitoba is concerned the hon. minister has made the explanation very nicely. It is a rather unusual departure on the part of the government to commence building colonization roads in a province such as Manitoba and I think the government are establishing a dangerous precedent when they begin colonization roads through an organized province. The information that has been given to me is that in three cases each one of these amounts is to be expended in a way that is going to be a benefit to the candidates of the government who are now in the field.

Mr. HYMAN. In the absence of my colleague the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) I am going to ask that the matter stand.

Mr. BOYD. The information I have is that there is a certain foreign vote in the localities which are to be traversed by these roads and that the object of spending the money is for the reason I have given. It is a most extraordinary departure to undertake to spend the money of this government in that way and we ask that if you are going to spend money spend it in some proper way.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Give it to the Manitoba government.

Mr. BOYD. Give it to the Manitoba government and give it to the territorial government. If you spend it there, why should you not be called upon to do the same thing in every part of Manitoba, or in Ontario, or in any part of Canada? I do not know any person who could have placed it before the House in a nicer way, but it does not alter the case as I have stated it to the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not view this item with very much favour and I do not believe that the people of the organized provinces of this Dominion will look upon it with very much favour.

Mr. BOYD. We know well enough what they are doing it for.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. INGRAM. We know what the idea is, but we know it is a thing that should not be encouraged. We have organized provinces in the Dominion who look after their roads and bridges; and we pay a sum of money to the government of the Northwest Territories to administer the Northwest Territories. If they want $25,000 for building roads, this government should let them expend that as they expend the other money voted to them. If this system is allowed, the government will not hear the last of it. Our sessions are long enough now, but if matters of this kind are introduced they will be extended. I am anxious to close the session, but I will stay here to prevent this kind of thing. If this money goes to the Northwest Territories' government I have no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. So far as the Territories are concerned, this is not a precedent, because money was voted for this very road by this parliament five or six years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Which road?

Mr. SCOTT. One of the roads mentioned by the minister.

Mr. HYMAN. Athabasca river to Slave lake.

Mr. SPROULE. Who spent the money?

Mr. SCOTT. I think the money was put in the hands of the Northwest Public Works Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. And the vote was made in this way. There is nothing to prevent the system being followed.

Mr. SPROULE. We have voted money every year for this purpose, and the vote was introduced by the Minister of the Interior, but the money went to the Northwest assembly and the work done under their control, but now we are taking it out of their control.

Mr. HYMAN. I simply asked the vote to stand in the absence of the Minister of the Interior. I said the department had no policy in the matter.

Mr. INGRAM. You said the Public Works Department was going to expend it.

Mr. HYMAN. I think you will find in 'Hansard' that I merely said I presumed so.

Mr. INGRAM. I will apologize if the minister did not say that his department would expend this money.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not intend to say so, and I think you will find that I did not make the statement. There will be a full explanation if you allow the item to stand until the Minister of the Interior, at whose request it was introduced, is here.

Mr. SPROULE. When I asked if that were the policy of the government the minister said that it was a departure from their former policy, and that the Public Works Department would expend it, but now he says the government have no policy.

Mr. HYMAN. I think it is a departure, because you do not find every year items of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, you do.

Mr. HYMAN. Was there an expenditure last year in Manitoba ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking of the Territories.

Mr. HYMAN. I was speaking in reference to the whole item.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When the item comes up again would the minister let us know where that road runs from North Erwood, and why they are building a road there ?

Mr. HYMAN. I will call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the hon. gentleman's remarks.

River St. Lawrence ship channel—to make good the damage to the dredge 'J. I. Tarte,' $65,000.

Mr. HYMAN. There was an accident attended unfortunately by loss of life and we require four new boilers for the dredge which were purchased by contract at $36,800 and the total cost is $65,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was there an inquiry ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, but I do not wish to make a statement for the reason that there are some suits pending against the government and it might be used.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What class of boilers ?

Mr. HYMAN. Scotch boilers.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they manufactured in Canada ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, the contract is let to Canadians and they will be made in Toronto.

Rideau Hall and grounds—repairs and improvements, $600.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What are these ?

Mr. HYMAN. These are repairs required in consequence of the fire.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. People have drawn attention to the dilapidated condition of the sidewalk down there. Why not put in a granolithic walk?

Bayfield harbour—extension of southern pier, $1,600.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended altogether at Bayfield ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total amount of the contract was $6,440. There has been an expenditure of $4,458.42, and there is a balance of $1,600, making a total expenditure of $6,141.42.

Mr. BLAIN. What interest does this serve ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a vote asked for to close the contract that was entered into. Full particulars were asked for and given at the time.

Collingwood harbour improvement, $6,050.

Mr. SPROULE. We wanted to get some information about Collingwood harbour. We wanted to know what was the cost of that dock and how was the estimate made ?

Mr. HYMAN. The report of the engineer of the government is that the cost was $545,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the engineer made a report on that ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will that report be brought down ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, we will have it brought down and it may be discussed on the further supplementaries.

Depot harbour, dredging, $11,200.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the explanation of that ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is dredging around the wharf so as to make the depth of water twenty feet. It is a government wharf.

River Otonabee, dredging at Peterborough, $410.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is this for ? These waters for some purposes are under the control of the Railway Department and for some under Public Works.

Mr. HYMAN. For canal purposes they are under the Railway Department and for some under Public Works.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I suppose the channel wants to be enlarged.

Mr. HYMAN. That would be Public Works.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A great deal of work requires to be done in Victoria county.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, and it is necessary work.

Sidney harbour breakwater, British Columbia, $3,000.

Mr. EARLE. Does that complete the construction of the breakwater ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is a further vote in the estimates. This is to complete the work down to the 30th of June, 1904.

Mr. EARLE. What is the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The toal cost up to the present is $13,000. The estimated cost is $16,000.

Pelee Island, Ont., cable connection with mainland, to complete payment for repairs, $1,150.

Mr. INGRAM. How is that cable operated ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is operated by telephone by the government.

Telegraph lines—Qu'Appelle-Edmonton section—loop line from a point between Bresaylor and Onion Lake stations to Lloydminster, $4,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are you changing the line ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a line that makes a loop from the main line and back to the main line.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will we take up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. A number of Bills and then probably Militia estimates and Railways and Canals and there is quite a number of odd items yet to be passed.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Saturday.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1904.

VOL. IV., 1904.

From the Sixth day of July to the Twenty-ninth day of July, inclusive.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved. Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Geo. D., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden), in Com., 6394 (iv).

Militia Act, Command vested in King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6404 (iv).

Armstrong, J. E., *East Lambton.*

Coal Oil Bounties, *re* Official Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).

Cold Storage on Allan Strs., *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6191 (iv).

Guysborough Election and Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6107 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

Barker, Saml., *Hamilton.*

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax), to Sup., 6615 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Lighting Contract, O.C.'s asked for, 6150 (iv).

G.T.Ry. Arbitration (additional powers) B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in Com., 7673 (iv).

I.C.R., Bridges, Cost of Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6265 (iv).

——— Windsor Junction and Halifax, Double Track, &c. (remarks), 6263 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in Com., 6691, 6775; on M. for 3°, 7565 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening), 6265; (draw bars for cars), 6265; (Windsor Branch), 6219 (iv).

Barker, Saml.—*Con.*

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6103 (iv).

Bell, A. C., *Pictou.*

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax), to Sup., 6608 (iv).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026, 6086 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Pay of Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6224 (iv).

River John Mail Contract, Inquiry for Papers, 6024 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada), 6156, 6164 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, Quebec (Valleyfield), 7972; Harbours and Rivers, Ontario (Sarnia, dredging), 7856; (Sault Ste. Marie, dredging), 7857; (Southampton), 7857; (Thornbury), 7863; Quebec (Seven Islands wharf), 7828, 7973; (Three Rivers wharf), 7840 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings), 6289; (working expenses), 6026 (iv).

Tobacco Duty, Excise and Customs, Amount paid, 1903-4 (Ques.), 6546 (iv).

Bennett, W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in Com., 7651 (iv).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6035 (iv).

Bennett, W. H.—*Con.*

Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent in Eng. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7798 (iv).

Midland Dock, Rental of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7563 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ontario (Amherstburg, dredging) 7750; (Bracebridge wharf), 7751; (Collingwood harbour), 7751; (Depot Harbour), 7753; (Goderich harbour), 7754; (Midland Harbour wharf), 7853; (Penetanguishene pier), 7854; (Thornbury), 7863; Quebec (Grand Vallee pier), 7768 (iv).

Blain, R., *Peel.*

"Chapman" Ball-bearings, Application I.C.R. Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

"Cleveland" Patent Cylinders *re* I.C.R. Locomotives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Strs., Increase in Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6195 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7652 (iv).

Dredging in Ont., Summary of Expenditures asked for, 7875 (iv).

"Fielding" Dredge, Cost of Building (remarks) in Com of Sup., 7881 (iv).

Freight Discrimination *re* Atlantic Fast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6207 (iv).

I.C.R. Employees and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6049, 6128 (iv).

Mail Contracts between Can. and G. B., and New York Route (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 6161, 6200 (iv).

Nova Scotia Harbours and Rivers, Summary of amounts expended in Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv).

Political Interference *re* Govt. Employees, Letter of Hon. Wm. Ross (read) 6062 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 7888 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6702, 6729, 7548 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Personal Explanation *re* Dennis Eagan's Letter (remarks) 7545 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 6343; (enlargement) 6303; Grenville (wharf) 6866; Lachine (electric installation) 6826; North Channel (dam., &c.) 6318; Sault Ste Marie (construction) 6819; Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6864; Welland (electric plant) 6354, 6797; (Port Colborne deepening) 6362, 6812.

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6151 (iv).

Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6941; (relief and seed grain) 6938 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 6161; (St. John and Glasgow) 6213 (iv).

Blain, R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous ("J. I. Tarte," damage to dredge) 8021 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (damages to perishable goods, P. E. I.) 7595 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.) 7631; Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging, B.C., (new plant) 7885; Ont. (new plant) 7881; Ont. and Que. (plant) 7886 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Dom. (repairs, &c.) 7851; N.B. (Hopewell Cape) 7748; N. S. (Bayfield harbour) 7635; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7637; (Digby pier) 7637; (Fort Lawrence pier) 7638; (Georgeville wharf) 7638; (Glace Bay) 7640; (Neil's Harbour) 7643; (Pembroke wharf) 7644; (Port Hawkesbury) 7644 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Barry's Bay) 7751; (Bayfield wharf) 8021; (Burlington channel) 7751; (Depot Harbour) 7753; (Goderich harbour) 7755; (Honora wharf) 7851; (Pembroke wharf) 7854; (Port Colborne) 7897; (Port Perry dredging (7854; (Spanish River) 7861 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (West Point wharf) 7744, (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7770; (Lake St. John dredging) 7775; (Laprairie ice piers) 7775; (Lotbiniere wharf) 7776; (Riviere du Loup) 7782; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle) 7782; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 7782; Roads and Bridges (Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8017 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening), 6269; (Windsor branch), 6219 (iv).

Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution, &c. (Ques.), 6885 (iv).

Blanchet, J. B., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6759 (iv).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K. C. M. G., (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*

Defence Committee in London, Tels. from Lord Minto and Mr. Chamberlain (read), 6365 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, on Inquiry for Papers, 6023 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup., 7684, 7689 (iv).

——— Original Gazette laid on Table, 7785.

——— Papers laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. (B. 5), in Com., 6365, 6464, 6467, 6540.

Militia Bill, Reprinting, &c. (remarks) 6882.

"Military Gazette" (Canadian) and Govt. Patronage (remarks), 7906 (iv).

Militiamen not on Duty, Under Control of Minister, &c. (remarks), 7732 (iv).

Musketry School Camp, Taxes *re* Clubs, &c. (remarks), 6551 (iv).

Ross Rifle Contract, Tests, &c. (Ans.) 6887.

Sydney Strike, Withdrawal of Militia (remarks) 6806 (iv).

Borden, R. L., *Halifax.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock), on M. for 1°, 7901 (iv).

Appointments to Public Offices, Personal Character, &c. (Amt.), to Com. of Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70), 7827 (iv).

Auditor General, Resignation (Amt.), to Com. of Sup., 6553; Amt. Neg. (Y. 56; N. 94) 6635.

Business of the Hse., Government Legislation, &c. (remarks), 6787 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6259 (iv).

Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. *re* with Imp. Govt. (remarks), 6882 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 6648, 6880 (iv).

——— Understanding *re* Discussion (remarks), 7540 (iv).

Dog-Fish Pest, Rep. of Commissioners, Inquiry for, 6928 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in Com., 7650 (iv).

Grand Narrows Bridge, Information from Minister (remarks), 6265 (iv).

G.T.Ry. Arbitration (additional powers), B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in Com., 7678 (iv); on M. for 3°, 7786 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, Aliens Investigation, Evidence furnished G.T.P. Authorities (remarks), 6892 (iv).

——— Evidence of C. M. Hays, before Judge Winchester *re* Letter to Prime Minister of 16th June (remarks), 6292 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7692, 7721 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 6013, 6263 (iv).

Guysborough Election and I.C.R. Employees &c., Ref. of Mr. Sinclair to "heelers" (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 6105 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Amounts expended, Completed Works, &c., Statement asked for, 7648 (iv).

Indian Timber cut on Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).

I.C.R. Employees and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6052,

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).

——— Control of Patronage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).

Jackson, J. B., Appmnt. as Commercial Agent, Charges *re* (amt.) on M. for Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70) 7827 (iv).

Judges, Appnmt. of, on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Russell, M.P., 7944 (iv).

McIntosh, Mr. John, Late M.P., Decease of (remarks), 6547 (iv).

Milford Ry. Accident, Damages, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 6142 (iv).

Borden, R. L.—*Con.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6376, 6495, 6505 (iv).

Militia System, Form of giving Instructions, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 6376 (iv).

Naturalization and Aliens Acts Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6794 (iv).

Nova Scotia Judges, Appnmt., &c., and Promises to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7941 (iv).

P.E.I. Telegraph Connection and Govt. Control, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7892.

Proulx, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7903 (iv).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6690, 6719, 6742; on M. for 3°, 7546, 7552, 7567 (iv).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Revised Statutes Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6795 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter written as Minister of Militia *re* Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv).

Supply Bill, One-fifth Vote of Estimates, Procedure, &c. (remarks), 6638 (iv).

Supply B. 156 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 6784 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Judge Dodd) 7939; (Supreme Court) 7939 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6293 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Justice (private secretaries) 7937 (iv).

Indians—Generally (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6960; N.B. (agents' salaries) 6937; (medical attendance) 6938; N.S. (agents' salaries) 6933; (medical attendance) 6937; (relief and seed grain) 6936 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6186; (Halifax, Newfld. and Liverpool 6212 ; (St. John and W. Indies) 6216 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baxter's harbour) 7635; (Cow Bay) 7637; (Glace Bay) 7639; (Kelly's Cove) 7644; (Livingstone's Cove) 7643 ; (Port Bevis) 7636; (Port Hood entrance) 7645; (Sandy Cove) 7646; (Skinner's Cove) 7646; (Tenecape breakwater) 7647; (Victoria Beach) 7647 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Quebec Harbour) 7897; (transportation facilities) 7897 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N.B. (Deer Island, &c.) 7891; P.E.I. (Port Hood, &c.) 7892 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 6264; (draw bars for freight cars) 6265.

Treadgold Concession, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7792 (iv).

——— (remarks) on Stmnt. of Prime Minister, 6013 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6093 (iv).

Bourassa, H., *Labelle.*
Governor General (Lord Minto)—Criticism *re* Military Control (remarks) in Com. on B., 6416 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6379, 6402, 6427, 6435, 6467, 6486, 6535 (iv).
Naturalization and Aliens Acts Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6793 (iv).
Personal Explanation *re* Militia Bill, 6552 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Delay in Printing Voters' Lists (remarks) 6789 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7771 (iv).

Boyd, N., *Macdonald.*
Assiniboine River, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7653 (iv).
Fishing Licenses granted in Lakes North of Winnipeg (Ques.) 7783 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6431 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, Two Cent Rate, 7560 (iv).
Sessions, Length of, Delay in Calling Parlt., &c. (remarks) 6638 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (protection services) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin, lowering) 7876; (repairs, &c.) 7875; Roads and Bridges (colonization roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8019 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 6292 (iv).
Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Brock, W. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7660 (iv).

Broder, A., *Dundas.*
Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7933 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Rouville.*
Inland Revenue Act *re* Distillers, Repeal (Ans.) 6148 (iv).
Tobacco Duty, Excise and Customs, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 6546 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6910 (iv).
Trenton Harbour Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer (Ans.) 6149 (iv).

Bureau, J., *St. Maurice.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers wharf) 7837 (iv).

Calvert, W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Christman, Annie, Relief (B. 155) M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 6786 (iv).

Campbell, A., *West York, Ont.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6758 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 6353 (iv).
West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6101 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce), *South Oxford.*
Binder Twine Seizures, on Inquiry for Ret., 6024 (iv).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs., Provision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7922.
Freight Discrimination *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6199; Rep. *re* Officers, &c. (remarks) 6205 (iv).
Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent, Charges *re* (remarks) 7806 (iv).
Mail carried via New York, Memo. (read) 6202 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Standard Oil Refinery, Visit of Inspector *re* Bounty Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6150 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 6154; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6210; (St. John and Belfast) 6214; (St. John and Digby) 6216; (St. John and Glasgow) 6213; (St. John and London) 6215; (St. John and W. Indies) 6216 (iv).

Casgrain, T. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
McIntosh, Mr. John, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 6548 (iv).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Talbot) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6786.
Naturalization and Aliens Acts Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 6792 (iv).
Post Office Orders, Printing in French, &c. (remarks) 6550 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6693, 6722 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 6812 (iv).

Clancy, J., *Bothwell.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of Hse., 6677 (iv).

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6586 (iv).

Binder Twine Seizures, Inquiry for Ret., 6024.

Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7926.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7653 (iv).

Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers, &c. (Ques.) 6680 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act *re* Distillers, Repeal, &c. (Ques.) 6148 (iv).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7669 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 7590; (fish culture) 7588 (iv).

Indians—Generally (Bryce, Dr., salary) 6961; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 6932; P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6939 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (overseers' salaries) 7599; (wharf at Charlottetown) 7598 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7615 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Dom. (repairs, &c.) 7850; Que. (Champlain wharf) 7767 (iv).

Sydenham River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6922 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, Delay in bringing down Report of Commissioner (remarks) 7797 (iv).

Walpole Island, Instructions *re* Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Clarke, E. F., *West Toronto.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 7902 (iv).

Allan Strs. on Atlantic Service, Average Speed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).

——— Average Speed, &c. (Ques.) 6888 (iv).

——— New Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).

Atlantic SS. Service, Discrimination *re* Freights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6199; Rep. from Officers (remarks) 6205 (iv).

Auditor General, Resignation of, Action of Govt. &c. (Ques.) 6887 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6649 (iv).

C. Ross Co., Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6544 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7657 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, Letter to W. T. R. Preston, *re*, Inquiry for, 6681 (iv).

Clarke, E. F.—*Con.*

Elkhorn School, Sale of Printing Press (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).

Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 : in Com., 6697 (iv).

Fair-Wage Res. *re* Bonused Rys. (Ques.) 6883.

G.T.P. Surveys, Aliens deported, Action taken *re* (Ques.) 6542, 6884 (iv).

——— Emplymt. of Aliens, Verbatim Copy of Evidence furnished to G.T.P. Co. (remarks) 6880, 6890 (iv).

——— Evidence of Judge Winchester (remarks) *re* printing, &c., 6291 (iv).

——— Surveys, &c., in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7733 (iv).

Indian Schools, Results of Education (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).

I.C.R.—Double Tracking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

——— Employees, Wages paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).

Kingston Penitentiary, Appnmt. of Protestant Chaplain (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7951.

Letter Carriers, Pay on Sick Leave (Ques.) 6888 (iv).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6201 (iv).

Mail Steamers, Speed per Hour, &c. (Ques.) 6546 (iv).

Militia at Sydney Riots, Withdrawal, &c. (remarks) 6788, 6806 (iv).

Militiamen not on Duty, Amenable to Partisan Interests (remarks) 7733 (iv).

"Military Gazette" (Canadian) and Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).

Naval Militia, Establishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Navigation Co., Cor. *re* Contract for Seven Islands Wharf (read) 7981 (iv).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Letter *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal, &c., Approval of Govt. (remarks) 6014; Letter (read) 6015 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6551 (iv).

Questions asked by Members, Rights to Information, &c. (remarks) 6890 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6697 (iv).

Seven Islands Wharf, Contract *re*, in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

——— Cor. with Public Works Dept. (read) 7981 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing roads) 6871; Lachine (slope walls) 6825; Soulanges (St. Amour's gully) 6869; Trent (construction) 6827, 6859; Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 6813; (stone protection) 6867; (Townsend valve) 6867 (iv).

Clarke, E. F. —*Con.*

SUPPLY—Con.

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6151 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 7949 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (medical relief) 6957 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 6154; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6210 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7971.
Penitentiaries—Kingston (salaries) 7951.
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Valleyfield) 7972 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto Harbour Improvement) 7869; P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater, 7742; Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7830, 7972; (Three Rivers wharf) 7836; (Yamaska dredging) 7843 (iv).
Railways—(G.T.P. surveys, &c.), 6291; I.C.R. (working expenses) 6024 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher) on Sen. Amts., 7968 (iv).

Toronto Harbour Improvements, Eastern Entrance, in Com. of Sup., 7869 (iv).

Toronto Island, South Side (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7795.

Cochrane, E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

I.C.R., Bridge Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6696 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (sheriffs' allowances) 7945 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 6837, 6846; Welland (electric plant) 6803; (Port Colborne entrance) 6812 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6938 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6206 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7635; (Bayfield harbour) 7635; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636; (Cow Bay) 7637; Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7979; (Three Rivers wharf) 7838.

Copp, A. J. S., *Digby, N.S.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby pier) 7638 (iv).

Cowan, M. K., *South Essex.*

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6100 (iv).

Daniel, John W., *St. John City.*

Atlantic, Fast SS. Service, Freight carried from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6194 (iv).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Daniel, John W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6139 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6391, 6472, 6493, 6512, 6524, 6535 (iv).

St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. on Militia B., 6391 (iv).

St. Lawrence Winter Navigation *re* Allan Strs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 6156; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6211; (St. John and Dublin) 6215; (St. John and London) 6215 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6026, 6144 (iv).

Davis, T. O., *Saskatchewan.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with sittings of Hse, 6678 (iv).

Douglas, Jas. M., *East Assiniboia.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during sittings of Hse, 6679 (iv).

Earle, Thomas, *Victoria, B.C.*

Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Customs Collectorship at Victoria, B.C., Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 6364 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation, &c.) 6958; (salaries) 6957; (schools) 6957 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rentals, &c.) 7622; (generally) 7619 (iv).
——— Ottawa (Ry. Commission) 7625; (snow cleaning) 7630; Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7633.
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7885, 7890; Ont. (new plant) 7882 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson and Kennedy Lake) 7876; (Fraser River protection) 7876; (Sydney harbour breakwater) 8022 (iv).
——— N.S. (Abram's wharf) 7634; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7635; (Baxter's harbour) 7635; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636; (Bridgewater dredging) 7637; (Georgeville wharf) 7639; (Glace Bay) 7639; (Iona wharf) 7642; (Neil's Harbour) 7643; (Port Hawkesbury) 7645; (Victoria Beach) 7647 (iv).
——— Ont. (Gananoque dredging) 7754 (iv).
——— P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 7743.
——— Que. (Lotbinière wharf) 7776 (iv).

Victoria Harbour Dredging, Inner Side (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7890 (iv).

——— Use of "King Edward" (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7878 (iv).

Victoria Post Office, B.C., Rental, &c. (remarks in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*

Alberton Station, "Y," Abolishing of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Campbellton Wharf and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792.
Canada Eastern Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv).
Canals, Operating Staff (statement) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).
Canal Toll Collectors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6331-2 (iv).
Canals, Working Expenses (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Cattle Guard Commission, Extra Remuneration (Ans.) 6545 (iv).
"Chapman" Ball-bearing Attachments to I.C.R. Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286.
"Cleveland" Cylinder Equipment for I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Cornwall and Williamsburg Canals, Workshops, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 6544 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7538 (iv).
Cornwall Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
Grain and Grain Products carried on I.C.R. (Ans.) 7784 (iv).
Grand Narrows Bridge Protection, &c (statement) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
G.T.P. Surveys, &c., in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— Surveys by Govt. Parties, &c. (Ans.) 6544 (iv).
——— Evidence furnished to G.T.P. Authorities (remarks) 6893 (iv).
Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
I.C.R., Additional Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
——— Bridges, Strengthening, &c. (names given) in Com. of Sup., 6264, 6266 (iv),
——— Capital Expenditure Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 6104 (iv).
——— Employees, Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6036, 6108 (iv).
——— Interference with Running of Trains by Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6255.
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).
McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Milford Ry. Accident, N.S., Damages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6140 (iv).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operation, &c. (Ans.) 6149 (iv)
New Glasgow, I.C.R., Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
North Channel, Completion of Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6324 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Poonamalie Dam, Repairs to, &c. (Ans.) 7785.
P.E.I. Ry., Pay to Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6222 (iv).
——— Tourist Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6706 (iv).
Subsidies to Railways, Payment (B. 157) 1° m., 6873 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Chambly (Denault's culvert) 6870; (landing wharf) 6872; (macadamizing road) 6870; (Ste. Thérèse Island) 6869 (iv).
——— Cornwall (enlargement) 6293, 6644; (lighting, &c.) 6645; (shoals dredging) 6347.
——— Galops (channel completion) 6334; (enlargement) 6294 (iv).
——— Grenville (wharf) 6865 (iv).
——— Lachine (canal gates) 6868; (construction, &c.) 7538; (dredging basins) 6826; (electric installation) 6826; (old locks rebuilding) 6867; (St. Ours locks) 6864; (slope walls) 6825; (underpinning wall) 6868 (iv).
——— North Channel (dam, &c.) 6341 (iv).
——— Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6816 (iv).
——— Soulanges (arms and heaters) 6868; (land damages) 7538; (St. Amour's gully) 6868; (steel bridge at power house) 6863; (survey for breakwater) 6862; (water-wheel governors) 6868; (workshops, &c.) 6863 (iv).
——— Trent (construction) 6827, 6859 (iv).
——— Welland (electric plant) 6348, 6797. (obstructions, &c.) 6358; (Port Colborne entrance) 6812; (protection banks) 6866; (retaining walls) 6867; (Townsend valves) 6867 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys) 6290; I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6285; (bridge strengthening) 6264; (drawbars for freight cars) 6264; (Windsor branch) 6218; (working expenses) 6024, 6144; P.E.I. (working expenses), 6220 (iv).

Telegraphers' Union, I.C.R., Special Agreement *re* Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6038 (iv).
Transportation Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Lennox) for Rep., 6363 (iv).
Welland Canal, Electric Lighting Cost (stmnt) in Com. of Sup., 6675, 6807 (iv).
——— Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*

Auditor General's Resignation, &c., Action of Govt. (Ans.) 6888 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6566 (iv).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 2°, and in Com., 7786-7 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6789 (iv).
Canals, Working Expenses (remarks) on Conc., 6686 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Coal Oil Bounties : See "Petroleum."

Cornwall Canal and Davis Contract (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7540 (iv).

——— Letter of Aud. Gen. *re* Papers (remarks) 6880 (iv).

Estimates, Making up, &c., "jumbled," &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7761 (iv).

G.T.Ry., Rentals, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).

I.C.Ry., Interference by Members with Running of Trains (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6257 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

Item Appropriations in Supply, Balance Column (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Judges appointed for Political Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I., on Conc., 6683 (iv).

Pacific Bank of Canada Bill, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place in Order Paper, 7783 (iv).

Petroleum, Crude, Bounty (prop. res.) 7785.

P.E.I. Ry. Stations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).

P.E.I. Telegraph Connection with Port Hood, and Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).

Supply Bill—(interim)—(B. 156) 1° m.; 2° m.; 3° m., 6784 iv).

——— Procedure *re* One-Fifth Vote (remarks) 6637 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6644; North Channel (dam) 6318 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Newfoundland and Halifax) 6212; (St. John and S. America) 6216 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby pier) 7637; (Glace Bay) 7639; (Green Cove) 7641; (Island Point) 7642 ; (Janvrin's Island) 7642; (Kelly's Cove) 7644; (Larry's River) 7642; (McNair's Cove) 7643; (Main-a-Dieu) 7643; (Margaretsville harbour) 7643; (Melbourne wharf) 7643 ; (Meteghan Cove) 7643; (Morrison's Point) 7644; (Neil's Harbour) 7643; (Ogden's Pond) 7644; (Pembroke breakwater) 7644; (Pickett's pier) 7644; (Port Hastings) 7644; (Port au Pique wharf) 7644; Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7761; Telegraph Lines (Marconi system) 7896; P.E.I. (mainland connection) 7892 (iv).

Temporary Clerks, Placing on Permanent List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6099 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*

P.E.I. Chicken Fattening Stations, on Inquiry for Ret., 6467 (iv).

Seed Growers' Association incorp. (B. 151) 1° m., 6364 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6606, 6624.

Canals, Working Expenses (remarks) on Conc., 6685 (iv).

Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 7649 (iv).

Exchequer Court, Additional Judge (remarks) 7945 (iv).

Express and Telephone Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, in Com., 6689 (iv).

Fish carried in Bond to U.S., O.C. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, Aliens, &c., Names of those deported (Ans.) 6884 (iv).

——— Action *re* (remarks) 6542 (iv).

——— Warrants for Deportation, &c. (Ans.) 6884 (iv).

G.T.Ry. Arbitration (B. 152) 1° m., 6465; in Com., 7673; 3° m., 7786 (iv).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6310 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6374, 6406, 6425, 6471, 6496, 6505 (iv).

Naturalization and Aliens Acts Amt. (B. 147) 2° m., 6791; in Com., 6794 (iv).

——— Letter from Judge Killam (read) 6792.

Nova Scotia Judgeships, Promises to Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7940.

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 100) on Senate Amts., 6889 (iv).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) M. to place on Govt. Orders, 6364 (iv).

——— (B. 132) in Com., 6686; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6723; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6767; 3° m., 7545 (iv).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. (B. 149) in Com., 7669; 3° m., 7786 (iv).

Revised Statutes Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 6541; and in Com., 6795 (iv).

Salvation Army Officers and Parole System *re* Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7954.

Seven Islands Wharf, Contract *re*, in Com. of Sup., 7992 (iv).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 102) on Senate Amts., 6889 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Justice (private secretaries) 7937; (salaries) 7954 (iv).

Dominion Police (salaries) 7949 (iv).

Justice (Ad Hoc Judges) 7939; (consolidation of statutes) 7958; (Exchequer Court) 7939; (litigated matters) 7960; (N.W. Ters.)

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7938; (N.S., Judge Dodd) 7939; (Supreme Court) 7939; Yukon (fees and expenses) 7949; (law books) 7949; (sheriffs' allowances) 7945; (travelling allowances) 7945.

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (salaries) 7953; Kingston (Chaplains) 7950; Miscellaneous (brick-making) 7957; (parole system) 7954.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7769; (Lotbinière wharf) 7777; (Newport breakwater) 7779; (Percé wharf) 7780; (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7992 (iv).

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) in Com., 6790.

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6919 (iv).

Fowler, G. W., *King's, N.B.*

Campbellton Wharf Accommodation, and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly, Cor., &c., on M. for Sup., 7788 (iv).

Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).

Grain and Grain Products carried on I.C.R., Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 7783 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6368, 6371, 6425, 6454, 6502, 6517.

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing road) 6872; Lachine (slope walls) 6826; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6818; Trent (construction) 6827; Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 6813; (retaining walls) 6867 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Justice (private secretaries) 7937 (iv).

Justice—Yukon (fees, expenses) 7949; (sheriff's allowances) 7946; Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7958; (litigated matters) 7961; N. W. Mounted Police (Cashel's escape) 7963 (iv).

N.W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 7965 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (salaries) 7953 ; Generally (parole system) 7956; Kingston (salaries) 7952 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Alma pier) 7750; (Caraquet wharf) 7746; (Great Salmon River) 7747; (Hopewell Cape) 7748; (Petit Rocher) 7749; (St. John River) 7750 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7768, 7769; (Lotbinière wharf) 7776; (Murray Bay wharf) 7779; (Pointe Ste. Pierre) 7780 (iv).

Galliher, W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7653 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6717 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8003 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 79)—(M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 7966.

Ganong, G. W., *Charlotte.*

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (hatcheries) 7587; (oyster culture) 7588; (protection service) 7580 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (water service) 7631; Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 7744; (Black Brook) 7745; (Campbellton wharf) 7745; (Caraquet wharf) 7745; (Hopewell Cape) 7748; (Negro Point) 7750; (North Head) 7748; (Petit Rocher) 7749; Telegraph Lines, N.B. (Deer Island, &c.) 7891 (iv).

Gauvreau, C. A., *Temiscouata.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 7781 (iv).

German, W. M., *Welland.*

SUPPLY :

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6817; Trent (construction) 6836; Welland (electric lighting plant) 6798 (iv).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) Pet. *re,* 6147 (iv).

Gibson, A., *York, N.B.*

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 143) in Com., 6322 (iv).

Gilmour, J., *East Middlesex.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6463, 6516 (iv).

Gourley, S. E., *Colchester.*

Champlain, Erection of Monument to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

G.T.Ry. Co.'s Arbitration B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 6466 (iv).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6310 (iv).

Militia Act B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6381, 6405, 6426, 6438, 6470, 6490, 6538.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6712; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6724, 6733 (iv).

Revised Statutes Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6796 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (construction) 6853 (iv).

Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7959; (litigated matters) 7961.

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7972.

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6287.

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6918 (iv).

Hackett, E., *West Prince, P.E.I.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6206 (iv).

Hackett, E.—*Con.*

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Completion, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).

Pension Scheme *re* Ry. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Dismissals in 1896 (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).

——— Tourist Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6710 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7969.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7745; P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7736; (New London) 7738; (Point Prim wharf) 7738; (Richmond Bay wharf) 7739; (Rustico harbour) 7739; (Souris Point) 7740; (Summerside breakwater) 7740; (West Point wharf) 7743 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6220.

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*

Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses, Reps. asked for : in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

American Fishing Cos. abd Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com of Sup., 7581 (iv).

Can. Atlantic Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase by Govt. (remarks) 6874 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6648 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7694 (iv).

I.C.R., Capital Expenditure (remarks) 6104. (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

——— Charges against Sir Chas. Tupper, 6122.

——— Political Intereference of Employees at Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6047.

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6506 (iv).

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 6322 (iv).

North Channel Dam, Completion, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Deficits *re* Working Expenses (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6693, 6777 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (Denault's culvert) 6870; (landing wharf) 6873; (macadamizing road) 6870 (iv).

——— Cornwall (enlargement) 6293; (lighting contract) 6648; (shoals dredging) 6347. (iv).

——— Galops (channel completion) 6337; (enlargement) 6300 (iv).

——— Grenville (wharf) 6865 (iv).

——— Lachine (old locks rebuilding) 6867.

——— Norh Channel (dam, &c.) 6314, 6315, 6323 (iv).

Haggart. Hon. John—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—St. Ours (lock) 6864 (iv).

——— Soulanges (arms and heaters) 6868; (St. Amour's gully) 6868; (steel bridge for power house) 6862; (survey for breakwater) 6862 (iv).

——— Trent (construction) 6829, 6859 (iv).

——— Welland (electric plant) 6348; (obstructions, &c.) 6359 ; (Port Colborne, deepening) 6360 (iv).

Fisheries (overseers, &c.) 7581 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (overseers, salaries) 7598 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (ship channel, St. Lawrence) 7599 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 6275 (iv).

Welland Canal, Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6103 (iv).

Halliday, James, *North Bruce.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Southampton) 7857 (iv).

Haszard, H., *West Queen's, P.E.I.*

P.E.I. Ry., Charlottetown Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6237 (iv).

Henderson, D., *Halton.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7664 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6393 (iv).

Pacific Bank of Canada B., on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6770 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (construction) 6852; Welland (obstructions, &c.) 6359 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (new plant) 7884; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7775; P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7737; Que. (Chateau Richer) 7767; (Grand Vallée pier) 7770; (Lake St. John dredging) 7775; (Lotbinière wharf) 7778; (Newport breakwater) 7779; (Percé wharf) 7780 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 7 (Mr. Thompson) on Sen. Amts., 7967.

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6093, 6845 (iv).

Heyd, C. B., *South Brant.*

Auditor General's Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6593 (iv).

Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 161) 1°*, 7649 (iv).

Ry. Act. Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6724, 6745; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6774 (iv).

Holmes, R., *West Huron.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7663 (iv).

Hughes, J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*

Fish Driers, Whitman Method (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).

"Military Gazette" (Canadian) and Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Extension and Working Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Knight's Point) 7740; (Summerside breakwater) 7740; (West Point wharf) 7743 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6242.

Hughes, Saml., *North Victoria.*

Cedar Lake Fishery Overseer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7659 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, Letter of Mr. Preston *re* and Editorials in English Press (remarks) 6018 (iv).

Exchequer Court, Additional Judge, in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, on M. for Sup., 7688, 7700 (iv).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Hutton, Maj.-Gen., Late G.O.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6369 (iv).

Judges, Appnmt. of and Promises made to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7940. (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7943 (iv).

"Military Gazette" (Canadian), Par. in "Citizen" *re* Govt. Patronage, 7903 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6368-6463, 6469-6540 (iv).

——— Reprinting as amended (remarks) 6681.

Militia Promotions and Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).

Militia Regulations *re* Examinations, Inquiry for Papers, 6024 (iv).

Musketry School, Taxes *re* Expenses in Camp (remarks) 6550 (iv).

N.W. Mounted Police, Land Scrip, &c., for 1885 Rebellion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7965.

Russell, Mr., M.P., and Promise of Judgeship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).

Session, Length of, Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6640 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowances) 7946 ; (travelling allowances) 7945 (iv).

Hughes, Saml.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Fisheries (overseers) 7581 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7970.

N.W. Mounted Police (Cashel's escape) 7964.

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (salaries) 7953 ; Miscellaneous (brick-making) 7958; (parole system) 7955 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall grounds) 8021; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Depot Harbour dredging) 8022; (Otonabee river) 8022; Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7831, 7997; Miscellaneous ("J. I. Tarte," damage to dredge) 8021; Roads and Bridges (Colonization roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8017; Telegraph Lines (Qu'Appelle-Edmonton section) 8023 (iv).

Twelfth of July, Holiday Adjournment (remarks) 6264 (iv).

Whitley, Lt.-Col., Tel. to from Min. of Ag. (M.) to adjn., 6875 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S. (Acting Minister of Public Works), *London.*

Buildings rented by Dom. Govt., List (read) 7622 (iv).

C. Ross Co., Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6544.

Dredging in Ont., Summary of Expenditure (remarks) 7875 (iv).

"Fielding," Dredge, Cost of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7881 (iv).

Midland Dock, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 6322 (iv).

N.S. Harbours and Rivers, Summary of Amounts expended (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv).

Ottawa Buildings rented by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7625; List (read) 7628 (iv).

Picton Custom House, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).

Port Credit, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7888 (iv).

P.E.I. Telegraph Service and Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).

"Richelieu," Dredge, Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 6543 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (armouries) 7619; (electric power) 7631; (engineers, &c.) 7630; (experimental farms) 7620; (generally) 7619; (heating, &c.) 7630; (rentals, &c.) 7621; (list of buildings) 7622; (water service) 7631 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 7628; (Major's Hill Park) 7629; (Ry. Commission) 7625; (Rideau Hall, fuel) 7628; (Rideau Hall, grounds, 8021; (snow cleaning) 7630 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Valleyfield) 7972 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7885; Generally (new plant) 7885; Man. (new plant) 7884; Mar. Provs. (hydraulic

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
plant) 7880; N.S. (new plant) 7885; Ont. (new plant) 7880; P.E.I. (new dredge) 7880 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson and Kennedy lakes) 7876; (Fraser River protection) 7876; (Sydney River breakwater) 8022 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dom. (repairs, &c.) 7850 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Dauphin Lake lowering) 7876; (repairs, &c.) 7875; (St. Andrews rapids) 7897 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7774 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Alma pier) 7750; (Anderson's Hollow) 7744; (Black Brook) 7745; (Campbellton wharf) 7745; Cape Tormentine) 7745; (Caraquet wharf) 7745; (Dalhousie harbour) 7747; (Dipper Harbour) 7747; (Great Salmon River) 7747; (Hopewell Cape) 7748; (Negro Point) 7750; (North Head) 7748; (Petit Rocher) 7749; (St. John River) 7750.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Abram's wharf) 7634; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7635; (Baxter's harbour) 7635; (Bayfield wharf) 7635; (Big Pond wharf) 7636; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636; (Bridgewater dredging) 7637; (Cow Bay) 7637; (Digby pier) 7637; (Fort Lawrence pier) 7638; (Georgeville wharf) 7638; (Glace Bay) 7639; (Hall's harbour) 7642; (Indian Harbour) 7642; (Iona wharf) 7642; (Kelly's Cove) 7644; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 7642; (Larry's River) 7642; (Lingan beach) 7643; (Livingstone's Cove) 7643; (Malignant Cove) 7643; (Middle River) 7643; (Neil's Harbour) 7643; (Pembroke breakwater) 7644; (Port Bevis wharf) 7636; (Port Hawkesbury) 7644; (Port Hood entrance) 7646; (Port Maitland) 7646; (Prospect wharf) 7646; (Sandy Cove) 7646; (Scott's Bay) 7646; (Skinner's Cove) 7646; (Spry Bay wharf) 7646; (Summerville wharf) 7646; (Sydney quarantine station) 7647; (Tenecape wharf) 7647; (Victoria Beach) 7647; (Wedge Point) 7647; (West Bay wharf) 7647; (White's Cove) 7648 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg dredging) 7750; (Barry's Bay) 7751; (Bayfield wharf) 8022; (Bracebridge wharf) 7751; (Burlington channel) 7751; (Collingwood harbour) 7751, 8022; (Depot Harbour) 7753; (Depot Harbour, dredging) 8022; (Gananoque dredging) 7754; (Goderich harbour) 7754; (Grand Bend pier) 7843; (Honora wharf) 7851; (Kingsville pier) 7852; (Little Current) 7852; (Meaford harbour) 7852; (Midland harbour) 7853; (Otonabee dredging) 7855, 8022; (Owen Sound) 7853; (Pembroke wharf) 7853; (Penetanguishene pier) 7854; (Port Colborne) 7897; (Port Perry dredging) 7854; (Port Stanley dredging) 7855; (Rondeau, dredging) 7855; (Sarnia, dredging) 7855; (Sault Ste. Marie, dredging) 7856; (Southampton) 7857; (Spanish River) 7857; (Temiscaming wharf) 7852; (Thessalon breakwater) 7863; (Thornbury) 7863; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7864; (Wiarton wharf) 7874 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7736; (New London) 7738; (Point Prim Island) 7738; (Richmond Bay wharf) 7739; (Rustico harbour) 7739; (Souris Point) 7740; (Summerside breakwater) 7740; (West Point wharf) 7744 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse aux Gascons) 7766; (Baie St. Paul) 7766; (Bonaventure East) 7766; (Caplan breakwater) 7767; (Chambord wharf) 7767; (Champlain wharf) 7767; (Château Richer) 7767; (Deschambault wharf) 7767; (Father Point) 7767; (Grand Vallee pier) 7768; (Grondines wharf) 7774; (Lake St. John dredging) 7775; (Laprairie ice piers) 7775; (Lotbiniere wharf) 7776; (Magdalen Island) 7779; (Murray Bay wharf) 7779; (Newport breakwater) 7779; (Percé wharf) 7780; (Pointe St. Pierre) 7780; (Quebec harbour) 7896; (Rimouski pier) 7780; (Rivière du Loup) 7780; (Ste. Famille pier) 7782; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle) 7782; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 7782; (St. Simeon wharf) 7828; (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7972; (Three Rivers wharf) 7835; (Trois Pistoles) 7843; (Verchères wharf) 7843; (Yamaska dredging) 7843 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 7879 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 7895; (architects, &c.) 7895; (Art Gallery) 7895; (St. Lawrence River, dredge "J. I. Tarte") 8021; (surveys, &c.) 7895; (transportation commission) 7896; (transportation facilities) 7897 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Colonization roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8017; N.W.T. (Peace river) 7891 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7891 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Dom. (Marconi system) 7896; N.B. (Deer Island, &c.) 7891; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle-Edmonton section) 8023; Ont. (Pelee Island and mainland) 8023; Que. (Anticosti, Fox Bay) 7895; (Bersimis to Godbout) 7894 (iv).
Sydenham River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Improvements at Eastern Entrance, in Com. of Sup., 7864 (iv).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Arrangements *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging inner side (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7890 (iv).
——— Use of "King Edward" (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Victoria Postoffice, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).
West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6100 (iv).

Ingram, A. B., *East Elgin.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of Hse, 6677 (iv).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) on Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv).
Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7927.
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7690 (iv).

Ingram, A. B.—*Con.*

Guysborough Election and I.C.R. Employees, Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6027, 6045 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members' Families (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).

I.C.Ry., Interference by Members with Running of Trains (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iv).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Logan) 6277 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).

Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent in Eng., Charges *re*, &c., on M. for Sup., 7811 (iv).

Milford Ry. Accident, Damages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6371, 6448, 6519 (iv).

Naval Militia, Ref. to in Com. on Militia Act, 6421 (iv).

Newspaper Patronage in Prince Albert (remarks) 6642 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter written as Minister of Militia *re* Elections (remarks) 6063 (iv).

Sessions, Length of, Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6642 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 6346; Welland (electric plant) 6349, 6797; (Port Colborne deepening) 6360 (iv).

N.W. Mounted Police (gratuity to Mrs. Beaupré) 7618; (pay of force) 7618 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (accommodation for wives, &c.) 7620; (Major's Hill Park) 7629 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wiarton wharf) 7874; Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7768 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous—Roads and Bridges (colonization roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8017 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Pelee Island and mainland) 8023 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 6284; (working expenses) 6025; P.E.I. (working expenses) 6252 (iv).

Tobacco Industry, Duties, &c. (remarks) 7785.

Johnston, Alex., *Cape Breton.*

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Pay of Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).

Johnston, R., *Cardwell.*

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).

Kaulbach, C. E., *Lunenburg.*

Fish Hatcheries in Lunenburg Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Kaulbach, C. E.—*Con.*

Fishing Bounty, Increase in Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

Lunenburg County, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).

Naval School Esablishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7596 (iv).

Newfoundland Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 6788 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (fish culture) 7587 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (masters, &c., examination) 7595 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—N.S. (new plant) 7886 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7634; (Baxter's harbour) 7635; (Breton Cove wharf) 7636; (Green Cove) 7641; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 7642; (Livingstone's Cove) 7643; (Malignant Cove) 7643; (Port Hood entrance) 7646 (iv).

Kemp, A. E., *East Toronto.*

G.T.Ry. Co.'s Arbitration B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 6465 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Dues, Inquiry for Ret., 6466 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7866 (iv).

Kendall, A. S., *Cape Breton.*

I.C.R. Employees and Political Interference at Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6059.

Militia at Sydney, Inquiry for Cor., 6553 (iv).

Lancaster, E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6258 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7692 (iv).

——— Resignation, Letter read, &c., on M. to Sup., 7680 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, *re* Express Companies, 7549 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (officials' allowances) 7947 (iv).

Canals—Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6863; Welland (electric plant) 6349 (iv).

Justice—Miscellaneous (litigated expenses) 7960 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8008 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 6271 (iv).

Welland Canal, Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6101 (iv).

LaRiviere, A. A. C., *Provencher.*

SUPPLY :

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (industrial schools) 6946; (surveys) 6952; P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6940 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfred. G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *East Quebec.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6679 (iv).

Alaskan Boundary, Cor. laid on Table, 6263.

Atlantic Mail Steamers, Average Speed, &c. (Ans.) 6888 (iv).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation (remarks) 6787 (iv).

Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) 6875 (iv).

Cardinal Canal, Damages by Floods (remarks) in Sup., 7594 (iv).

Chambly Canal, Damage by Flood, Indemnity, &c. (Ans.) 6365 (iv).

Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (remarks) 6883 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Lighting Contract, O.C.'s asked for (remarks) 6150 (iv).

Customs Collectorship in Victoria, B.C., Vacancy (Ans.) 6365 (iv).

Dundonald, Earl of, Farewell to, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to adjn., 7542 (iv).

Flour Standards, &c. (Ans.) 6546 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, Evidence furnished to G.T.P. Authorities (remarks) 6891 (iv).

——— Evidence of Mr. Hays *re* Letters, on Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., on Inquiry (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for Papers, 6014 (iv).

Hudson's Bay, Police Patrolling and Customs Ports, in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).

Lachine Canal, Authority given for Ry. Purposes (remarks) 6150 (iv).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6310 (iv).

McIntosh, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 6546 (iv).

Mail Steamships, Speed per Hour (Ans.) 6546.

"Military Gazette" (Canadian) *re* Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7903 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6374, 6536 (iv).

——— Reprinting as amended (remarks) 6681.

Militia at Sydney, Withdrawal of, &c. (remarks) 6788 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Dues, on Inquiry for Ret., 6467 (iv).

Newfoundland Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 6788 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*

N.W. Mounted Police, Land Scrip, &c., for 1885 Rebellion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iv).

Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Printing Bureau, Delay in Printing Voters' Lists (remarks) 6789 (iv).

Proulx, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7902 (iv).

Questions asked and Members' Rights to Courteous Answers (remarks) 6891 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Companies, 7545 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7970; (patrolling Hudson Bay) 7968 (iv).

N.W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 7964; (damages *re* capture of Cashel) 7963; (gratuity, Mrs. Beaupré) 7618; (gratuity to Mrs. Brooke) 7618; (pay of force) 7618; (W. M. Walke, damages to) 7619 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (salaries) 7953 (iv).

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6791 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher) on Sen. Amts. (M.) to adjn. Deb., 7967-8 (iv).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 150, on M. (Mr. German) *re* Pet., 6147 (iv).

Tobacco Industry, Duties on, &c. (remarks) 7786 (iv).

——— Rep. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Monk) to print, 7542 (iv).

Treadgold Concession, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Report (remarks) 6013, 7794.

Twelfth of July, Precedent for Adjournment (remarks) 6264 (iv).

Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution, &c., Names of Counties (Ans.) 6885 (iv).

Whitley, Lt.-Col., and Min. of Ag., on M. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to adjn., Ques. of Order, 6876 (iv).

Lavell, J. R., *Leeds and Grenville.*

Poonamalie Dam, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 7784.

Lefurgey, A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*

Alberton Station, Abolishing "Y" (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6119 (iv).

Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).

Pension Scheme for Ry. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6221 (iv).

——— Letter from J. J. Wallace (read) 6227.

P.E.I. Chicken-Fattening Stations, Inquiry for Ret., 6467 (iv).

Lefurgey, A. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Pay to Labourers, Circulars quoted in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
——— Shortage of Cars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6227 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic plant) 7880 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6220.

Lennox, H., *South Simcoe.*
Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6571 (iv).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238, 6244 (iv).
Canals—Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Cattle Guard Commission, Extra Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 6545 (iv).
Charlottetown Station, Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6672 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7538 (iv).
Cornwall and Williamsburg Canal Workshops, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 6544 (iv).
Estimates, Make-up of, &c., "Jumbled" Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7762.
G.T.P. Surveys, Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Surveys by Govt. Parties, &c. (Ques.) 6544 (iv).
I.C.R.—Bridges, Cost of Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).
Item Appropriations in Supply, Balance Column (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).
Murray Harbour Bridge and Hillsboro' Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Letters from Aud. Gen. (read) on Conc., 6682 (iv).
Railway Estimates, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Chambly (Denault's culvert) 6870; (landing wharf) 6873; (macadamizing road) 6870 ; (Ste. Therese Island) 6869 ; Galops (enlargement) 6296; St. Ours (locks) 6865; Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6863; Trent (construction) 6830, 6860 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6151 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6178; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6212; (St. John and Belfast) 6214 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7744; N.S. (Baxter's harbour) 7636; (Digby pier) 7637; (Larry's River) 7642 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot Harbour) 7754; (Goderich harbour) 7758; Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7768; (Magdalen Islands) 7779; (Rimouski piers) 7780; (Rivière du Loup) 7781 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 6291; I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6271, 6285; (Windsor branch) 6219; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour Branch, and Hillsboro' Bridge) 6682; (working expenses) 6238 (iv).

Lennox, H.—*Con.*
Transportation Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 6362 (iv).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Arrangements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).

Logan, H. J., *Cumberland.*
Archibald, Maj., *re* Parole System and Penitentiaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7955.
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
I.C.R., Interference *re* Running of Trains (personal explanation) 6276 (iv).
——— Pay to Workingmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6226 (iv).
——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6119 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6398, 6502 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6711 (iv).

Maclean, W. F., *East York, Ont.*
American Fishing Cos. and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Arbitration B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 6466 (iv).
G.T.P. Surveys, Aliens deported, Action taken *re* (remarks) 6542 (iv).
Hudson Bay Fishery Patrol, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6471, 6488 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental paid to Govt. and by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7624.
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. (amts.) 6687, 6713, 6761; on M. for 3° (amts.) 7545, 7551, 7563 (iv).
Sessions, Length of and Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6639 (iv).

Macpherson, R. G., *Burrard.*
American Fishing Cos. and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7583 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7654 (iv).
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7733 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5, in Com., 6519 (iv).
Pacific Bank of Canada Bill (M) to place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).

McEwen, G., *South Huron.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand Bend pier) 7844 (iv).

McLennan, A., *Inverness.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hawkesbury) 7644 (iv).

Mignault, R. M. S., *Yamaska.*

Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operation, &c. (Ques.) 6149 (iv).

Monet, D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6432 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7737 (iv).

Monk, F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6259 (iv).

Chambly Canal, Indemnity for Damages by Floods, Names, &c. (Ques.) 6365 (iv).

Lachine Canal, Authority given for Ry. Purposes (remarks) 6150 (iv).

Mails sent via New York to G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6469, 6536 (iv).

Public Works and Marine Depts., Transfer of Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7602.

"Richelieu," Dredge, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 6543 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, O.C. *re* Transfer to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7602 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6158 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting, repairing, &c.) 7620 (iv).

Tobacco Industry, Protection and Encouragement (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6894; Neg. (Y. 19; N. 50) 6927 (iv).

——— Rep. of Commissioners, Printing, &c. (M.) 7542 (iv).

Morin, J. B., *Dorchester.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (new plant) 7881 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7774; Que. (Anse aux Gascons) 7766; (Baie St. Paul) 7766; (Grand Vallée pier) 7768; (Seven Islands wharf) 7829, 7974; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7891; Telegraph Lines (Bersimis to Godbout) 7894 (iv).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General), *North York, Ont.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7898.

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6258 (iv).

Fair Wage Clause and Bonused Rys., Application *re* (Ans.) 6883 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, Aliens deported, Action *re* (Ans.) 6542 (iv).

——— Employment of Aliens, Rep. of Evidence furnished to G.T.P. Co. (remarks) 6880 (iv).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Immigrants, Italians, Rep. *re* Destitute Condition (remarks) 6931 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

Judges appointed as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6118 (iv).

Letter Carriers, Pay on Sick Leave (Ans.) 6889 (iv).

Mail Matter carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6200 (iv).

Postal Matter, Free to M.P.'s, Instructions to Postmasters (remarks) 6549 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 153) 1° m., 6541 (iv).

Post Office Orders, Printing in French, &c. (remarks) 6550 (iv).

River John Mail Contract, on Inquiry for Papers, 6024 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter as Minister of Militia *re* Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (construction) 6833, 6846 (iv).

Welland Canal, Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

Whitley, Lt.-Col., and Min. of Ag., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 6876 (iv).

Northrup, W. B., *East Hastings.*

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7734 (iv).

Militiamen not on Duty, Amenable to Partisan Interests (remarks) 7734 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6705 (iv).

Ross Rifle Contract, Tests, &c. (Ques.) 6886.

Oliver, F., *Alberta.*

Govt. Patronage *re* Newspaper, &c. (remarks) 6642 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6735, 6764 (iv).

Sessions, Length of and Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6640 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited (B. 80) in Com., 6093; on Sen. Amts., 7721 (iv).

Osler, E. B., *West Toronto.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7787 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re* Trap Nets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7731 (iv).

Hudson Bay Fisheries Protection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6450, 6500 (iv).

Osler, E. B.—*Con.*

Militiamen out of Uniform, Controlled by Minister, &c. (remarks) 7732 (iv).

New England Fish Co. and Canadian Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (protection, overseers, &c.) 7572.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dalhousie harbour) 7747; (Petit Rocher) 7749; Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7760; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7864; P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7737; Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7830; (Three Rivers wharf) 7835 (iv).

Toronto Island, South Side Piers, in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).

Parmelee, C. H., *Shefford.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com. (M.) to sit concurrently with Hse., 6676 (iv).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs), *North Wentworth and Brant.*

Fish carried in Bond to U.S. Ports, O.C. *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 7586 (iv).

Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers, &c. (Ans.) 6680 (iv).

Pope, Rufus H., *Compton.*

McIntosh, Mr. John, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 6548 (iv).

Porter, E. G., *West Hastings.*

Trenton Harbour Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer (Ques.) 6149 (iv).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Maisonneuve.*

Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Notification to Keepers *re* Change (Ans.) 6681 (iv).

"Alert" Str., Transfer to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

American Fishing Cos. and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).

Beaver River Fish Hatchery, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Campbellton Wharf and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7791.

Dog-Fish Pest, on Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners, 6929 (iv).

Fish Driers in Use (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).

Fishing Licenses granted to Lakes North of Winnipeg (Ans.) 7783 (iv).

Hudson's Bay Fishery Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

James Bay, Fishing License to A. McNee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

Napanee River Buoys, Painting, &c. (Ans.) 6149 (iv).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Naval Militia Establishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

New England Fish Co. and Canadian Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).

Prescott Lighthouse, Construction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Public Works and Marine Depts., Transfer of Duties, O.C. *re* (read) 7599; List of Dredges, Plant, &c. (read) 7600 (iv).

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, History (read) 7613 (iv).

——— Insurance Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7607 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (cold storage inspection) 7589 ; (fish culture) 7587; (Georgian Bay laboratory) 7593; (inspectors, &c.) 7572; (overseers, salaries) 7598; (oyster culture) 7588.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 7597; ("Lurcher" lightship) 7597; (wharf at Charlottetown) 7598 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (damages to perishable goods, P.E.I.) 7594; (masters and mates) 7596 (iv).

Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Pringle, R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6644 (iv).

Puttee, Arthur W., *Winnipeg.*

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal, Aud. Gen.'s Letter *re* Papers (remarks) 6879 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Interference *re* Employees in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6038.

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6427, 6452, 6512 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6726 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 7897; Yukon (Lewes and Yukon Rivers) 7880 (iv).

Telegraphers' Union, Special Agreement *re* Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6038.

Reid, J. D., *South Grenville.*

"Alert" Str., Transfer to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

American Fishing Cos. abd. Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247, 6262 (iv).

Cardinal Canal, Damages by Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).

——— Enlargement, in Com. of Sup., 6324 (iv).

——— Toll Collectors, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6331-2 (iv).

Reid, J. D.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7539 (iv).

Galops Canal Enlargement, Pay of Staff, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Carunal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

Mud Island Shoal, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iv).

Prescott Lighthouse, Construction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (lighting, &c.) 6645; Galops (channel completion) 6335; (enlargement) 6294; North Channel (dam, &c.) 6315 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 7597 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax to Liverpool) 6211; (St. John and Glasgow) 6213 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (damages to perishable goods, P.E.I.) 7594 (iv).

Welland Canal Deepening, Policy of the Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6361 (iv).

Robinson, Jabel, *West Elgin.*

Auditor General's Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6634 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Appointments, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6420 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6727, 6746 (iv).

Roche, William, *Halifax.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Dredging—N.S. (new plant) 7885 (iv).

Roche, W. J., *Marquette.*

Dixon, Mr. Geo., Homestead Entry, Performance of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 6885 (iv).

Duck Mountain Timber Berths, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6543 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation, &c.) 6958; (medical relief) 6957; (travelling expenses) 6958 (iv).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6941; (clothing) 6946; (Elkhorn school) 6948; (farm implements) 6942; (general expenses) 6954; (live stock) 6944; (medical attendance, &c.) 6945; (seed grain) 6942; (Sioux treaty) 6953; (surveys) 6951; Yukon (medical attendance) 6959 (iv).

Rosamond, B., *North Lanark.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7757 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria, N.S.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6679 (iv).

Apples shipped in Cold Storage to G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).

Fish Driers, Unsuccessful Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6389, 6503, 6519 (iv).

Personal Explanation, "Dennis Eagan" Letter, Par. from Newspapers (read) 7542 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6725 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Indians—P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6939.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6163 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—N.S. (new plant) 7886; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636; (Green Cove) 7641; (Port Hawkesbury) 7644 (iv).

Ross, Wm., *South Ontario.*

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, *re* Express Companies, 7548 (iv).

Russell, B., *Hants.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Scott, W., *West Assiniboia.*

Govt. Patronage *re* Prince Albert Newspaper (remarks) 6642 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (construction) 6841 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (colonization roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8020 (iv).

Sherritt, J., *North Middlesex.*

Grand Bend Breakwater, Contract *re* McTavish Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand Bend pier) 7843; (Sarnia dredging) 7856; (Spanish River) 7858; Que. (Three Rivers wharf) 7841 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford, (Minister of the Interior), *Brandon.*

Dixon, Geo., Homestead Entry, Duties *re* (Ans.) 6885 (iv).

Duck Mountain, Timber Berths, Sale of (remarks) 6543 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, Letter to W. T. R. Preston, on Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Clarke) 6018, 6552, 6682 (iv).

Geological Survey Rep. presented, 6150 (iv).

Indians, N.B., Fishing Rights leased to Henry Bishop (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6937 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

Indian Schools, Results of Education (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).

Indian Timber cut on Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 158) 1° m., 6874 (iv).

Songhees Indians, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation, &c.) 6958; (medical relief) 6957; (salaries) 6957; (schools) 6957; (travelling expenses) 6958.

——— Generally (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6960.

——— Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6941 ; (clothing) 6946; (Elkhorn school) 6848; (farm implements) 6943; (general expenses) 6955; (industrial schools) 6946 ; (live stock) 6944; (medical attendance, &c.) 6945; (saw mills) 6954; (seed grain) 6942; (Sioux treaties) 6953; (surveys) 6951.

——— N.B. (agents' salaries) 6937 (iv).

——— N.S. (agents' salaries) 6933; (medical attendance) 6937; (relief and seed grain) 6936 (iv).

——— Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 6932 (iv).

——— P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6941 ; (relief and seed grain) 6938; (travelling expenses) 6938 (iv).

——— Yukon (medical attendance) 6959.

Walpole Island, Instructions *re* Survey (read) 6932 (iv).

Sinclair, John H., *Guysborough.*

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032, 6066, 6106 (iv).

Smith, Ralph, *Vancouver.*

G.T.P. Surveys, Aliens, &c., Names of Men deported (Ques.) 6884 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson's Lake) 7876 (iv).

Smith, E. D., *South Wentworth.*

Cold Storage Transportation on Steamships, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7907; Neg. (Y. 38; N. 62) 7936 (iv).

Flour Standards set, &c. (Ques.) 6545 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6523 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6163; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6211; (St. John and London) 6215 (iv).

Ventilation on Allan Strs., *re* Cold Storage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6176 (iv).

Speaker. Mr. (Hon. N. A. Belcourt), *Ottawa.*

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 6905 (iv).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 6923 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amts. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7545 (iv).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Peter Macdonald), *East Huron.*

Canada Eastern Ry., Irrelevancy of Debate on P.E.I. Ry., 6260 (iv).

Gov. Gen. (Lord Minto) Criticism *re* Military Control (ruling) 6418 (iv).

Judges, Appnmt. of, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Member for Hants, 7943 (iv).

Militia Act, Order, Ques. of, *re* Denial of Statement (ruling) 6386 (iv).

Sessions, Length of, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 6641 (iv).

Trent Canal, Ques. of Order (ruling) 6842 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6845 (iv).

Sproule, T. S., *East Grey.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently during Sittings of Hse., 6676 (iv).

American Fishing Co. and Can. Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

Apples shipped in Cold Storage to G.B. (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).

Atlantic Fast SS. Contract with Allans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6156, 6167, 6182 (iv).

Auditor General's Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6597 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7787 (iv).

Beaver River Fish Hatchery, Establishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation (remarks) 6787 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv).

Canada Southern Railway Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Ingram) on Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv).

Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7927.

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6648 (iv).

Dog-Fish Pest, Rep. of Commissioners, on Inquiry for, 6930 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7658, 7663 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, Farewell to, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 7542 (iv).

Editorials in English Papers *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6023 (iv).

Estimates, "Jumbled" in making up, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

Fish carried in Bond to U.S. Ports, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Provs. and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

G.T.Ry., Rentals, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).

Sproule, T. S.—*Con.*
Grant, Geo. N., and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6040.
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7733 (iv).
Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6029, 6040 (iv).
——— Slander of the Judges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6105 (iv).
Indian Timber cut on Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pay to Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6225 (iv).
I. C. R., Political Appnmts. (remarks) Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent, Charges *re*, on M. for Sup., 7817 (iv).
James Bay, Fishing License to Arch. McNee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Judges appointed as Political partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
Library, House of Commons, Better Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7621 (iv).
McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
Mail sent via New York and Allans' Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
"Military Gazette" (Canadian) *re* Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).
Murray Harbour Ry., P.E.I., on Conc. (remarks) 6684 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police, Land Scrip for 1885 Rebellion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7965.
Ottawa Buildings for Govt. Use, Rentals, and Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7625.
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7817 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6698, 6717, 6730, 6758, 6766; on Amts. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7558, 7564 (iv).
Representation Act (1903) Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7670; on M. for 3°, 7786 (iv).
Session, Length of, Delay in Calling Parlt. (remarks) 6639 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, Unparliamentary Language (Mr. Oliver) 6641 (iv).
Standard Passenger Tolls, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. B., 6766 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 6339; (enlargement) 6304; Lachine (dredging basins) 6826; (slope walls) 6825; North Channel (dam, &c.) 6314; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6817; Trent (construction) 6827; Welland (electric plant) 6349, 6797; (obstructions, &c.) 6360 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6150 (iv).

Sproule, T. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Fisheries (fish culture) 7587; (Georgian Bay laboratory) 7593; (inspectors, &c.) 7572.
Indians—N.S. (salaries) 6933; P.E.I. (travelling expenses) 6938 (iv).
Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7960; (litigated matters) 7961.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and London) 6215; (St. John and W. Indies) 6216; (St. Lawrence route) 6156.
Miscellaneous (Champlain's monument) 7972.
Penitentiaries (parole system) 7955 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (armouries) 7620; (electric power) 7631; (experimental farms) 7620; (generally) 7619; (heating, &c.) 7630 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 7629; (heating, &c.) 7629; (lighting, repairs, &c.) 7620; (Major's Hill Park) 7629; (Rideau Hall, fuel) 7628 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Valleyfield) 7972 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—Generally (new plant) 7885; Ont. (new plant) 7881; P.E.I. (new dredge) 7880 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7641 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood harbour) 7751, 8022; (Depot Harbour) 7754; (Gananoque dredging) 7754; (Goderich harbour) 7757; (Grand Bend pier) 7845; (Kingsville pier) 7852; (Meaford pier) 7852; (Owen Sound harbour) 7853; (Rondeau, dredging) 7855; (Sault Ste. Marie, dredging) 7856; (Spanish River) 7857, 7861; (Temiscaming wharf) 7852; (Thessalon) 7863; (Thornbury) 7863.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure East) 7766; (Caplan breakwater) 7767; (Champlain wharf) 7767; (Deschambault wharf) 7767; (Grand Vallée pier) 7768; (Lotbinière wharf) 7777; (Rimouski piers) 7780; (Rivière du Loup) 7781; (Ste. Famille pier) 7782; (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7832, 7975; (Three Rivers wharf) 7838; (Yamaska dredging) 7843 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 7880 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 7895; (architects, &c.) 7895; (surveys, &c.) 7895; (transportation commission) 7896.
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Colonization roads, Man. and N.W.T.) 8018 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines Generally (Marconi system) 7896; P.E.I (Govt. system) 7894; Que. (Anticosti, Fox Bay) 7895; (Bersimis to Godbout) 7895 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Windsor branch) 6219; P.E.I. (working expenses) 6220 (iv).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6790 (iv).
Temporary Clerks, Placing on Permanent List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher) on Sen. Amts., 7966 (iv).
Treadgold Concession, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7795.
West Canadian Collieries, Limited. B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6094; on Sen. Amts., 7721.

Sutherland, R. F., *North Essex.*

Christman, Annie, Relief (B. 155) 1° m., 6680.

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8007 (iv).

Talbot, O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6472 (iv).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 6785 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7772; (Three Rivers wharf) 7840.

Taylor, Geo., *South Leeds.*

Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses, St. Lawrence River, Notification to Keepers (Ques.) 6681.

Frankville Postmaster, Refusal to send letter to M.P.'s without postage stamps (remarks) 6549 (iv).

Kingston Penitentiary, Appnmt. of Protestant Chaplain, Letter *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).

Postal Matter, Free Postage to Members of Parlt. (remarks) 6549 (iv).

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowances) 7945 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing roads) 6872; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6818; Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6863 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence River ship channel) 7616 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (chaplain's salary) 7950 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7763; Que. (Deschambault wharf) 7767; (Grand Vallée pier) 7772; (Seven Islands wharf) 7990; (Three Rivers wharf) 7837 (iv).

Thompson, A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6434, 6447, 6473, 6513, 6525 (iv).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6470, 6790, 6882 (iv).

Vrooman, A. E., *South Victoria, Ont.*

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (construction) 6827 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Otonabee dredging) 7855; (Port Perry dredging) 7854 (iv).

Wade, F. B., *Annapolis.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of Hse., 6677 (iv).

Wade, F. B.—*Con.*

Apple Shipments in Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6177 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Decision of Ry. Commissioners, 6716 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6166 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Victoria Beach) 7647 (iv).

Ward, H. A., *East Durham.*

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6671 (iv).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7694 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6513 (iv).

Wilmot, R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*

St. John River Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic plant) 7880; N.S. (new plant) 7886.

Wilson, Uriah, *Lennox.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6680 (iv).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 7901 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7540 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

Immigrants, Italians, Rep. *re* Destitute Circumstances (remarks) 6931 (iv).

Napanee River Buoys, Painting, &c. (Ques.) 6149 (iv).

Picton Custom House, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).

Ry. Commission, Rent of Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7626 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (consolidation of statutes) 7959; (Judge Dodd) 7939 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation) 6958; Man. and N.W.T. (saw mills) 6954 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Miscellaneous (brick-making) 7958; (parole system) 7954 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating, &c.) 7630; (rentals, &c.) 7622; Ottawa (grounds) 7629; (lighting, repairs, &c.) 7620; (Major's Hill Park) 7620; (snow cleaning) 7630; Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7633; Dredging, Ont. (new plant) 7883 (iv).

Wright, A. A., *South Renfrew.*

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 150 (M.) to Place on Order Paper for 2°, 6786 (iv).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Abrams Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).
Acetylene Gas Changes in Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Notification to Keepers: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6681 (iv).
Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses: Reps. asked for (Mr. Haggart) 7597 (iv).
Acetylene Gas used for Cold Storage *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
Ad Hoc Judges: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Administration of Justice, N.W.Ters.: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
——— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
See 'Justice.'
'Admiral' Str., Gaspé Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).
Advertising *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7069 (iv).
Agriculture and Colonization Com., Concurrent Sittings with Hse.: M. (Mr. Parmelee) 6676 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Macoun *re* Peace River: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 7347.
Agriculture, Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7364 (iv).
Alaskan Boundary: Cor. laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6263 (iv).
Alberton Station 'Y,' Abolition of: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).
'Alert' Str., Transference to Marine Dept.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
——— Use by Supt. Stewart for Pleasure Yacht: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7520 (iv).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) 1° m., 7898 (iv).
Aliens and Naturalization Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6794, 7228 (iv).
Allan New Strs. for Atlantic Service: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Alma Pier, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
American Fishing Co. and Bonding Privileges: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).
American Fishing Co. and Can. Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7575.
Amherstburg Harbour Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lakes: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Anderson's Hollow Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
Anse aux Gascons Wharf Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Anticosti, Fox Bay Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Apples shipped to G.B., Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wade) in Com. of Sup., 6177.
Appointments to Public Offices, Personal Character, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70) 7827.
Arbitrations, Public Works, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Archibald, Maj., and Parole System: Remarks (Mr. Logan) in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iv).
Architects, Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Argyle and Springdale Townships, Taxes *re* School Lands, Litigation: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Armouries, Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv).
Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 7895.
Arts, Agriculture, &c., Cold Storage: in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).
Assay Offices, Chemicals and Instruments: in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Assiniboine River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract *re* Mails, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Atlantic Mail Steamers, Average Speed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6888 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. McCool) 7081 (iv).
Auditor General, and Audit Act, Extension, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 6553; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 94) 6636 (iv).
Auditor General, Resignation, Action of Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6887 (iv).
Aylmer, Ont., Establishment as an Outport for Customs: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7439 (iv).

Baie St. Paul Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Bailey's Brook Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).
Banff Hot Springs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iv).
Bank Act Amt. B. No. 160 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 7222; 2°, and in Com., 7786; 3°*, 7787 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6789 (iv).
Banking Com., Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 7364 (iv).

Barry's Bay Wharf, Madawaska, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' Allan Strs., Tonnage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Baxter's Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7635.
Bayfield Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7635.
Bayfield Harbour, Ont., Extension of Southern Pier: in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Beaver River Hatchery, Establishment: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7587.
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7057, 7060 (iv).
——— Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7213 (iv).
Bell Telephone Co., Decision of Ry. Commissioners at Port Arthur: in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6726 (iv).
Bersimis to Godbout Telegraph Service: in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).
Big Pond Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7636.
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 6905 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 6923 (iv).
Binder Twine Seizures: Inquiry for Ret., 6024.
Bisley Prizes: *See* 'Canadian Prizes.'
Black Brook Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease for Grazing Purposes: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Bonaventure, East, Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Boundary, B.C., Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).
Bowing on Floor of House when passing members who are speaking: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 7235 (iv).
Bracebridge Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
Breton Cove, N.S., Boat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (iv).
Brick-making in Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 7957 (iv).
Bridgewater, N.S., Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
Bryce, Dr., Appnmt. and Salary as Medical Inspector for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 6960.
Buildings, Dom., Rented by Govt., Generally: List read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Buildings, Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv).
——— Que: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Burlington Channel Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6787 (iv). *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Campbellton Siding, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
Campbellton Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).
Campbellton Wharf Accommodation and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly, Cor. &c.: Read (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 7788 (iv).
Canada and Australia Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase by Govt., Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 6874.
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 7443 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6238, 6244 (iv).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 6260 (iv).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7464 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. Ingram) in Com., and 3°*, 6322; on Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv).
Canadian Labour Bureau and Immigration Agents: Remarks (Mr. Puttee) in Com. of Sup., 7299; Cor. from Louis Leopold: Read, 7304-5 (iv).
C.P.R. Lands, Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Canadian Prize Winners in England: Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) 7436 (iv).
Canadian Year-book, as Immigration Literature and Advertising Whiskeys: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6293, 6797, 7466 (iv).
——— Collectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6331-2, 7531 (iv).
——— Operating Staff, Statement of Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).
——— Surveys, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).
——— Tolls, Collection *re*, Govt.'s Position: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7470 (iv).
——— Working Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).
Caplan Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Caraquet Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745.
Cardinal Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6308, 6324, 6331-2, 7594 (iv).
Cashel, Capture of, Expenditure *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7963 (iv).
Cattle Guard Commission, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7475.

Cattle Guard Commission, Extra Remuneration: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6545 (iv).
Cedar Lake Fishery Overseer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Census, 1901, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7224 (iv).
Chambly Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6365 (iv).
——— Denault's Culvert: in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).
——— Dredging at Ste. Thérèse Island: in Com. of Sup., 6869 (iv).
——— Electric Power House: in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iv).
——— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6870, 7470 (iv).
——— Waste Weir: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Chambord Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767.
Champlain's Monument: in Com. of Sup., 7969 (iv).
Champlain Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767.
Chaplains appointed to Penitentiaries, Protestant: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
'Chapman' Ball-Bearings, Application *re* I.C.R. Cars: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Station Site: Remarks (Mr. Haszard) in Com. of Sup., 6237 (iv).
Charlottetown Wharf, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
Château Richer Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Cheese Cooling Stations, Expenditure and Accounts: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).
Cheese Curing and Paraffining: Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Chesley Postmastership, Appnmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7081 (iv).
Chicken-Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7422.
——— Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).
Christman, Annie, Relief B. 155 (Mr. Calvert) 1° m., 6680; M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 6786; 2°*, 6883; in Com., and 3°*, 7420.
Clarke, Messrs., and Seven Islands Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7976.
'Cleveland' Patent Cylinders, *re* I.C.R. Locomotives: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6286 (iv).
Coal Oil Bounties: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Coal Oil Industry, Rep. of Bounty Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6173 (iv).
Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6882 (iv).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs.: Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 6175.
Cold Storage for Fish on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Wright) 7008 (iv).
Cold Storage Transportation on Steamships, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) to Com. of Sup., 7907; Neg. (Y. 38; N. 62) 7936 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7751, 8022 (iv).
Colonization Roads in Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8017 (iv).
Corn Duty, Ref. to by Mr. Cowan: in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, and Davis Contract *re* Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
——— Inquiry for O.C.'s *re* (Mr. Barker) 6150.
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Time of Discussion, 7538 (iv).
——— *See* 'Davis.'
——— Dredging Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 6347.
——— Employees, Delay in Paying: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6295, 6644 (iv).
Cornwall and Williamsburg Canal Workshops, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6544.
Cow Bay, N.S., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
C. Ross Co., Ottawa, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6544 (iv).
Culbute Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
Customs Collectorship, Victoria, B.C., Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 6364 (iv).

Dairying Commissioner's Branch, Lectures, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).
Dairy Products, Fraudulent Weighing at Montreal: Amt. (Mr. Pope) to Com. of Sup., 7244; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 75) 7271 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).
Dauphin Lake, Lowering of Water: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal., Aud. Gen.'s Letter *re* Papers: Remarks (Mr. Puttee) 6879 (iv).
——— Lighting Cornwall Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
See 'Cornwall Canal.'
Deer Island Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Defence Committee, London, Tels. between Can. and Imp. Govt.: Ref. to in Com. on Militia Bill, 6365 (iv).
'Dennis Eagan' Letter: Personal Explanation (Wm. Ross, N.S.) 7542 (iv).
Depot Harbour Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7753 (iv).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 8022 (iv).
Deschambault Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).

Digby Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).
Dixon, Mr. Geo., Homestead Entry, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 6885 (iv).
Dodd, Judge, Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7939.
Dog-Fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on M. for Sup., 6973; Letter from Mr. Howard Smith: Read, 6977 (iv).
——— Report of Commissioners: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6928 (iv).
Dom. Buildings, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).
——— List of Buildings: Read (Mr. Hyman) 7622 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2° m., and in Com., 7228, 7649 (iv).
Dom. Lands Commissioner's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
Dom. Lands Surveys, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7027, 7197 (iv).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 7953 (iv).
Dredge 'Fielding,' Cost of Building: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7881 (iv).
Dredging in Ont., Summary of Expenditure: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
Dredging Plant, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7885, 7890 (iv).
——— for Canals: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7884 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs., Hydraulic Plant: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
Duck Mountain Timber Berths, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 6543 (iv).
Dundonald, Lord, 'Exploiting by Tories,' Speech of Mr. Lemieux in Eng.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7082 (iv).
——— Farewell to, Adjournment of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7542 (iv).
——— Letter from Mr. Preston *re*: Read (Mr. Clarke) 6014-15 (iv).
——— Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6551; Statement (Mr. Sifton) 6552 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Clarke) 6681 (iv).

Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis, Allowance to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7441.
——— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7420, 7430 (iv).
Eaton Ice Process Prospectus: Read (Mr. Kaulbach) 7003 (iv).
Editorials in English Press *re* Canadian Affairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6023 (iv).
Edmonton 'Bulletin,' Attack on Toronto 'News': Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7348, 7361 (iv).
Electric Power for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iv).
Elkhorn Indian School, Sale of Printing Press: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Engineers for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Estimates, Procedure *re* One-Fifth Vote: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6637 (iv).
——— Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7530.
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7243, 7760 (iv).
Exchequer Court, Additional Judges: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7945.
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Experimental Farms Accounts, Discrepancies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Express and Telephone Cos., Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6687.
——— Jurisdiction of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7449.

Fair-Wage Res., Application to bonused Rys., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6883 (iv).
Farm Delegates to G.B., *re* Immigration: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).
Farran's Point Canal, Number of Locks: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).
Father Point Landing Pier, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Fish Bait in Cold Storage: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).
Fish carried in Bond to U.S., O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Fish Culture: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Fish-Curing and Refrigerating Stations, &c.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 6973 (iv).
Fish Driers in Use: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
——— Unsuccessful Methods: Remarks (Mr. Ross, N.S.) in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).
——— 'Whitman' Methods: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, P.E.I.) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries in Mar. Provs.: List read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7587 (iv).
Fish Supply, Transportation to Ontario: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7448 (iv).

Fisheries, Cold Storage Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
Fisheries Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 7572, 7598 (iv).
Fisheries Jurisidiction between Provs. and Dom.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re* Trap Nets: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572.
Fisheries Protection Service and American Fishing Cos.: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
Fishing Bounties, Increase in Payments : in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
Fishing Industry of Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr Borden, Halifax) on M. for Sup., 6973 (iv)
Fishing Licenses granted in Lakes North of Winnipeg : Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).
Fishing Licenses on Eastern Sea-board, Rep. of Commissioners : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) 7585 (iv).
Flesher, Mr., Inspector in Land Office, Minnedosa : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Flour Standards set, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 6545 (iv).
Fort Lawrence Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (iv).
Fraser River Protection Works, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
'Free Press,' Winnipeg, Harvest Number, Distribution *re* Immigration Literature : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).
Freight Discrimination *re* Canadians via Atlantic Strs.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6199 (iv).

Galops Channel, Completion : in Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6293, 7531 (iv).
——— Pay of Staff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 6294 (iv).
See 'North Channel.'
Gananoque Harbour Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).
Gas and Oil Exploration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
Gaspé and Dalhousie SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).
'Gaspesia,' Str., Quebec and Gaspé Route, Efficiency, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7445.
Geological Explorations in B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Geological Specimens, Purchase of : in Com. of Sup., 7219 (iv).
Geological Surveys, Compilation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Geological Survey, Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7199 (iv).
Geological Survey Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
Geological Survey Reps., Postage *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Sifton) 6150 (iv).
——— Reports, Sale and Distribution : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7213.
Georgeville Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7638.
Georgian Bay Laboratory for Fish : in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
Gilbert, Dr., Appnmt. as Port Physician at Fraserville : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7081 (iv).
Glace Bay, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7639 (iv).
Goderich Harbour Works, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).
Govt. Business, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 7363 (iv).
See 'Business.'
Govt. Cars used by Ministers, Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
Gov. Gen.'s Car, Purchase of : in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
——— Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
Govt. Patronage *re* Mr. Oliver's Newspaper : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 6642 (iv).
Grain and Grain Products carried on I.C.R., Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7783 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7843.
——— Contract with McTavish & Co.: Remarks (Mr. Sherritt) 7843 (iv).
——— Changes in Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sherritt) 7440 (iv).
Grand Manan SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Grand Narrows Bridge Protection : Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Grand River Dredging at Dunnville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 7443 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Arbitration B. No. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6465; 2°, and in Com., 7673; 3° m., 7786 (iv).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier 7228 (iv).
G.T.Ry., Rentals paid to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
G.T.P., Solicitorship : Personal Explanation *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire' (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7226 (iv).
——— Aliens on Surveys, Deportation of Aliens, Action of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6542.
——— evidence of Mr. Hays *re* letter to Prime Minister of 16th June : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6292 (iv).
——— names of those deported : Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 6884 (iv).
——— res. from Can. Society of Civil Engineers : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7439 (iv).

G. T. P. Ry., Aliens on Surveys, verbatim evidence supplied to G.T.P. Authorities : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6880, 6890; Tel. read (Sir Wm. Mulock) 7022 (iv).
——— warrants for deportation : Ques. (Mr. Clarke 6884 (iv).
——— Surveys, Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— govt. parties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6544 (iv).
——— Grades and Curvatures : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Grand Vallée Pier, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7768.
Grant, Geo. N., Political Interference in Guysborough Elections : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6040 (iv).
Greek Catholic Church, Investigation *re* Dispute as to Building : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7068 (iv).
Green Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7641.
Gregory, Lt.-Col.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6013, 6023, 6263 (iv).
——— Incomplete Cor.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7023 (iv).
——— Letter read *re* Resignation (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for Sup., 7680 (iv).
——— Original Gazette *re* : laid on Table (Sir Frederick Borden, King's) 7785 (iv).
Grenville Canal Wharf, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6865 (iv).
Grondines Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7774.
Guarantee Bonds Security for Public Officers, Notice *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7226 (iv).
Guysborough Elections and I.C.R. Employees, Political Interference : Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
——— 'Heelers,' ref. to by Mr. Sinclair, 6066.
——— Ref. to (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6105 (iv).
——— Slander of Judges, Ref. by Mr. Sinclair : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6105 (iv).

Haanel, Dr., Rep. *re* Smelting Ores : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iv).
Halifax and Canso Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Halifax and Liverpool SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6210 (iv).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6210 (iv).
Halifax and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Halifax County Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
Hall's Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642.
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
——— Dom., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7875, 7897 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7774 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).
——— N.S., Summary of Amounts expended in Estimates : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7750, 7843, 7897.
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7736 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766, 7828, 7896.
——— Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Harvest Number of Winnipeg 'Free Press' : *See* 'Free Press,' 'Immigration.'
Harvey, Mr., Political Interference in Marquette : Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).
Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7736 (iv).
Holt, Mr., Allowance to *re* Cattle Guard Commission : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Honora Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).
Howard, Maj., Winner of King's Colonial Prize at Bisley : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 7437.
Hudson's Bay Fishery Patrol, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Hudson's Bay Lands, Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7197.
Hudson's Bay, Patrolling and Customs Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
Hutton, Maj.-Gen.: Ref. to in Com. on Militia B., 6369 (iv).
Hydraulic Dredging Plant, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).

Ice-Breakers for Winter Mail Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Immigrants, Diseased, &c., Medical Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Immigrants entering at Port of Halifax, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7315 (iv).
Immigration Campaign Literature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7324, 7339 (iv).
Immigration Estimates : Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 7222 (iv).
Immigration Literature, and advertising Whiskeys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).
Immigration Salaries and Medical Inspection of Diseased Immigrants : in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iv).
Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 6680 (iv).
Indian Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642.
Indians, B.C., Agents' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Indians, B.C., Hospital Grants, Irrigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
——— Industrial Schools: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
——— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
——— Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Indians, Generally, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Indians, Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Indians, Man. and N.W.T., Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
——— Farm Implements: in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).
——— General Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
——— Live Stock: in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
——— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
——— Schools: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).
——— Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).
——— Triennial Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).
Indians, N.B., Additional Amount: in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).
——— Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6937.
——— Fishing Privileges leased to Henry Bishop, Letter from Chief Prisk: Read (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6937 (iv).
Indians, N.S., Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
——— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 6937 (iv).
——— Relief and Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iv).
Indians, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Indians, P.E.I., Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
——— Relief and Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).
——— Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).
Indian Saw and Grist Mills, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
Indian Schools, Result of Education: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).
Indian Timber Cut on Reserves: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 6934.
Indians, Yukon, Medical Attendance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act *re* Distillers, Repeal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 6148 (iv).
Insane Patients in N.W. Ters.: in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iv).
Inspector of Mines, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
I.C.R., Additional Sidings: in Com. of Sup., 6271 (iv).
——— Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
——— Capital Expenditure, Information given (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6104 (iv).
——— Double Tracking from Moncton to Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Gourley) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).
——— Draw-Bars for Freight Cars, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
——— Employees and Political Interference in Elections: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6026.
——— Employees, Pay to Trackmen, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6024.
——— Express Companies, Control of Business: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7449 (iv).
——— Interference in Running of Trains by Members: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6254, 6276 (iv).
——— Patronage, Control of: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).
——— Political Appointments: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
——— Rivière Ouelle Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
——— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Inter-Imperial Preferential Trade and Mr. Lemieux's Speech in England: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7082 (iv).
Interior, Civil Govt., Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iv).
Iona Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Island Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup, 7642 (iv).
Italian Immigrants stranded in Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 6931 (iv).

Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent in G.B., Evidence, &c.: Read (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 7798 (iv).
James Bay, Fishing License to Arch. McNee: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7575.
Janvrin's Island Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup, 7642 (iv).
Judges appointed as Political Partisans: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
Judges, Appointment of and Promises made to Members: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7943.
Justice, Civil Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup, 7937, 7954 (iv).
See 'Administration of.'

Katchawannoe Lake, Trent Canal Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Kingston Penitentiary, Chaplains, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).

Kingsville Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852.
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6864 (iv).
——— Authority given for Ry. Purposes: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6150 (iv).
——— Bank, Lease to Municipality: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7519 (iv).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Dredging Basins Nos. 1 and 2: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iv).
——— Electric Generator: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Electric Installation: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iv).
——— Employees, Delay in Paying: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iv).
——— Lock Gates: in Com. of Sup., 6868, 7536.
——— Locks Nos. 1 and 2, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Rebuilding Old Locks: in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
——— Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).
——— Water Service *re* Fires: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
'Lady Laurier' and Govt. Strs., Delay in Payment of Crew: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7224 (iv).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering of Water: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Lakefield, Trent Canal, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Lake St. John, Dredging, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7775 (iv).
Land Scrip, N.W.M. Police, for 1885 Rebellion: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iv).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 158 (Mr. Sifton) 1° m., 6874 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7775.
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Legare, Jean Louis, Compensation *re* Removal of Sitting Bull to U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Scott) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).
Lemieux, Mr., Sol. Gen.: *See* 'Solicitor General.'
Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iv).
Letter Carriers, Pay on Sick Leave: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6888 (iv).
Lévis Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Lewes River Dredging, Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Library, H. of C., Better Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7621.
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Changes to Acetylene Gas, Notification to Keepers: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6681 (iv).
See 'Acetylene.'
Lighthouse Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Lindsay, J. B., Lease of Grazing Lands: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Lingan Beach Protection, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Litigated Expenses, Justice Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7960 (iv).
Little Current Channel Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Live Stock Association Law: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. on B. 151, 7237 (iv).
Live Stock Exhibitions: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).
Livingstone's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Lobster Hatchery in Bay of Fundy: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
'Lord Strathcona' Wrecking Plant, Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
Lotbinière Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7776.
Lunenburg County Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
Lunenburg County, Fish Hatcheries: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Lurcher Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
McCreary, Mr., late M.P., Transfer of Body to Winnipeg, &c., and Private Cars: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7492.
McIntosh, Mr. John, late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6546 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Roadway Construction: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).
McNair's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
McNee, Arch., Fishing Licenses: *See* 'James Bay Fishing.'
Macoun, Mr., Rep. *re* Agricultural Com.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 7347; Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7348 (iv).
——— Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7201.
Magdalen Island and Mainland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater, Piers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
Mail Contract with Allan Strs.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).

Mails sent via New York, Contract with Messrs. Allan : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6162, 6184, 6200; Memo. read (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6202 (iv).
Mail Steamships, Average Speed per hour : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6546 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
——— Can. and G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6154.
Main-à-Dieu Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Malignant Cove Piers, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Manchester Line SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Copy received from Manitoba Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7440 (iv).
Maps, Printing and Lithographing : in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iv).
Marconi Telegraph System : in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
Margaretsville Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Marine Dept. and Public Works Dept.: *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
Markey, F. C., Contract *re* North Fisheries : *See* 'Fishing License'; 'Winnipeg and Nelson River."
Masters and Mates Examination, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7595 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Melbourne Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643.
Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7530.
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Midland Dock, Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).
Midland Harbour Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).
Midland Mercantile & Trading Co., Letter from Mr. Gelinas (read) *re* Rental of Dock (Mr. Bennett) 7764 (iv).
Middle River Shear Dam., N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Milford Ry. Accident, N.S., Damages, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6140 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6365, 6378, 6467 (iv).
——— Reprinting as Amended: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6681 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Tisdale) 6882 (iv).
Militia Regulations, *re* Examinations : Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6024 (iv).
Militia at Sydney, Withdrawal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6788; Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 6806 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Kendall) 6553 (iv).
Militia Bill : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' 6552.
'Military Gazette' (Canadian) *re* Govt. Patronage : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7902 (iv).
Militiamen not on Duty, Ministerial Control : Remarks (Mr. Osler) 7732 (iv).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mignault) 6149 (iv).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. L. P. Demers) : M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6785; in Com., and 3°*, 7160 (iv).
Monuments, National : in Com. of Sup., 7970.
Morrison's Point Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Mud Island Shoals, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iv).
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle Summer Service, SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7457.
——— Winter Service, Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
Murray Canal, Supt., Payments to : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7525, 7527.
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I., Completion, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).
——— and Hillsborough Bridge, Letter of Aud. Gen.: Read (Mr. Lennox) on Conc., 6682.
Musketry School Camp at Ottawa, Private Soldiers employed on Fatigue Duty : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 7090, 7096 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Expenditure at Camp : Laid on Table, 6969 (iv).
——— Taxes *re* Maintenance of, &c.: Remarks Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6550 (iv).

Napanee River Buoys, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6149 (iv).
Naturalization : *See* 'Aliens.'
Naval Militia Establishment : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
——— Establishment in Lunenburg Co.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7595.
Negro Point, N.B., Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 6322; 3°*, 6323 (iv).
New Campbellton, Kelly's Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
New England Fish Co. and Canadian Fisheries : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572.
Newfoundland Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 6788.
New Glasgow, Extensions of I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
New London Harbour Improvements, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

Newport Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
North Channel Dam, Completion, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6314, 6323 (iv).
See 'Galops.'
Northern Fishing Rights, Granting of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).
North Head Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).
North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co., Cor., &c., *re* Seven Islands Wharf: Read (Mr. Clarke) 7982 (iv).
See 'Seven Islands.'
N.W.M. Police, Capture of Convict Cashel, Compensation *re* Damages: in Com. of Sup., 7963 (iv).
——— Gratuity to Mrs. Beaupré: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
——— Gratuity to Mrs. Brooke: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
——— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
N.W. Ters., Govt. Administration: in Com. of Sup., 7023 (iv).
——— Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iv).
——— Provinical Autonomy: Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
Nova Scotia Judgeships, Promises to Members *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).

O'Callaghan, Mr., Duties on Cornwall Canal: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Ogden's Pond Protection Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Oil Boring Explorations in N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7217 (iv).
Otonabee River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7855, 8022 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— Lighting, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
——— Rentals paid to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
Ottawa Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Ottawa, House of Commons, Accommodation for Members' Wives: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Owen Sound Protection Works, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).

Pacific Bank of Canada B. No. 159 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 6973; 2°*, 7721 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).
Parole System, Appointment of Officer: in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).
Peace River, Rep. of J. M. Macoun, Distribution, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7201.
See 'Macoun,' &c.
Peace River, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Pelee Island Cable Connection with Mainland: in Com. of Sup., 8023 (iv).
Pembroke Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Pembroke Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853.
Penetanguishene Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7854 (iv).
Penitentiaries, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
Pension Scheme for P.E.I. Ry., Letters and Pets. *re*: Read (Mr. Lefurgey) 6221, 6227.
Percé Wharf, Gaspé Co. Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Perry, Mr., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) 7436 (iv).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) *re* G.T.P. Solicitorship, 7226 (iv).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Ross, N.S.) *re* 'Dennis Eagan' Letter, 7542 (iv).
Peterborough Dam, Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7464 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7749 (iv).
Petroleum Crude Bounty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding), 7785 (iv).
Pickett's Pier, Reconstructon, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Picton Custom House, Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
Pictou Landing, I.C.R. Siding: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Pictou and Murray Harbour SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv).
Playfair & Co., Rental for Midland Dock: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7765.
Pleasant Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Pointe aux Anglais Lightkeeper, Duties, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 7225 (iv).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).
Pointe St. Pierre Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Political Appointments: *See* 'I.C.R.'
Political Interference and Govt. Officials in Man.: Remarks (Mr. LaRivière) in Com. of Sup., 7067 (iv).
Political Interference by Govt. Employees: *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Guysborough,' &c.
Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on B., 6382 (iv).

Poonamalie Dam, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lavell) 7784 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Decision of Ry. Commissioners *re* Bell Telephone Co.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6733 (iv).
Port Bevis Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7636.
Port Burwell Harbour Works, Expenditure *re*, 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7440 (iv).
Port Colborne Deepening: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (iv).
——— Entrance Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6807 (iv).
Port Credit Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7888 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Hood, Northern Entrance, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (iv).
Port Hood Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
Port Maitland Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7448 (iv).
Port au Pique Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Perry Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7854 (iv).
Port Stanley Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
Port Stanley Harbour Works, Total Expenditure from 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7440 (iv).
Postal Rates between Can. and G.B. in 1868: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7437 (iv).
Postmaster's Refusal to send Letter free to M.P.'s: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6549 (iv).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. No. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) 1° m., 6541 (iv).
Poultry Stations: *See* 'Chicken Fattening.'
Prescott Lighthouse, Construction of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7817 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Letter in English Press *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal: Read (Mr. Clarke) 6014-15 (iv).
See 'Dundonald.'
P.E.I. and G. Britain Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7460 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Car Accommodation *re* Tourists, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6227, 6242 (iv).
P. E. I. Ry., Damages to Perishable Goods *re* Transportation, Compensation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
——— Deficits and Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).
——— Dismissals in 1896: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
——— Pay to Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
——— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
P.E.I. Telegraph Lines, Connection and Govt. Control, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— Connection with Port Hood, Govt. Control: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— Govt. System: in Com. of Sup., 7894.
——— Mainland Telegraph Connection: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
Printing Bureau: Delay in printing Voters' Lists: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 6789 (iv).
Private Cars: *See* 'Govt. Cars.'
Private Secretaries, Justice Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7937 (iv).
Prospect Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646.
Proulx, Mr., late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7902 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Depts., Transfer of Duties, O.C.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7599.
——— List of Dredges, Plant, &c.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7600 (iv).
Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv).

Qu'Appelle-Edmonton Telegraph Lines, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8023 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
Questions asked by Members, Rights *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6890 (iv).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. No. 73 (Mr. Lennox) M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to remove to Govt. Orders, 6364; in Com., 6686; 3°*, 6686 (iv).
——— B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6686; Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6687; Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Decision of Ry. Commissioners, &c., 6713; 3° m., 7545; Amt. (Mr. Blain) *re* Express Companies, 7545; Neg. (Y. 33; N. 72) 7550; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) *re* Telephones, &c., 7563; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 74) 7564; Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* 2-cent Passenger Rate, 7551; Neg. (Y. 17; N. 94) 7562; 3° agreed to, 7571 (iv).
Railway Commission Buildings, Rental: in Com. of Sup., 7625 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners' Private Car, Purchase of : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
Railway Dept., Payments to Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7490 (iv).
——— Payments to Extra Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 7489 (iv).
Railway Estimates, Information from Minister : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).
Railway Statistics, Collection of : in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies Payment B. No. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 6873 (iv).
Regina 'Leader,' Payments to for Immigration Literature : Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).
Registrars of N.W.T. Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7023 (iv).
Representation Act Amt. B. No. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2°, and in Com., 7669; 3° m., 7786.
——— Remarks, 7228 (iv).
Revised Statutes, Amt. B. No. 154 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6541; 2° m., and in Com., 6795; 3°*, 6797 (iv).
'Richelieu,' Dredge, Cost of Maintenance : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6543 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
Rideau Canal, Smith's Falls Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
Rideau Hall, Fuel, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7628.
——— Grounds, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Rimouski Pier Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
River John Mail Contracts : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Bell) 6024 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Harbour Improvements, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7781 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements and Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter written as Minister of Militia *re* Elections : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 6063 (iv).
——— Denial and Stmnt. *re* Forgery (Mr. Ross) 6062 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Contract, Tests, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6886 (iv).
Russell, Mr., M.P., Judgeship *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7940.
Rustico Harbour Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

St. Amour's Gully, Soulanges Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Andrews' Rapids, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7897 (iv).
St. Charles Junction, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
Ste. Famille Pier Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. Gabriel Basin, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
St. Godfroi de Nouvelle Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. John and Belfast SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6214 (iv).
St. John and Digby, SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
St. John and Dublin, SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6214 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, SS. Service : in Com. of Sup,, 6213 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. John and London, SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6215 (iv).
St. John, W. Indies and S. America, SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
St. John and Yarmouth, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. John River Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilmot) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
St. John River, Negro Point Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, Damages to Dredge, 'J. I. Tarte' : in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
——— History : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
——— Insurance Rates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7607 (iv).
——— List of Dredges, Plant, &c.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7600 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Transfer of Duties from Public Works to Marine Dept.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7599 (iv).
St. Lawrence Winter Navigation for Allan Strs.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6156, 7456.
St. Lawrence Wrecking Plant Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
St. Louis Exhibition, Officers appointed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7404 (iv).
St. Maurice Slides : in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
St. Ours Lock, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6864 (iv).
St. Peter's Canal Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
St. Simeon Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7828.
St. Stephen and Back Bay Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
St. Thomas Military Camp, District No. 1, Total Expenditure : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7226 (iv).

St. Thomas, 25th Battalion Club Rooms, Rent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7226 (iv).
Salmon River Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).
Salvation Army Officers and Parole System *re* Penitentiaries: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).
Sandy Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Sarnia Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855.
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Mr. Steer's Rep. *re* Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7034-5.
——— Letter in 'Globe' *re* Homestead Regulations: Read, 7036 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7856 (iv).
Saw Mills, Portable, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
Scholes, Lou, Champion Oarsman of the World: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 7437 (iv).
School Lands, Taxes *re*, Litigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Schools in N.W.T., Expenses *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iv).
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Scow Building for Canals, Advertising for Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).
Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. No. 151 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 6364; 2° m., and in Com., 7230 (iv).
Sessions, Length of, and Delay in Calling Parlt.: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) 6638 (iv).
Seven Islands Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7828, 7872 (iv).
——— Anonymous Letter *re* Work at Clarke's City: Read (Mr. Taylor) 7991 (iv).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. No. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv).
Shives Lumber Co., Cor. *re* Campbellton Wharf: Read (Mr. Fowler) 7788 (iv).
Shives, Mr., Purchase of Caraquet Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
Sioux Indians, Treaty, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Protection Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Smith's Falls Bridge over Rideau Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
Snow Cleaning, Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Solicitor General, Mr. Lemieux, and Political Speeches in England, Cable Despatch: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7082 (iv).
Songhees Indians, &c., Removal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Arms and Heaters: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Land Damages: in Com. of Sup., 7538.
——— Steel Bridge over Power House: in Com. of Sup., 6862 (iv).
——— Survey for Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6862 (iv).
——— Water Wheel Governors: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Workshops, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6863.
Souris Point Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
S. America and St. John, SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
Southampton Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iv).
Spanish River Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iv).
Sparks, Mr. W. S., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) 7402 (iv).
Springhill Junction, Water Boring, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
Spry Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647.
Standard Oil Refinery, Visit of Official *re* Bounties: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6173 (iv).
Standard Passenger Tariff Tolls: Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6761 (iv).
Statutes, Consolidation Commission, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iv).
Stewart, Mr., Inspector of Timber, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7072 (iv).
Stewart, Mr., Rep. *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Stewart, Supt. of Canals, and Str. 'Alert,' Use of: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7472, 7520 (iv).
——— Hotel Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
Summerville Wharf Addition, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Supply B. No. 156 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 1° m., 2° m., and 3° m., 6784 (iv).
——— Procedure *re* One-Fifth Vote: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6637 (iv).
Supply Items, in Balance Column, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6863.
Supreme Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7939.
Surveys for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Survey of Dom. Lands, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Sussex Platform for Barracks, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
Sydenham River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).

Sydney, B.C., Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 8022 (iv).
Sydney, N.S., and Bay St. Lawrence Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
Sydney and Whycocomagh Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7452 (iv).
Sydney Quarantine Station Wharf, N.S.: in Com .of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Sydney Riots, Withdrawal of Militia : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6788; Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 6806 (iv).
'Tarte, J. I.,' Damages to Dredge : in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Remarks in England *re* Lord Dundonald and Tory Press : Cable read (Mr. Clarke) 7020 (iv).
——— Accuracy of Rep. of London Cable, Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7441 (iv).
——— Cablegram in Montreal 'Star' : Read (Mr. Clarke) 7361 (iv).
Tate Dry Dock, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
Telegraphers' Union and I.C.R., Special Agreement *re* Dismissals : Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6038 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7891.
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv)
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).
Temiscaming Wharf, Ont: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2°*, 6790; in Com., 6790; 3°*, 6791 (iv).
Temporary Clerks, Permanent Staff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7896.
Tenecape Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7863 (iv).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher): M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 7966 (iv).
Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 150 (Mr. German) M. *re* Pet., 6147; 1°, 6147; M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 6786; in Com., and 3°*, 6845 (iv).
Thornbury Harbour, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7863 (iv).
Three Rivers Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iv).
Tiffin, Mr., Travelling in Private Car to California : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (iv).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry., Subsidies, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7225 (iv).
Timber Protection on Dom. Lands : in Com. of Sup., 7070 (iv).
Timber Reserve, Township No. 19, Man., Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).
Tobacco Commission to U.S., Instructions *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7224 (iv).
Tobacco Duties, Excise and Customs : Ques. (Mr. Bell) 6546 (iv).
Tobacco Experiments at Experimental Farms, Bulletins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7438 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Duties *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7785 (iv).
——— Protection and Encouragement : Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Sup., 6894; Amt. Neg. (Y. 19; N. 50) 6927 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission, Printing : M. (Mr. Monk) 7436, 7542 (iv).
Toronto Harbour (eastern entrance) Improvements Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7864 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Island (south side) Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).
Tow-Boat purchased by Govt. from Laperriere & Freres : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 7442 (iv).
'Townsend' Valves in Welland Canal Locks : in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
Trade and Commerce Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Transportation Commission : in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Lennox) 6362 (iv).
Transportation Facilities : in Com. of Sup., 7897 (iv).
Trap Nets and Fishery Regulations : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Treadgold Concession, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7792 (iv).
——— Suppression of Rep. of Commissioners : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6013 (iv).
Trent Canal, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 6827, 6846 (iv).
——— Dredging Machinery : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Lock Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Trenton Harbour Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer : Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6149 (iv).
Tree Culture and Mr. Stewart's Experiments : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
Trois Pistoles Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Twelfth of July, Adjournment, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6264 (iv).
Valleyfield Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Arrangements *re* Discussion : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).
Ventilation of Strs. *re* Cold Storage : Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 6176 (iv).
Verchères Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843.
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

Victoria Beach Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Victoria, B.C., Harbour, Dredging Inner Side: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7890.
——— Use of 'King Edward': Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7878 (iv).
Victoria P.O., B.C., Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Printed and Distributed: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6885 (iv).

Walke, W. M., Compensation *re* Damages, N.W. M.P.: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv).
Walpole Island, Indian Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Water Service for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iv).
Wedge Point Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 6361 (iv).
——— Electric Lighting Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6348, 6797; Rep. of R. J. Parke: Read (Mr. Enmerson) 6807 (iv).
——— stmnt. (Mr. Emmerson) 6675 (iv).
——— Employees, Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).
——— Gas Lighting: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).
——— Lock Tenders, Pensions to: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
——— Political Appointments: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
——— Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iv).
——— Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6867.
West Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647.
West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. No. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6093, 6845; M. to ref. back to Com., 6104; 3°*, 6845 (iv).
West Point Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7743 (iv).
Whitley, Lt.-Col., Tel. to from Hon. Mr. Fisher, *re* Command, &c.: M. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) to adjn., 6875 (iv).
White's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Wiarton Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6219.
Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licenses, Mr. Markey's Contract: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Winnipeg and Northern Lakes Fishing Licenses, Granting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).

Yamaska Dredging, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iv).
Young, Mr. Thos., Political Interference *re* Man. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Yukon District, Buildings, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
——— Fees, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
——— Govt. Administration Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
——— Judges, Travelling Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
——— Law Library, Purchase of Books: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
Yukon and Lewes River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Yukon, Officials, Living Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7947 (iv).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7025.
——— Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
——— Sheriffs, Allowances, Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).